

Biblical Principles of Leading and Managing Employees



BRUCE E. WINSTON



Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business

Series Editors

Kathleen Patterson
School of Global Leadership and Entrepreneurship
Regent University
Virginia Beach, VA, USA

Doris Gomez
Regent University
Virginia Beach, VA, USA

Bruce E. Winston
Regent University
Virginia Beach, VA, USA

Gary Oster
Regent University
Virginia Beach, VA, USA

This book series is designed to integrate Christian faith-based perspectives into the field of leadership and business, widening its influence by taking a deeper look at its foundational roots. It is led by a team of experts from Regent University, recognized by the Coalition of Christian Colleges and Universities as the leader in servant leadership research and the first Christian University to integrate innovation, design thinking, and entrepreneurship courses in its Masters and Doctoral programs. Stemming from Regent's hallmark values of innovation and Christian faith-based perspectives, the series aims to put forth top-notch scholarship from current faculty, students, and alumni of Regent's School of Business & Leadership, allowing for both scholarly and practical aspects to be addressed while providing robust content and relevant material to readers. Each volume in the series will contribute to filling the void of a scholarly Christian-faith perspective on key aspects of organizational leadership and business such as Business and Innovation, Biblical Perspectives in Business and Leadership, and Servant Leadership. The series takes a unique approach to such broad-based and well-trodden disciplines as leadership, business, innovation, and entrepreneurship, positioning itself as a much-needed resource for students, academics, and leaders rooted in Christian-faith traditions.

More information about this series at
<http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/15425>

Bruce E. Winston

Biblical Principles of Leading and Managing Employees

palgrave
macmillan

Bruce E. Winston
Regent University
Chesapeake, VA, USA

Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business
ISBN 978-3-319-77136-6 ISBN 978-3-319-77137-3 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77137-3>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018940757

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2018

Scriptures marked NAS are taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD (NAS): Scripture taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE®, copyright© 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover credit: Classen Rafael/EyeEm

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer International Publishing AG part of Springer Nature
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Contents

1	Contrast Leader, Manager, and Administrator	1
2	Leadership Style as an Outcome of Motive: A Contingency ‘State’ Rather Than ‘Trait’ Concept	7
3	Applications from the Mountaintop	15
4	Harvesting the Fruit of Agapao Leadership	49
5	The Virtue of Love: A Foundation for Leadership	63
6	The Four ‘Leadership’ Faces of Ezekiel 1, Ezekiel 10, and Revelation 4 Paralleled by the Four Gospels	77
7	The Leadership Styles of Jesus as Found in the Four Gospels	83
8	Compensation	119

vi Contents

9 Leadership According to Proverbs 31	127
10 Stepping Out of the Way When It Is Time to Leave—Ecclesiastes 3:1	139
Conclusion	143
Index	145

About the Author

Dr. Bruce E. Winston has been a part of Regent University since 1991, both with the School of Business and the School of Business and Leadership (SBL). He has led the school as Dean for seven years and also served as Director for the Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership program. Under his leadership, SBL experienced growth in its program and publication offerings, and earned prestigious accreditations for its MBA and leadership programs, including ACBSP and ASEL. Dr. Winston stepped away from his position as Dean in 2013 to focus on teaching, mentoring, and writing. He currently serves as Professor of Business and Leadership teaching in Regent University's Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership and MBA programs.

List of Tables

Table 7.1	Jesus' leadership styles from the Gospel of Matthew	85
Table 7.2	The frequencies of ascribed leadership styles in the Gospel of Matthew	94
Table 7.3	Jesus' leadership styles from the Gospel of Mark	99
Table 7.4	The frequencies of ascribed leadership styles in the Gospel of Mark	101
Table 7.5	Jesus' leadership styles from the Gospel of Luke	102
Table 7.6	The frequencies of ascribed leadership styles in the Gospel of Luke	108
Table 7.7	Jesus' leadership styles from the Gospel of John	109
Table 7.8	The frequencies of ascribed leadership styles in the Gospel of John	115

Introduction

This book focuses on the ontological (being) and axiological (doing) of leading, managing, and supervising employees. The book begins with a chapter that contrasts leaders, managers, and administrators and the roles they each play. The book then presents the role of motive in leadership decisions. The book continues by looking at the second half of the Sermon on the Mount and applying the principles to leading and managing. Following the principles is a chapter looking at the nine Fruit of the spirit as outcomes of living a life by scriptural principles. The book then reviews the 15 characteristics of what love is and what love is not from the 1 Corinthians 13 passage. The book presents the four modalities of leaders as conveyed in the Ezekiel 1 and 10 chapters, as well as Revelations 4 where Ezekiel and John describe the four faces of the winged beings. The modalities are described in terms of contemporary leaders interacting with employees in the workplace. Then, a chapter examines Jesus' leadership styles as depicted by His actions in the four Gospels. A chapter follows, based on the Parable of the Vineyard and how leaders should provide a minimum living wage. The book then compares the wife in Proverbs 31 to a good leader/manager in today's contemporary organization. The book ends with an

admonition from Ecclesiastes 3:1 about the need for leaders/managers to step away and not meddle when the leader/manager's role is finished. Throughout the book, composite case examples provide practical application of the concepts to contemporary organizations.



1

Contrast Leader, Manager, and Administrator

For this book, I define leader, manager, and administrator based on the focus of the person's efforts. A leader is someone who directs and motivates employees to accomplish new, or innovative, tasks that may not have been tried before. To use the Star Trek Motto "to boldly go where no one has gone before," whereas a manager focuses on maintaining a system and solving problems in the system so that the result is stability, reliability, and integrity of the system. Administrators focus on the routinization of tasks and accept problems as inherent in the system. Administrators focus on correct staffing levels, correct task assignment, and correct task tracking. The above definitions for leaders and managers are similar to what Ratcliffe (2013) suggested, and the definitions for managers and administrators are similar to what Surbhi (2015) proposed.

Leaders focus on people, while managers focus on the process, and administrators focus on the task. These definitions are important for this book in that each is described, in various ways in scripture. In Exodus 3 we find the account of God calling Moses to be a leader and take the Jewish people out of Egypt. We see John the Baptist calling the people to change their behavior and prepare to do something new

(Matthew 3). Throughout the gospels we see Jesus calling for change among the Jewish people asking them to engage in a new/different lifestyle.

In the account of building the temple (Ezekiel 41), we see what appears to be a manager planning the process and outcome of the building efforts. In Nehemiah, the book describes both a planning, problem-solving manager overseeing the efforts to rebuild the wall but also a leader seeking to call the Jewish people back to a Hebrew lifestyle and worship style. In another account of the building of the temple (1 Kings Chapter 5), we see Solomon acting as an administrator hiring and assigning tasks. In 1 Kings Chapters 6–8, we see Solomon acting in the role of manager planning and coordinating the process steps of building the temple. In 1 Kings 9, we see the author(s) refer to the ‘forced labor’ called for by Solomon (verse 15), thus showing a focus on the process and not on the ‘employees—in this case, slaves.

Leadership

Winston and Patterson (2006) reviewed the literature available at the time of their study to see how leadership was defined and measured. From their review of the literature they found over 1000 items related to a definition of leadership, which they condensed down to 91 dimensions/factors/categories and from this base developed an integrative definition of leadership:

A leader is one or more people who selects, equips, trains, and influences one or more follower(s) who have diverse gifts, abilities, and skills and focuses the follower(s) to the organization’s mission and objectives causing the follower(s) to willingly and enthusiastically expend spiritual, emotional, and physical energy in a concerted coordinated effort to achieve the organizational mission and objectives. The leader achieves this influence by humbly conveying a prophetic vision of the future in clear terms that resonates with the follower(s) beliefs and values in such a way that the follower(s) can understand and interpret the future into present-time action steps. In this process, the leader presents the prophetic vision in

contrast to the present status of the organization and through the use of critical thinking skills, insight, intuition, and the use of both persuasive rhetoric and interpersonal communication including both active listening and positive discourse, facilitates and draws forth the opinions and beliefs of the followers such that the followers move through ambiguity toward clarity of understanding and shared insight that results in influencing the follower(s) to see and accept the future state of the organization as a desirable condition worth committing personal and corporate resources toward its achievement. The leader achieves this using ethical means and seeks the greater good of the follower(s) in the process of action steps such that the follower(s) is/are better off (including the personal development of the follower as well as emotional and physical healing of the follower) as a result of the interaction with the leader. The leader achieves this same state for his/her self as a leader, as he/she seeks personal growth, renewal, regeneration, and increased stamina—mental, physical, emotional, and spiritual—through the leader–follower interactions.

The leader recognizes the diversity of the follower(s) and achieves unity of common values and directions without destroying the uniqueness of the person. The leader accomplishes this through innovative, flexible means of education, training, support, and protection that provide each follower with what the follower needs within the reason and scope of the organization's resources and accommodations relative to the value of accomplishing the organization's objectives and the growth of the follower.

The leader, in this process of leading, enables the follower(s) to be innovative as well as self-directed within the scope of individual-follower assignments and allows the follower(s) to learn from his/her/their own, as well as others' successes, mistakes, and failures along the process of completing the organization's objectives. The leader accomplishes this by building credibility and trust with the followers through interaction and feedback to and with the followers that shapes the followers' values, attitudes, and behaviors towards risk, failure, and success. In doing this, the leader builds the followers' sense of self-worth and self-efficacy such that both the leader and followers are willing and ready to take calculated risks in making decisions to meet the organization's goals/objectives, and through repeated process steps of risk-taking and decision-making the leader and followers together change the organization to accomplish the organization's objectives.

The leader recognizes the impact and importance of audiences outside of the organization's system and presents the organization to outside audiences in such a manner that the audiences have a clear impression of the organization's purpose and goals and can see the purpose and goals lived out in the life of the leader. In so doing, the leader examines the fit of the organization relative to the outside environment and shapes both the organization and the environment to the extent of the leader's capability to insure the best fit between the organization and the outside environment. (pp. 7–8)¹

The definition above speaks to doing new, innovative things, vision, mission, goals, unity of values, expending energy and effort toward the organization's goals and resonance of the organization's goals with the employees' goals.

Management

Fayol, in 1916, posited six functions of management (Mindtools 2017):

1. Forecasting
2. Planning
3. Organizing
4. Commanding
5. Coordinating
6. Controlling

Fayol produced a series of principles for managers, based on the six functions. Note that none of the functions speak to innovation, new direction, vision, values, etc. Nothing wrong with this, but it does show the differences between what a leader does and what a manager does. This is not to say that someone could not be both a leader and a manager, but it helps to know which one is at any given time so that oneself and others can understand the person's motives, behaviors, and expectations.

¹Used with permission from the *International Journal of Leadership Studies*.

Administration

Administration, as defined in the Oxford dictionary is the ‘running of a business’ or ‘the day to day administration of a company’. It is a bit awkward to define administration as ‘administration,’ There is little in the contemporary business peer-reviewed journals about the definition of administration. According to [padmad.org](http://www.padmad.org/2014/02/definition-of-administration-as-defined.html) (<http://www.padmad.org/2014/02/definition-of-administration-as-defined.html>), the word administration is from the two Latin words ‘ad ministrare’ meaning to ‘to act’ ‘to serve’ or ‘to do.’ According to [Randstad.co.uk](https://www.randstad.co.uk/job-seeker/career-hub/archives/what-does-an-administrator-do_1175/) (https://www.randstad.co.uk/job-seeker/career-hub/archives/what-does-an-administrator-do_1175/), administrators are the ‘oil’ that lubricates the operation of the business.

It is also possible to see someone work as a manager and an administrator. I don’t recall ever seeing someone work as both a leader and an administrator since leaders focus on doing new things rather than the orderly precision of a set of routines.

Works Cited

- Mindtools. (2017). *Henri Fayol’s principles of management*. Retrieved December 22, 2017, from <https://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/henri-fayol.htm>.
- Padmad.org. (2017). *Definition of administration as defined by various authors*. Retrieved December 22, 2017, from <http://www.padmad.org/2014/02/definition-of-administration-as-defined.html>.
- Ratcliffe, R. (2013). What’s the difference between leadership and management? *Guardian Careers*. Retrieved December 22, 2017, from <https://www.theguardian.com/careers/difference-between-leadership-management>.
- Surbhi, S. (2015). *Difference between management and administration*. Key Differences. Retrieved December 22, 2017, from <https://keydifferences.com/difference-between-management-and-administration.html>.
- Winston, B., & Patterson, K. (2006). An integrative definition of leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(2), 6–66. http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/publications/journals/ijls/new/vol1iss2/winston_patterson.doc/winston_patterson.htm.



2

Leadership Style as an Outcome of Motive: A Contingency 'State' Rather Than 'Trait' Concept

The notion that differing leadership styles have differing motives is not new but what this conceptual article offers is a new way of seeing leadership styles, specifically the four styles of charismatic, transformational, servant, and transactional as a set of contingent styles that leaders select from based on the leader's 'state' of motive at the time of any given leader–follower exchange. Leaders, according to Yukl (2005) engage in persuasive behavior as a means of gaining followers' compliance toward some desired goal attainment. This conceptual study contends that there is/are one or more motives that drive the leader's use of persuasive means. Brown (2003) claims that motives "do not reveal themselves directly. Instead, we must infer their existence by analyzing behavior and the conditions under which the behavior occurs" (p. 604). Brown's comment implies that leaders tend not to divulge the motive that underlies the behavior but rather researchers are engaging in ethnographic observation and implying motives based on observed behavior. However, behaviors are sometimes the same when different motives are at play. For example, while leaders may behave in ways that benefit the follower, transformational leadership, according to Bass (2000) as well as Patterson et al. (2004) differs from servant leadership in that the

transformational leader is focused on the well-being of the organization whereas the servant leader is interested in the well-being of the follower. Thus, the mere observation of leader behavior may not be sufficient to truly understand the leader's motive. This paper argues that leaders should consciously recognize their motives; understand how those motives affect the leadership style selected for any given leader–follower interaction; and disclose to the follower what motive lies beneath the behavior to avoid the follower's misinterpretation of the leader's behavior.

There is a paucity of research on leaders' motives with the one notable exception of McClelland's (1961) motive-based motivation theory that posited that all leader behavior can be understood through the three motives of (a) need for achievement, (b) need for power, and (c) need for affiliation. This present paper looks at a different set of motives that may be used to explain and predict which one of four leadership styles a leader may use: (a) charismatic, (b) transformational, (c) servant leadership, and (d) transactional leadership. The underlying motives of each of the four respectively are: (a) me, (b) we, (c) thee, and (d) it. This paper presents each of the four motives/leadership styles and presents support for the premise that motive and style are related. Similar to McClelland's work, these four motives can be seen as a configuration of motives that lead to the situational selection of style. But contrary to McClelland's approach this paper argues that motives are 'state' rather than 'trait,' and the leaders vary their motives from situation to situation. The scope of this paper is limited to single-motive leadership styles and does not discuss multiple motive styles such as the paternalistic or clan leadership styles that might include multiple motives or the absence of motives such as the laissez-faire style.

Charismatic Motive of 'ME'

House (1977) presented his theory of charismatic leadership as a set of behaviors, which was in contrast to Weber's (1947) consideration of charisma as a trait of leadership. House claimed that charismatic

leaders engage in impression management strategies as a means of building their image. This present paper makes the connection between the motive of self-image building as a driving force for the leader to engage in the charismatic leadership style.

The use of self-enhancement strategies, according to Kobayashi and Brown (2003) is universal in that both Western and Eastern cultures seem to exhibit equivalent levels of self-esteem and engage equally in self-enhancement strategies. If Kobayashi and Brown are correct in their claim, then it is logical that we should expect to see all leaders engage in some form of self-enhancement behaviors in some leader–follower interactions. This article does not address the dysfunctional ‘dark side’ of charismatic leadership as Conger (1990), and Sankowsky (1995) present the dysfunctional side but rather considers the ‘functional’ use of charismatic motives and behaviors.

In addition to self-enhancement, charismatic leaders engage in persuasive rhetoric and dialogue as a means of gaining compliance and support from followers to achieve the leader’s vision. Jacobsen and House (1999) imply that charismatic leaders present the leader’s vision in such a manner as to convince the follower that the follower has the ‘right’ to achieve the vision. Usually, according to Jacobsen and House, the follower seeks to expend energy and resources to achieve the leader’s goals because the goals are inline with the followers’ own desires. For this present conceptual article, the underlying ‘ME’ motive of charismatic leadership behavior rests in the desire by the leader to see his/her image enhanced or his/her vision/goals achieved.

This conceptual chapter proposes that if leaders self-disclose that the leader wants to enhance his/her image or that the leader seeks to achieve his/her vision and goal, the follower will have accurate information as to why the leader seeks to persuade the follower and may help to remove the follower’s suspicion about the leader’s motive. This fits well with Avolio et al. (2004) authentic leadership concept in that according to Avolio et al. authentic leaders “transparently [interact] with others” (p. 802) although Avolio et al. do not specifically call for authentic leaders to disclose their motives.

Transformational Motive of “WE”

Bass (2000) as well as Patterson et al. (2004) stipulate that transformational leaders do what they do to achieve the organization's goals. The transformational leader subjugates his/her personal interest and expects the follower to subjugate personal interests so that the organization's interests may be served. During the leader–follower interaction, it may not be clear if the leader's motive is personal or organizational. It is also not clear in some cases if the good of the organization also becomes a means of enhancing the leader's image. Further, ambiguity arises when both the leader and follower share in the values and vision of the organization and thus are not able to see a difference in the motive for behaviors that achieve the organization's goals. It is for precisely this reason that this conceptual article argues for the leader to be cognizant of the motives for the behavior and to be able to articulate the motives to the followers such that, as Avolio et al. (2004) call for, transparency in the motive-behaviors occurs.

Bass and Avolio (1994) theorized that transformational leaders engage in four elements of behavior: (a) inspirational motivation, (b) idealized influence, (c) individual consideration, and (d) intellectual stimulation as well as charismatic and transactional behaviors but the focus of transformational leadership lies in the four I's of behavior. However, closer inspection reveals that charismatic leaders as well as servant leaders also seek to inspire, influence, reward, and stimulate as well. The difference, though, lies in the motive that underlies the reason for the behavior. The motive of ‘WE’ that focuses the efforts of all for the good of the organization drives the persuasive behavior of the leader to gain compliance from the follower.

Servant Motive of “THEE”

Bass (2000) as well as Patterson et al. (2004) postulate that servant leaders seek the greater well-being of the followers even at the potential expense of the organization. This sentiment is shared by Winston and Ryan (2006) in their presentation of servant leadership as a

humane orientation. The servant leader, according to Patterson (2003) and Winston (2003) selects employees/followers that are aligned with the organization's values (person-organization fit) and, in contrast to charismatic leaders, seeks to understand the follower's vision with the intent of modifying the organization within environment/resource constraints such that the follower can achieve his/her goals. The presumption here is that if there is true values alignment (high degree of person-organization fit) then whatever the employee/follower wants to do will be good for the organization. But this is not the only approach to goal attainment. A tenet of servant leadership, according to Patterson and Winston, is that as the leader–follower exchanges progress there is an ever-increasing bond between the leader and follower such that the follower begins to seek out what the leader wants just as the leader seeks what the follower wants such that the follower begins to behave in ways that achieve the leaders' goals. This is similar to charismatic leadership, and another example of why observing behaviors may not be an acceptable means of determining motive as Brown (2003) contends one should do. The difference in motive here is that the servant leader does not set out to persuade the follower to achieve the leader's goals but rather the follower sets out to discover the leader's goals and works to achieve them in an altruistic manner.

Transactional Motive of "IT"

The motive for transactional is devoid of relationship and shows a contrast between the use of 'IT' as compared to the other three 'ME,' 'WE,' and 'THEE' as a means of showing that sometimes the leader's motive is not about the relationship but task only. While it is not predictable what task-related behaviors leaders may see as devoid of relationship it is likely that every leader has some things that he or she needs to get done just for the sake of getting them done. For example, while it is possible that a leader asking a follower to empty a trash can may have organizational value (ascetics) or follower-value (health) it is more likely that the behavior of emptying the trash can is just something that has to be done and for which the leader is willing to pay for the accomplishment.

The 'pay' may be in the form of extrinsic rewards, or intrinsic but usually transactional behavior rewards are extrinsic. Bass (1985) adds to this understanding of pay for performance, or contingent rewards as he refers to it, by including punishment for lack of performance or wrong performance. Bass makes a point that all leaders exhibit both transformational and transactional styles, but Bass does not discuss whether or not leaders make it clear to followers why they are using each of the styles. The leader may not be interested in 'excellence' as Bass (1990) points out in that transactional leadership behaviors may lead to mediocrity as followers perform at minimum levels to maximize the extrinsic reward for work done.

The ambiguity in motive is evident here as in the other motive sections in that a leader may present a persuasive message to the follower to achieve some goal and it may be seen as the leader framing the request within the greater good of the organization or the follower, wherein the leader may really be just engaging in a negotiated discussion or a 'telling' discussion as a means of accomplishing the task. A follower who seeks relational interaction with the leader may misinterpret the leader's behavior resulting in the follower ascribing motives to the leader that are not accurate. By disclosing the motive of 'IT' to the follower, the leader removes the relational aspect from the behavior or the motive and transparently shows the follower that the behavior is sought and rewards are given simply for accomplishing the goal.

Discussion

The literature implies that followers, through observation and interpretation, will ascribe a motive to a leader's actions. The literature also shows that leaders' behaviors may be similar even though different motives are at work. These two observations from the literature show that if different motives yield similar behaviors and if followers may be motivated to behave based on the leader's motive then it is logical that the leader may want to articulate his/her motives in discussions with followers.

The information presented in this conceptual article implies that leaders have different motives at work at different times, and it may be

that a leader may interact with followers for a period of time using a variety of motives—sometimes out of self-enhancement, sometimes out of interest for the organization, sometimes out of interest for the follower and sometimes out of no particular motive but just wanting to complete a task. The literature lacks the depth of coverage of the notion of the contingency approach of differing motives driving different leadership styles.

The crux of this conceptual article is that leaders may find higher levels of effectiveness if leaders disclose their motives to followers during the exchange of persuasive communication with the follower. This disclosure gives the followers a clearer reason for the requested efforts and the follower can decide whether or not to comply and at what level of involvement.

Future research on this topic might include ethnographic studies using interviews and observations of both leaders and followers to determine levels of commitment and involvement based on different levels of leader-disclosure of the underlying motives. Leadership development training may find higher levels of follower performance effectiveness if leaders are trained to be cognizant of their motives and disclose the motives to followers.

Works Cited

- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 801–823.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, *18*(3), 19–32.
- Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *7*(3), 18–40.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Brown, J. D. (2003). The self-enhancement motive in collectivistic cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34*(5), 603–605.
- Conger, J. A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 19*(2), 44–55.
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189–207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Jacobsen, C., & House, R. J. (1999). *The rise and decline of charismatic leadership*. Retrieved February 26, 2006, from http://leadership.wharton.upenn.edu/_change/publications/House/RiseandDeclinofCharismaticLeadership-House.doc.
- Kobayashi, C., & Brown, J. D. (2003). Self-esteem and self-enhancement in Japan and America. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34*(5), 567–580.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* (Doctoral Dissertation, Regent University, UMI AAT 3082719).
- Patterson, K. A., Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership—A difference in leader focus. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 25*(4), 349–361.
- Sankowsky, D. (1995). The charismatic leader as narcissist: Understanding the abuse of power. *Organizational Dynamics, 23*(4), 57–72.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: The Free Press.
- Winston, B. E. (2003, October 16). Extending Patterson's servant leadership model: Coming full circle. *Regent University School of Leadership Studies Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. <http://www.regent.edu/acad/cls/2003ServantLeadershipRoundtable/>.
- Winston, B. E., & Ryan, B. (2006, March 14–16). Servant leadership as a humane orientation: Using the GLOBE study construct of humane orientation to show that servant leadership is more global than Western. *The 1st International Conference on Value-Based Leadership*. University of Stellenbosch Business School. Bellville, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Yukl, G. (2005). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). New York: Prentice-Hall.



3

Applications from the Mountaintop

This chapter is based on the second part of the sermon on the mount passage from Matthew 5. I addressed the first part of the sermon, the Beatitudes, in a prior book (Winston 2018) as a basis for selecting and developing employees who are a good fit for the organization. The second part of the Sermon on the mount looks at the behaviors that leaders and managers should exhibit.

Salt and Light (You're a Christian, so Show It!)

Matthew 5:13–16:

You are the salt of the earth; but if the salt has become tasteless, how can it be made salty again? It is no longer good for anything, except to be thrown out and trampled underfoot by men. You are the light of the world. A city set on a hill cannot be hidden; nor does anyone light a lamp and put it under a basket, but on the lampstand, and it gives light to all who are in

This chapter was first published in my prior book *Be a Leader for God's Sake* 2003.

© The Author(s) 2018

B. E. Winston, *Biblical Principles of Leading and Managing Employees*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77137-3_3

the house. Let your light shine before men in such a way that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven. (NAS)

Martin (1986) believes that when Jesus called His followers ‘salt,’ that it was a statement of fact, not a calling to a higher place. In calling his followers ‘salt,’ Jesus was articulating what everyone should have already known. Augsburg (1982) states that salt represents three vital qualities: (a) purity, (b) preservation, and (c) flavor. Believers are to have these qualities to be agents of change.

Today, most of us don’t appreciate salt as the Hebrews and Romans did at the time when Jesus presented his lesson from the mount. You have to realize that in Jesus’ day, soldiers often received their pay in salt (the root word is the same as salary). Don’t let the limitations of the English language deprive you of the rich opportunity to grasp this truth. After all, we have so much salt that many of us are on salt-restricted diets! We even have salt substitutes. Salt was a rare and valuable commodity that was essential for preserving food and for adding flavor.

Jesus also called his followers to be the light of the world. In our society today, we have a hard time valuing “light,” compared to the biblical era when the brightest household light was a candle. In the inner city, we suffer from a condition called “light pollution.” Many inner-city dwellers have not seen the grandeur of a starry night and have to drive dozens of miles to get far enough away from the city to see a meteor shower. Pictures from the space shuttle reveal the eerie glow of urban streetlights on our planet at night. One can only wonder what would happen if Jesus gave this sermon today. Perhaps, instead of salt and light, we would have been called to be the “clean air” and “clean water” of the earth. Okay, I’m not going to rewrite Scripture, but I want you to consider the value and importance of salt and light to the people sitting on the mountainside listening to Jesus’ words.

Palmer (1986) helps us understand the value of salt by reminding us “[e]very listener in the first-Century Mediterranean world would be able to appreciate the importance of this salt image. The value of salt is tested not by the way it appears, but by what happens as a result of its use” (p. 30). As Christian leaders put more of their Christianity into the workplace, the more favorable and preserved the workplace becomes.

However, if the Christian leader goes overboard in pushing his or her Christianity, the workplace can become too salty and will be unsuitable for consumption by fellow workers.

Consider the use of salt to flavor food. When a cook adds salt to a broth, the salt is no longer visible, but if sufficient salt has been used; the taste of the salt is present. However, if the cook continues to add too much salt to the broth, it is not likely that the broth will be good to the palate. On the other hand, when there is a need to preserve food, such as meat, the amount of salt is increased to the point that the taste may be negatively affected, but the meat is still preserved and protected. Before consuming, the meat is usually soaked or otherwise treated to remove the excess salt.

There is a strong admonition given to those who wish to follow Jesus. Our Lord tells us that if a Christian loses his or her “saltiness,” i.e., purity, or ability to preserve or flavor, then the only option is to be discarded. The New International Version of the Scriptures puts this passage this way, “... to be thrown out and trampled by men.” In Luke 14:35, Luke states it this way: “It is fit neither for the soil nor for the manure pile; it is thrown out.” The original Aramaic, according to Bowman and Tapp (1957), reveals a play on words. The Aramaic words for ground and dung are *lara* and *lrea*, respectively, that sound very much alike when pronounced.

Matthew’s account in the King James translation of the Scriptures refers to trampled by man. The Greek word for trodden is *katapateo* meaning to reject with disdain, or to be trampled underfoot (Strong’s word 2662). This is strong language, for it implies that if a Christian leader does not act as salt in the workplace by preserving and flavoring, then Christ will reject him. Since I follow the evangelical teachings that consider salvation as secure, then this passage implies that although salvation is secure, Christ will not be able to use the Christian to further His kingdom.

Pelikan and Cardman (1973), in their analysis of St. Augustine’s teaching on the Sermon on the Mount, point out that this crucial admonition harkens back to the aforementioned Beatitude. Jesus warned His followers that they would receive persecution. St. Augustine added this to the salt analogy saying that the Christian must not be

afraid to act from fear of persecution. For if he or she does fail to act, then what good can the Christian provide to the world.

Now let's dive into the virtues of Christians being light. Eddleman (1955) offers an excellent analogy for what Jesus was referring to in this Sermon on the Mount. Eddleman says: "Light warms as it radiates. Its life-giving quality sustains us physically on the earth. 'In Him was life: and the life was the light of men' (John 1:4). The light of God's love, warm and life-giving, is the source of all religion that is not counterfeit. The word 'light' in New Testament language is the root of our word 'phosphorescent'; there is a continual glow" (p. 31). The Greek word Eddleman refers to is *phos* meaning to shine or make manifest. Both are appropriate words to describe the Christian leader in the workplace. Because of the leader's Christian light, it should be clear to all employees in the workplace that this person is indeed a Christian, but the light should not be so overpowering that those around the leader turn away.

Jesus went on to say that believers are a city on a hill. This is a metaphor for the Christian leader to act as a guide for the sojourner. Imagine walking across a large plain at night. There ahead is a city set on a hill, with the city's lights visible for tens of miles. The city's lights act as a beacon to guide you to your destination. This is an excellent analogy for a Christian leader whether he or she is mentoring a younger employee or sharing the vision of the organization.

Jesus uses light as a multi-faceted symbol. He uses light to show illumination or phosphorescence, and as a lighthouse guiding the wanderers. And He uses light as a source of warmth and comfort. I lived many years in Alaska where the winters are cold, long, and dark. Many stores installed large heat lamps just inside the outer doorways that afforded the entering patrons a refreshing presence of warmth and light as they entered. The departing patrons enjoyed the same experience just before entering the frigid arctic air as they left the store. Coming and going, patrons received a welcome respite from the world's torment. Imagine the Christian leader, now, as a warm, comfortable respite in a tormented world. How much more could this Christian do for the kingdom than one who was dull and cold, indistinguishable from the worldly leaders that abound?

Jesus calls Christian leaders and supervisors to be both salt and light. This is a statement of “required” functional behavior. Lloyd-Jones (1962) said it well:

I suggest to you, therefore, that the Christian is to function as the salt of the earth in a much more individual sense. He does so by his individual life and character, by just being the man that he is in every sphere in which he finds himself. For instance, a number of people may be talking together in a rather unworthy manner. Suddenly a Christian enters into the company, and immediately his presence has an effect. He does not say a word, but people begin to modify their language. He is already acting as salt, he is already controlling the tendency to putrefaction and pollution. Just by being a Christian man, because of his life and character and general deportment, he is already controlling that evil that was manifesting itself, and he does so in every sphere and in every situation. He can do this, not only in a private capacity in his home, his workshop or office, or wherever he may happen to be, but also as a citizen in the country in which he lives. (<https://www.monergism.com/thethreshold/sdg/salt.html> about two-thirds down the webpage)

Murder (Anger in the First Degree)

Matthew 5:21–26:

You have heard that the ancients were told, ‘YOU SHALL NOT COMMIT MURDER’ and ‘Whoever commits murder shall be liable to the court.’ But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother shall be guilty before the court; and whoever says to his brother, ‘You good-for-nothing,’ shall be guilty before the supreme court; and whoever says, ‘You fool,’ shall be guilty enough to go into the fiery hell. Therefore if you are presenting your offering at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your offering there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and present your offering. Make friends quickly with your opponent at law while you are with him on the way, so that your opponent may not hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the officer, and you be thrown into prison. Truly I say to you, you will not come out of there until you have paid up the last cent. (NAS)

When Jesus referred to the Commandment, saying, “Thou shalt not kill,” he was directly challenging the day’s interpretation of the law, but He didn’t stop there, He added the clause “Whoever commits murder shall be liable to the court.” The original commandment was not to kill—no exceptions. With the addition of what would happen if you do kill, the statement ceased to be a commandment and became law. In the second half of the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus sought to restore the commandments to a former higher calling (Lloyd-Jones 1962, p. 222).

The word angry, that Matthew uses is the Greek word *orgizo*. *Orgizo* means, “provoking or enraging another, to become exasperated, or to become angry with another” (Strong’s word 3710). This infers the need for patience. *Raca* is a word of disgust and disdain which one person might feel toward another. The word means an empty-one. The phrase, You fool, comes from the Greek word *moros* meaning “dull, stupid, heedless, or absurd” (Strong’s word 3474). Jesus instructs everyone to avoid even the thought of ill will toward another. Martin Luther King, in his work *Stride Toward Freedom*, admonished people “to avoid not only violence of deed but violence of spirit” (Augsburger 1982 p. 72).

Augsburger (1982) wrote:

While one may say he has never killed, Jesus asks about the inner attitude of anger and hate, of destructive words and hostility. Anger wounds others and also warps the spirit of the one immersed in the feeling of wrath or indignation. We need to understand our feelings to be honest about them, but we must resolve anger in other ways than focusing on personalities with destructive attitudes toward them. Paul writes, ‘If you are angry, don’t sin...’ (Eph. 4:26). Anger is a temporary madness and its expression has no place in the community of disciples. (p. 72)

Does this imply that the Christian leader or supervisor must not have angry thoughts? In other parts of the Scripture, we see Jesus speaking poorly of the Pharisees and the moneychangers who were doing business in the inner walls of the temple. Note the example set by Jesus, though. In Jesus’ anger, He is angry at injustice and the blindness of those who should be able to see.

Jesus' words in the Sermon on the Mount speak of being angry without cause. Being angry without a cause is like the leader who sees an employee sitting for a moment and then becomes angry with the employee for slothfulness. There may be many reasons why the employee was sitting idly. The leader in this example violated Jesus' teaching by getting angry without cause. Jesus calls the Christian leader to understand the spirit of the commandment rather than the letter of the law.

Continuing with this thought, Lloyd-Jones (1962) wrote:

The holier we become, the more anger we shall feel against sin. But we must never, I repeat, feel anger against the sinner. We must never feel angry with a person as such; we must draw a distinction between the person himself and what he does. We must never be guilty of a feeling of contempt or abhorrence, or of this expression of vilification. (p. 226)

Consider Matthew 12:34b: "For the mouth speaks out of that which fills the heart" (NAS). Also, consider the Beatitude, Blessed are the pure of heart. Jesus sees our heart as the place where we must block evil and prevent it from entering, for to think evil and to do good is hypocrisy. Jesus admonishes anyone who harbors ill will to reconcile the differences with the other person. Jesus elevates His reconciliation directive to even greater heights by saying that Christians should not sue their brothers. The word brother in Greek is adelphos (Strong's Word 80), means a literal or figurative brother. Jesus is saying that you will be better off by settling with the one you have wronged than waiting and having the matter tried before people who do not know you.

I wonder how many leaders who are caught embezzling, engaging in insider trading, or conducting illegal corporate espionage would be better off confessing their wrong-doings to their CEO and negotiating a settlement rather than trying to hide within the legal system by pleading not guilty. These Scriptures indicate that the Christian leader who commits a wrong against an employee or another leader must go to the injured party, reconcile, and settle. It takes a mature leader to admit that he or she is wrong and to offer physical or emotional restitution. Accompanying this is, of course, repentance.

Christian leaders should see from this passage that if they harbor ill will toward an employee, then they must quickly discuss the matter and not let it fester into a seething wound of anger. Anger, left to its own, soon becomes a tool for Satan. Think of yourself or someone you know who became angry with another person and allowed it to stew for a while without dealing with it. If you are like most people, sooner or later an explosive encounter occurs between the two parties with harsh words that develop into emotional hurts. How do you think the world would see a Christian leader in this light? Certainly not as a beacon on the hill set there to guide others!

The Abilene Paradox (Harvey 1988) is a wonderful book filled with many insights that seem to fit the Sermon on the Mount. One of the essays in the book discusses a Japan Airlines pilot who, through pilot error, landed six miles short of the runway at the San Francisco airport, in the water. The passengers said that it was such a smooth landing no one realized that the plane was in the water until a boat passed by! Later, when the pilot, named Asah, entered his hearing to answer charges of poor performance, the pilot said, “Like Americans say – Asah screwed up” (the text of the conversation implies a harsher word here). No one could argue with the pilot since it was exactly as he said. At least he was honest. I can’t help but wonder how President Nixon would have fared in the press had he followed the same line of action as this Japan Airlines pilot. I wonder what our court systems might look like if we all owned up to our actions.

Anger doesn’t have to be big anger, even little anger is included in this teaching by Jesus. After one year of studying and attempting to develop into an agapao-leadership style, I was particularly busy with a full pile of work on my desk. I walked out of my office to get some materials that I needed, and I noticed my assistant talking with friends on the phone. I could always tell when she was talking with friends because the tone of her voice and the selection of words varied from when she was talking to other administrative staff or her family. I thought to myself, “I hope she gets off the phone quickly, so that we can complete all this work!” If I was busy, I was sure everyone else was, too!

An hour later, I came out of my office for more materials, and my assistant was on the phone again, but with a different friend. I could feel my anger rising, and I began to mutter to myself as I gathered the next round of materials for my slowly decreasing pile of work. This time I could not keep quiet. I interrupted her conversation and asked about a project that I had assigned her the day before. She answered that the project was complete and that she had sent it on to the next administrative office. I went into my office and placed the materials on my desk and then went back to my assistant. I interrupted her phone call again and asked her about a second project. Her response, like the first, was that the project was done and had been shipped on along its administrative path. An hour later, I left my office to get a cup of coffee, and my assistant was no longer at her desk but was now at the coffee pot talking with a co-worker. My anger rose. I walked up to my assistant and asked her about a third project. Her answer, like the previous answers, was the same. Then she asked me a question: "Bruce, why are you asking me if these projects are done?" I answered quickly that there was a lot of work to be done and that I was concerned. She responded that the only person in the office who was not caught up on work was me, in fact, and that she was convinced that I really didn't trust her. I stammered that it wasn't true, but the longer I stood there and thought about it, the more I realized that what she said was right. We had an informal policy, in the office, that when we had a lot of work to do, we worked hard, and if we were caught up, we enjoyed the time as we desired. I admitted to her that she was right. She then looked at me and said: "Bruce, you learned something today!" And with that, she turned and walked down the hall. I stood there realizing that like the main character in the book *The Flight of the Buffalo* (Belasco and Stayer 1994) I had just reverted back to my original buffalo nature and had crashed back to the prairie.

According to the Sermon on the Mount, my thoughts of anger and frustration were totally unjustified. But what do you do with justified anger? As we discussed earlier in the book, Jesus gives us an excellent example. In the account of Jesus chasing out the money changers and the sellers from the temple, we see Jesus acting out of righteous anger, but acting with controlled discipline.

Adultery (Sexual Harassment/Discrimination)

Matthew 5:27–30:

You have heard that it was said, ‘YOU SHALL NOT COMMIT ADULTERY’; but I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman with lust for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart. If your right eye makes you stumble, tear it out and throw it from you; for it is better for you to lose one of the parts of your body, than * for your whole body to be thrown into hell. If your right hand makes you stumble, cut it off and throw it from you; for it is better for you to lose one of the parts of your body, than for your whole body to go into hell. (NAS)

Jesus’ message regarding adultery countermands traditionally held beliefs of the Jewish community. In this passage, the law talks about adultery, but Jesus condemns lust. How often do we read about the leader who lost his job or took early retirement because of a sexual harassment suit? Some might say that he didn’t commit adultery, and they would be right, but the problem remains. The spiritual law talks about the danger of lustfulness, and many leaders have paid the price for breaking this spiritual law.

Augsburger (1982) says that the interpretation of the old law was directed at the married man, and that adultery referred to “marriage breaking,” or the violation of a covenant. But, Jesus broadened the meaning to both married and single people who needed to respect other people in the highest regard. Eddleman (1955) sheds more light on this passage by pointing out that Jesus refers to lust as coming from the heart of man. A man can only blame himself for this sin. Augsburger (1982) and Eddleman (1955) both agree that Jesus considered this issue to be one of great severity, one to be avoided at all costs. Eddleman (1955) contends “Christ did not call for actual mutilations of the body but rather mastery of it” (p. 54). It is obvious that Jesus was referring to men in this passage to emphasize the importance of the message to male leaders and supervisors, but naturally, women are not excluded from this teaching. I see this passage commanding leaders to control lustful thoughts toward employees. Sexual thoughts are powerful emotions

and Jesus' teaching aims at bringing this emotion under control. Martin Luther said: "I cannot keep the birds from alighting on my head, but I can restrain them from making nests in my hair."

Oaths (You're as Good as Your Word)

Matthew 5:33–37:

Again, you have heard that the ancients were told, 'YOU SHALL NOT MAKE FALSE VOWS, BUT SHALL FULFILL YOUR VOWS TO THE LORD.' But I say to you, make no oath at all, either by heaven, for it is the throne of God, or by the earth, for it is the footstool of His feet, or by Jerusalem, for it is THE CITY OF THE GREAT KING. Nor shall you make an oath by your head, for you cannot * make one hair white or black. But let your statement be, 'Yes, yes' or 'No, no'; anything beyond these is of evil. (NAS)

At the time that Jesus spoke these words, Augsburg (1982) explains, the Jewish community had developed a hierarchy of oaths making some statements more binding than others. Jesus was instructing His listeners that they must be honest and forthright with an oath. Today, if we could trust what another person told us, do you think we would need all of the attorneys and the mounds of legal paper that our nation generates each year? Imagine what it would be like to work for a leader or supervisor who always supported and fulfilled what was promised to you. Imagine what it would be like to be a supplier to an organization where the leader's words were binding. There would be no contracts, no invoices. Is it possible? There are actually some firms that are working at this level of relationship. Jesus calls leaders and supervisors to be careful about what they promise and then to always fulfill what they promise, regardless of the cost. The King James translation uses the word communication. The Greek word for "communication" is *logos* meaning, "something said" (including the thought). The Greek words for "yes" and "no" are *nai* and *ov* (Strong's words 3483 and 3756), respectfully, which brings to mind a strong affirmative and strong negative condition

with no room for interpretation of meaning. Jesus commands leaders and supervisors to make their commitment either yes or no. Remove the gray areas and speak clearly so that your employees and peers can understand your message and know exactly what to expect.

Along these same lines, Lloyd-Jones (1962) clarifies what Jesus meant when He said that no one should ever take an oath. Lloyd-Jones illustrates this referring to numerous occasions where God's people (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph of the Old Testament; and Paul of the New Testament) and God, Himself, took oaths. Lloyd-Jones concludes from Scripture that there are places and times for oaths when there exists a sense of solemnity and differentiation. Jesus forbids the use of oaths in ordinary conversation, for there is no need to take an oath about an argument. Jesus calls for simple veracity, the speaking of truth, in all ordinary communications, conversations, and speech (pp. 268–269).

In contrast to Lloyd-Jones, Govett (1984) believes Jesus was saying that no one should ever take oaths. Govett makes a strong case by asserting that the Christian who takes an oath comes under the law and not under grace. Still, it seems that if Govett were correct, Jesus would have had to explain away the serious oaths of the Jewish fathers: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. Remember in the Sermon on the Mount Jesus presented a series of principles that all people should live by every day. These create the code of behavior for our daily living. It seems logical from Jesus' teachings that we can conclude that He is addressing heart-issues in this passage, just as He addressed heart-issues in the preceding passages. He seeks to show that we should live our life for good, in our hearts, our heads, and in our behaviors. To act righteously is not enough; Christian disciples must be righteous. Jesus did not forbid lusting after one's spouse (because in that context, the behavior is appropriate), nor from showing anger when the situation called for anger (again, the context is critical), and He does not say that disciples should not swear an oath when the context calls for it. Matthew records Jesus responding to a question under oath in Matthew 26:63–66:

But Jesus kept silent. And the high priest said to Him, "I adjure You by the living God, that You tell us whether You are the Christ, the Son of

God.” Jesus said to him, “You have said it yourself; nevertheless, I tell you, hereafter you will see THE SON OF MAN SITTING AT THE RIGHT HAND OF POWER, and COMING ON THE CLOUDS OF HEAVEN.” Then the high priest tore his robes and said, “He has blasphemed! What further need do we have of witnesses? Behold, you have now heard the blasphemy; what do you think?” They answered, “He deserves death!” (NAS)

And again in 2 Corinthians 1:23:

But I call God as witness to my soul, that to spare you I did not come again to Corinth. (NAS)

Consider Hebrews 6:16–20:

For men swear by one greater than themselves, and with them an oath given as confirmation is an end of every dispute. In the same way God, desiring even more to show to the heirs of the promise the unchangeableness of His purpose, interposed with an oath, so that by two unchangeable things in which it is impossible for God to lie, we who have taken refuge would have strong encouragement to take hold of the hope set before us. This hope we have as an anchor of the soul, a hope both sure and steadfast and one which enters within the veil, where Jesus has entered as a forerunner for us, having become a high priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek. (NAS)

In the Hebrews passage, God took an oath as a sign to His people. Thus, it seems to me that there must be an appropriate time to take an oath. The issue in this lesson is how others see the disciples’ behavior.

Jesus’ earlier lesson stated that disciples should be like “a city on the hill”? This current lesson on oaths goes hand-in-hand with this teaching. As a city on a hill, Christian leaders are out in the open for all to see. Christian leaders must not exaggerate, or allow people to exaggerate for them. For the world will judge Christians by what they say, what they do, and what they permit. And ultimately, what others think of Christian leaders they will also attribute to Christ.

An Eye for an Eye (Discipline)

Matthew 5:38–42:

You have heard that it was said, ‘Eye for eye, and tooth for tooth.’ But I tell you, do not resist an evil person. If anyone slaps you on the right cheek, turn to them the other cheek also. And if anyone wants to sue you and take your shirt, hand over your coat as well. If anyone forces you to go one mile, go with them two miles. Give to the one who asks you, and do not turn away from the one who wants to borrow from you. (NAS)

Jesus refers to the Old Testament advice from Exodus 21:23–25:

But if there is serious injury, you are to take life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise. (NAS)

And Leviticus 24:20

fracture for fracture, eye for eye, tooth for tooth. The one who has inflicted the injury must suffer the same injury. (NAS)

In the Code of Hammurabi, we see similar messages, but in the Code of Hammurabi, punishments exceeded the crimes. For many people in that day, these passages became the “Law of Revenge” requiring, in Jewish custom, the immediate punishment of one who committed an infraction against another person. Jesus pointed out how the Scribes and Pharisees misinterpreted the Scriptures. The intent of the Exodus and Leviticus passages was to limit the punishment that one might mete out. Jesus sought to show the Jewish community that the law bound no one, but rather that He came to fulfill the law, which was a greater call to love one another. Thus, all should live according to love.

Jesus also called believers to resist evil. The Greek word for resist is *anthistemi* meaning to stand against or to oppose, (Strong’s word 436) and the Greek word for evil is *poneros* referring to mischief, malice, grievous, harmful, malicious, or wickedness (Strong’s word 4190).

On this subject, some authors such as Lloyd-Jones believe that Jesus commands all disciples not to resist evil, but to maintain a pacifist position at all costs. This pacifist view could not be true for it would violate many other parts of Scripture where Jesus admonishes us to resist the evil one and to control our emotions. Jesus, Himself, drove demons out of people and enabled the apostles to do likewise. If such a premise were true, why would God give us Ephesians 6:10–18 about preparing for battle against the prince of this world? Why would Jesus have driven the moneychangers from the temple? Jesus is the epitome of resisting evil! Look again at the Greek. Jesus shows that disciples must live life according to the spirit of the law and not the letter of the law. The letter of the law demanded revenge for every infraction. Individuals would take the law into their own hands and seek retaliation. How many feuds have developed because an individual's interpretation led to retaliation? This is how feuds escalate to war. I believe that this passage calls Christian leaders who have been hurt by someone to respond in the spirit of love rather than a spirit of revenge. You have heard of leaders and supervisors who live by the motto: "I don't get over it, I get even." What message does this behavior communicate to followers? Augsburgburger (1982) says:

We must recall Jesus' words that the citizens of His Kingdom are like salt to the earth, light to the world and yeast in the loaf; the minority which influences the whole but never dominates it, which lives by the higher ethic of love even at the cost in one's own life of the way of the cross. (p. 81)

Many times, evil people or leaders (poneros) will mistreat those under them just to watch them react negatively. But how does the evil person react when the victim doesn't respond? He will soon give up and seek another victim. There is a story (I doubt it is true, but it does illustrate the point) about an old man that lived in a small run-down house just a block from a junior high school. Every afternoon, a group of boys from the school would stop by the old man's house after school and taunt the old man and call him names. The old man would come outside and yell at the boys and raise his cane at them. The boys would laugh mischievously and run away satisfied with their success.

At the beginning of a new school year, the old man changed his strategy. As expected, the boys stopped by the old man's house and called him names. This time though, the old man came out and waved hello to the boys from the porch. The old man then said: "If you boys will come back tomorrow and yell at me some more, I will give each of you one dollar." With that, he turned and went back into the house.

The next day the boys returned and fulfilled the man's wishes. True to his word, the old man came out and gave each of the boys one dollar. He waved to the group and said, "See you tomorrow." Tomorrow came and so did the boys. After the boys had yelled and taunted the old man, the old man came out and said, "I cannot pay you a dollar anymore, for all I have is a quarter for each of you. Please come back tomorrow." The next day the boys, again, yelled and taunted the old man. The old man came out and said, "I can only pay each of you a dime, for I am nearly out of money."

With this, the leader of the group of boys said: "A dime? It's not worth it. Let's go guys." The boys left and never bothered the old man again. When the evil one (poneros) does not get the desired result, his behavior changes.

Let's now look at what it means to go "the extra mile." Let's consider the laborer who is required to work eight hours, but routinely works nine hours without a request for more pay. Should the leader be expected to pay without being asked? If the leader is required to pay for eight hours of work, but instead pays for nine, should the worker come to expect that generosity? When we live by law, we also work and pay by law. This is the great sin of the economic world that Adam Smith laid out for us in his work *The Wealth of Nations*. Smith's call was for each person to pay as little as possible for as much gain as possible. This has become the great mantra of capitalism, but of course, it is incorrect. The greatest gains come from the greatest commitment of workers and followers, not by paying them as little as possible. Carnegie is credited with giving away 90% of his income near the end of his life and supporting all of the people that he could. He was quoted as saying that his gain came from what he gave, not from what he made. I agree that there are people who will take advantage of others who are so generous, but no leader is required to keep and build relationships

with those who would do harm. The goal of agapao leadership is similar to the goal of transformational leadership in that both leader and follower seek to lift the other to higher levels. Like Carnegie, leaders and followers who go the extra mile have the greatest chance to influence those whom they serve.

Love Your Enemies (Competition)

Matthew 5:43–48:

You have heard that it was said, ‘YOU SHALL LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOR and hate your enemy.’ But I say to you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven; for He causes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the righteous and the unrighteous. For if you love those who love you, what reward do you have? Do not even the tax collectors do the same? If you greet only your brothers, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same? Therefore you are to be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect. (NAS)

I treat this passage separately because so many people see this as a separate concept from the “Law of Revenge” that we just discussed. I also treat this passage separately because it is at this point that I part from the thinking of other writers (Augsburger 1982; Lloyd-Jones 1962; Govett 1984; Eddleman 1955).

I do agree with these other writers that this passage is a continuation of the previous and that you will more fully understand by reading the two as one long thought (Matthew 5:36–48). To set the stage for my explanation of this passage, consider the following facts from Scripture. God already set the rule of loving your neighbor in the Old Testament. Jesus said this was the second greatest commandment. As a result, the Israelites were supposed to treat each other well and to not charge excessive interest, or to deny the wants of another. The Old Testament also held strong language regarding enemies, in fact, Exodus and Leviticus recommend destroying enemies in battle.

The question that the Israelites debated for centuries is Jesus' central theme. The Israelites learned from early childhood that their countrymen were their neighbors, while all non-Israelites were their enemies. Imagine growing up believing that someone who is different from you is your enemy. This sheds light on the Middle East struggles of today, doesn't it? The Israelites grew up believing that bigotry was a natural state of events. If someone came from Samaria, no Israelite would trust that person. Most likely, the Israelites would try to cast the Samaritan out of Israel.

This is why Jesus' story of the Good Samaritan, told in Luke 10:30–37, is such a shock to the Pharisee's question regarding just who is "a neighbor." Jesus intentionally uses a Samaritan, a person that most Israelites would have described as an enemy, to be the neighbor in His story. The thieves were not neighbors, the priest was not a neighbor, but the one to whom most Jews would not have given the time of day, was the neighbor.

Let me digress for a moment. The Winston family (the branch from which I am descended) settled in what is now southern Virginia and northern North Carolina during the 1670s. In the late 1990s, I met my father's cousin who still lived in northern North Carolina. During our visit, she recalled a conversation that she had with her great-grandmother in the early 1920s. My father's cousin was beginning to date and her great-grandmother wanted to give her some advice, and this is what she said, "Stay away from those Virginia boys because you know what they are like!" Imagine that just because you lived across a state line you were considered to be bad. I'm wondering just how much has changed since the time that Jesus spoke the Sermon on the Mount!

Many people see this passage as Jesus advocating a pacifist lifestyle. But this whole treatise, so far, has been to show the Israelites how they misunderstood God's laws. God commanded people to love their neighbor. Jesus showed the Jewish crowd that the spirit of this law abides in the heart. To hate someone whom you do not know, and who has committed no violation against you is simply wrong. Today, we call it bigotry.

To drive this home, let's consider some of the Greek language in this passage. The Greek word for hate is *miseo* that means to detest or to love less (Strong's word 3404). The word for enemy comes from the Greek *echthros* meaning hateful, hostile, or adversary (Strong's word 2190). Remember the passage on the Law of Reciprocity? If the

Israelites hated people from other countries, it is only logical that people in other countries would hate them and would retaliate with equal, if not escalated, feelings and actions.

Jesus showed the Jewish community that their misinterpretation of the old laws led to hatred toward people they did not even know that resulted in a breakdown of relationships. Instead of hating, Jesus showed them that they should love their enemies. The Greek word for love here is *agapao*, the very basis for The Beatitudes!

Jesus stated in this passage that the spirit of the law called for people to naturally feel goodwill toward one another, even if the other person was a stranger. However, a quick reading of Jesus' comments to the Pharisees in the Gospels will dispel any belief of Jesus being a pacifist.

Of additional interest in this passage is the use of the Greek words for sons and brothers which are *huios* and *adelphos*, respectfully (Strong's words 5207 and 80). Both words imply a distant or figurative kinship. Jesus did not speak about true sons or brothers, but rather that people should look upon those with whom they are interacting as if they were either their children or siblings.

Jesus calls Christian leaders to learn about people before making judgment. If a positive relationship occurs, then feelings of goodwill are in order. This passage relates to competitors, as well. Unfortunately, many business management writers teach that business is like war and you must fight against your competitors. However, if we follow Jesus' teaching here, we must approach competitors with feelings of goodwill and seek ways to collaborate instead of seeking destructive competitive methods.

This does not mean that we stop operating as separate companies. For instance, the Japanese taught United States firms how to work in symbiosis. Japanese firms shared research and exploration, and then each firm, using the jointly gained information, developed the best products possible for the customer.

There was a time when my printing company had a fire in the plant. It was a small fire with minimal damage, but it was big enough to get a mention on the 6:00 p.m. news. At 6:30 p.m. I received a call from a major competitor who had seen the news report, and to my surprise was calling to see if we needed additional press capacity. He offered to provide one of his presses for us to use while the damage was repaired.

The competitor's action showed love and concern. We did not need the capacity since the fire did not affect any of the production equipment, but I can tell you that from that moment on, my attitude toward the competitor was one of support and concern. Our two firms later worked together on joint ventures that benefited both of our firms, and especially our mutual customers. Would this have been possible had we hated each other? Of course not. Jesus calls us to think, feel, and behave in ways that bless everyone around us, including ourselves. This must start with our heart attitude. Matthew 12:34 says

You brood of vipers, how can you, being evil, speak what is good? For the mouth speaks out of that which fills the heart. (NAS)

And Matthew 15:18 says

But the things that proceed out of the mouth come from the heart, and those defile the man. (NAS)

In this first verse, Jesus is responding to the Pharisees, and in the second verse, Jesus is explaining a parable to his disciples. Jesus' message throughout the New Testament continually stresses and re-stresses the spirit of God's original message.

Now, re-read this Sermon on the Mount passage and the one before it as a single passage showing the interpretation of the law and the spirit of the law. This passage is about heart attitude, not pacifism. This concludes Jesus' teaching on the heart, and then he turns to observable behavior and the correct reasons for the behavior.

Lifestyle and Motive (Being Good Rather Than Looking Good)

Matthew 6:1–4:

Beware of practicing your righteousness before men to be noticed by them; otherwise you have no reward with your Father who is in heaven.

So when you give to the poor, do not sound a trumpet before you, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, so that they may be honored by men. Truly I say to you, they have their reward in full. But when you give to the poor, do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing, so that your giving will be in secret; and your Father who sees what is done in secret will reward you. (NAS)

Augsburger (1982) addresses this section of the Sermon on the Mount as Jesus' treatment on lifestyle and motive. Jesus selected the three most important elements of Jewish religious tradition: almsgiving, prayer, and fasting and brought them to the forefront. I combine them because the message is the same in all three. Jesus condemns service with an ulterior motive and emphasizes service for the sake of righteousness. The New International Version of the Scriptures translates this into acts of righteousness, and the King James translates it into alms from the Greek word *eleemosune* meaning compassionateness, beneficence, or good deeds (Strong's Word 1654) Jesus calls the *agapao* leader to behave in righteous ways because it is the right thing to do. This behavior is in contrast to the actions of a leader who participates in company functions just so that upper leadership might see him "being" good. These actions are also in contrast to the leader who would offer training to a younger leader as a way of proving what a good corporate citizen he is. Jesus says that God will not reward leaders who do acts with a hidden agenda, because the leaders have already received their rewards.

While we should behave in private ways, we should also expect God to acknowledge us publicly. For a long time, I did not understand this passage and I interpreted the text to mean that leaders should do good deeds out of the public's sight, so that if anyone found out and gave recognition, the act of kindness would be even more out in the open, thus further violating Jesus' teaching. But what the passage says is to do acts of kindness with the right attitude of just wanting to help for the sake of wanting to help. If you receive recognition and gratitude from someone, as a result, accept it warmly and sincerely, but never do the act expecting a reward.

I suppose the question is, "Do you want to serve or to be served?" Servant leadership teaches that we should follow Jesus' teaching to do

good acts with the right motive. Think about yourself, or someone that you know, who agrees to speak before a group of people. After the event, when the participants are preparing to leave, the speaker lingers near the table or podium in the hope that people will come and say how much they enjoyed the speech. Did the speaker come to serve or to be served? While everyone enjoys a compliment, Jesus warns us to be aware of our motives behind our behavior. Do you act because you thought you would get a compliment, or did you act because it was the right thing to do?

Treasures in Heaven (Building Righteous Relationships that You Can Take with You!)

Matthew 6:19–21

Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust destroy, and where thieves break in and steal. But store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust destroys, and where thieves do not break in or steal; for where your treasure is, there your heart will be also. (NAS)

Jesus follows the motive passage with a “reward” passage. There is a saying that “money follows ministry” and Jesus assures us that God honors our actions if we perform them for the sake of righteousness. In this particular passage, Jesus compares the rewards of this world with the rewards of heaven. He does not condemn possessing material goods; He condemns seeking them as the primary focus in life. Paul repeats this message later to Timothy in 1 Timothy 6:10.

For the love of money is a root of all sorts of evil, and some by longing for it have wandered away from the faith and pierced themselves with many griefs. (NAS)

The passage from Matthew 6:19–21 builds upon the previous passages about motive to show that not only do you need the right motive, but

you also need the right focus. Jesus also gives the Jewish community a measuring tool to use in judging others. He says, “for where your treasure is, there your heart will be also” (NAS). People will be able to see the focus of your heart by the treasures that you store. The Greek word for “heart” is *kardia* that means “the thoughts or feelings of a person.” Here we see a connection to the Beatitude of being pure in heart.

Leaders and supervisors usually have demands put upon them to perform toward specific goals and objectives that provide gain for their organizations. Companies that primarily seek to gain wealth will become known as being interested only in their customers’ money. Supervisors that store up reports of high output at the expense of their employees’ health and welfare will be known as the supervisor to be avoided. When the firm puts the customer ahead of profit, they will be known to customers as a firm that can help them. And, the supervisor who puts the health and welfare of employees first will be known by employees as the one to work for. Why wouldn’t people want to work for leaders that look out for their employees’ interests? This is a reciprocal relationship. The employer is looking out for the employee. Hence, the employee is looking out for the employer.

Be Singled Minded (Keeping the Main Thing the Main Thing)

Matthew 6: 22–24

The eye is the lamp of the body; so then if your eye is clear, your whole body will be full of light. But if your eye is bad, your whole body will be full of darkness. If then the light that is in you is darkness, how great is the darkness! No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and wealth. (NAS)

This Scripture passage relates to the passage that we just covered and reveals that the central force of behavior behind the motive is integrity. The word “lamp” is the Greek word *luchnos* meaning a portable

lamp or illuminator, perhaps a candle (Strong's word 3088). The word light is the Greek word *phos* meaning "luminescence in the widest form" (Strong's word 5457). The Greek word *haplos* that we translate to 'clear' means to be single, which communicates a focus on vision (Strong's word 573). Jesus uses a complex metaphor here speaking of eyes and light and body. If a person has clear eyesight, then his body can operate well. But if the eyes are cloudy with disease or damaged tissue, then the body does not receive the full picture of the surrounding world. Even more intense is the image of the blind person who is unable to receive any visual clues from the outside world. Jesus tells us that if we do not focus on what is good, our vision will be cloudy and dark.

Today, we often say that people are looking through dark lenses, or rose-colored glasses, or that someone can see clearly. The analogies imply that the filters used to see the environment around us determine what we see. Our spiritual worldview is another expression that we use to filter what we gather through our eyes. Thus, to see things perfectly, we must have clear eyes that are devoid of all evil. Leaders may find themselves forming opinions about an employee's idea before actually hearing the presentation, all because the leader is blind to the truth. Leaders and supervisors must ensure that their eyes are clear and singularly focused. Once focused, all secondary things become clear.

Jesus continues with His thoughts on focus and single-mindedness by explaining that man cannot serve two masters. The Greek word *antechomai* means to hold fast or to support, from which we translate devoted, (Strong's word 472) and the Greek word *kataphroneo* means to think against or disesteem, from which we translate despise (Strong's word 2706). The King James Version uses *mammon* instead of wealth, which is closer to the Greek word that the New American Standard translates as 'wealth.' When Jesus used the word *mammon*, He may have referred to the Chaldean god of money or to avarice. It is quite possible that He talks about both, and possibly even a third use of the term, the deification of money. All three could be at play here, and it would have made an interesting word play during Jesus' lecture. Jesus' point is that you must serve one primary master and that the Jewish community had to decide if it was going to serve

God or if it was to focus on gaining earthly treasures. From the arrangement of the passages, it is quite possible that many in the audience were concentrating on gaining earthly treasures.

Do not Worry (God Is in Control—Reduce Your Stress Level)

Matthew 6:25–34:

For this reason I say to you, do not be worried about your life, as to what you will eat or what you will drink; nor for your body, as to what you will put on. Is not life more than food, and the body more than clothing? Look at the birds of the air, that they do not sow, nor reap nor gather into barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not worth much more than they? And who of you by being worried can add a single hour to his life? And why are you worried about clothing? Observe how the lilies of the field grow; they do not toil nor do they spin, yet I say to you that not even Solomon in all his glory clothed himself like one of these. But if God so clothes the grass of the field, which is alive today and tomorrow is thrown into the furnace, will He not much more clothe you? You of little faith! Do not worry then, saying, ‘What will we eat?’ or ‘What will we drink?’ or ‘What will we wear for clothing?’ For the Gentiles eagerly seek all these things; for your heavenly Father knows that you need all these things. But seek first His kingdom and His righteousness, and all these things will be added to you. So do not worry about tomorrow; for tomorrow will care for itself. Each day has enough trouble of its own. (NAS)

How surprising it must have been for those people to hear Jesus instruct listeners to not worry about their lives. Life was especially hard during Bible times. The Greek word used for “worry” is *merimnao* and it means, “to be anxious about” (Strong’s word 3309). Today, many people express fear in the workplace, not fear of a co-worker doing physical harm to them, but fear of what will happen if they fail. Workers usually fear that they will lose their jobs if they do not do what their supervisor wants. I have talked to hundreds of people who, out of fear, did

things on the job that they knew were not ethical totally out of fear. This passage is especially for those employees. Remember the story in the Beatitude of Peacemaking about writing the letter of resignation and leaving the date blank? Well, it applies here too.

Jesus calls us to seek first the kingdom. Seek in Greek is the word *zeteo* that means to require or to seek after (Strong's word 2212). Added comes from the Greek word *prostithemi* meaning, add, increase, or proceed further (Strong's word 4369). Jesus is continuing a message that He presented earlier by saying that having material items is all right as long as it is not your main focus. He emphasizes that God will provide for your wants if you operate in righteous ways. The paradox of the Christian lifestyle is that we get the material things that we do not seek when we first seek righteousness. Leaders should seek what is right for the company and not just the next promotion. Leaders should seek what is right for the employees and not for the extra ounce of production they can get out of them. Companies should promote the leaders who seek what is right because companies want what is best for the firm. Employees will produce the extra ounce of production simply because they find joy in serving a righteous supervisor.

I once heard that a politician acts in ways that benefit his next election while a statesman acts in ways that help the next generation. I think Jesus calls us to be statesmen and to do what is right for the organization rather than what is right for us individually.

If we stop worrying about tomorrow and live righteously today, tomorrow will take care of itself (with God's help, of course). And whom would you rather have in control of tomorrow—God or you?

Judging Others (Be Willing to Submit to the Same Criteria by Which You Judge)

Matthew 7:1–6:

Do not judge so that you will not be judged. For in the way you judge, you will be judged; and by your standard of measure, it will be measured to you. Why do you look at the speck that is in your brother's eye, but do

not notice the log that is in your own eye? Or how can you say to your brother, ‘Let me take the speck out of your eye,’ and behold, the log is in your own eye? You hypocrite, first take the log out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take the speck out of your brother’s eye. Do not give what is holy to dogs, and do not throw your pearls before swine, or they will trample them under their feet, and turn and tear you to pieces. (NAS)

Many Christians read this passage and believe that we are never to judge anyone. This is not the case, for in many other places, Scripture asks us to judge. Scripture calls us to test (meaning to judge) the spirits of a man and see if what he teaches is true. We judge not by the outward appearance, but by the inward appearance of the man. The first verses of this passage are simply the Law of Reciprocity in action. Jesus explains to the Jewish community that whatever standard of worth they use to measure another, they should be willing to be measured by themselves. Writers on this subject (Augsburger, Eddleman, and Govett) believe that Jesus tells us not to judge at all. But in reality, there are times to judge and times not to judge. The following Scriptures give credence to the belief that we should judge: Leviticus 19:5; 27:12; Numbers 35:24; Deuteronomy 1:16; 16:18; 17:12; 1 Samuel 3:13; Proverbs 20:8; 31:9; John 8:15; Acts 4:19; 1 Corinthians 5:12; 6:6; 10:15; and 11:13. Equally important, there are also passages in Scripture that tell us God should be the only judge of certain actions. It is important that we know when and how to judge and be willing to submit to the same criteria.

Fox (1966) said it clearly, “[t]he plain fact is that it is the Law of Life that, as we think, and speak, and act towards others, so will others think, and speak, and act towards us” (page 2 of Chapter 6 retrieved from <https://reader.bookshout.com/reader/9780062010674/read>) Leaders who evaluate employees in the dreaded annual employee evaluation should consider whether they would want superiors evaluating them by the same criteria.

Over the past years, I have written several documents for use in my courses. Students know that my writing contains considerable typos and grammatical mistakes. I tell students that while I will grade them

on their use of English and grammar, they should grade me by the same criteria when it is time for the course evaluation. It is hard to accept this criticism. Sometimes I feel that I would like to criticize their work, but not allow them to criticize mine. However, I know that as I judge them, I must willingly accept their judgment based on the same criteria.

Remember Jesus' teaching in an earlier passage about not hating your enemy just because he or she is different? Jesus is reinforcing this concept in this passage. How often do people judge another because of the color of their skin, the appearance of their clothes, or their speech dialect? If you judge people in any of these ways, you must be willing for them to judge you on the same criteria. Earlier, I mentioned that I grew up in a small rural farming community in the Midwest. There were no African-American families in this little community of 2000 residents. One day, an African-American family moved to town and rented a trailer in the local trailer park. The family had two children; one of them was a boy my age that was in my class at school. During his first week, I socialized with the boy during lunch and recess and enjoyed his company. But then he told me that his family was moving away. I asked why but he wouldn't say. I learned sometime later that the town leaders forced the family to leave because of the color of their skin. I never understood why and still do not understand. I would hope that we could judge people by their hearts rather than their skin. The Book of Acts provides an excellent example of how to judge correctly. After Paul's conversion and training, the Christians still did not trust him and judged him to be evil until Paul proved his transformation to them. When the Christian leaders saw Paul's heart and understood Paul's new birth, the leaders judged him to be good and welcomed him into their lives. Can you imagine what would have happened if Christians had judged Paul solely on his past without consideration for his conversion? Jesus couched this whole discussion this way before you are going to pick on something small and petty in a person's life, you had better consider the big awful thing in your own life. That is what Jesus meant in his analogy of the speck and the mote. No one is perfect, and no one has the right to judge someone acting as if they are perfect. If we are

going to judge at all, it needs to be from the perspective of knowing that we also have defects that others should point out in order for us to improve.

Proverbs 27:17 tells us that one man sharpens another just as iron sharpens iron. Each man challenges the other to improve, and by this process, each person becomes better. But, if only one person is judging and the other is constantly submitting, then there can only be limited improvement.

Leaders should take heed of this concept and seek as much judgment from employees as they mete out in judgment to employees. With leaders and followers challenging each other, both can improve. This is, of course, totally contrary to much of the leadership in the United States today. We see many leaders prowling around the office roaring judgments like angry lions. Here's the truth, real lions do not need to roar, they need to be lions, and respect will follow.

I hear many employees complain that the leader who judges them is not competent to do the employee's job. I have seen this to be true in many cases and wonder how a leader might accurately judge the work of another if he is incapable of doing the job. Is the leader willing to let someone who cannot do his job judge him? Does he or she have a choice? If someone who cannot do his job judges the leader, how credible can the evaluation be? In the final verse of this passage, we are introduced to the recognizable concept of "casting pearls before swine." What Jesus is telling us is to have discernment in our judgment. If we find someone who is unworthy to receive valuable things, don't reward them, hence, don't cast pearls before swine, for whatever reason. The Jewish audience to whom Jesus spoke did not have much use for pigs, at all (although there was a sect of the Hebrews in the area that raised and ate pork). This is a difficult passage to apply to leaders and supervisors because of the obvious reference in Scripture to what is sacred, but let's see what happens when we look closer. Many leaders and supervisors practice "closed-mouth" leadership styles in contrast to "open-book" leadership. First, there is the belief that too much information entrusted to employees will prove harmful to the company in some way. But there is another way of looking at this. If company information is a matter of record, there should be nothing in the records that can ultimately hurt

the company. If you judge the employee to be good in heart, then share the information. If you judge the employee to be bad in heart, then do not give information. The good employee is interested in the firm's goodwill, and the bad employee is interested in his or her goodwill. The leader must judge with discernment.

Ask, Seek, and Knock (Persevere and Serve)

Matthew 7:7–12:

Ask, and it will be given to you; seek, and you will find; knock, and it will be opened to you. For everyone who asks receives, and he who seeks finds, and to him who knocks it will be opened. Or what man is there among you who, when his son asks for a loaf, will give him a stone? Or if he asks for a fish, he will not give him a snake, will he? If you then, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father who is in heaven give what is good to those who ask Him! In everything, therefore, treat people the same way you want them to treat you, for this is the Law and the Prophets. (NAS)

In these verses, the Greek words for ask, seek, and knock, imply a continual state of activity. These words could read, “Ask and keep on asking, seek and keep on seeking, knock and keep on knocking.” Jesus encourages His followers to keep continuously petitioning God for what they need. Jesus is reminding the Jewish community there on the hillside that even they, as mere humans, treat their children well and such it is with their Heavenly Father who desires, all the more, to treat His children well.

Eddleman (1957) reminds us that this passage supports the earlier passages on judgment, discernment, and action. He illustrates this by showing that if a child asks for bread, the father will not give a stone (people of this period baked bread in a flat hard form that someone might mistake for a stone if given only an indiscriminating look).

I think that this passage goes much deeper for leaders and supervisors concerning behavior toward employees. Consider the employee

who asks for new tools to perform her work because the current tools are insufficient. The leader should examine the facts, test the heart of the employee, and if at all possible, give her the tools. So often I observe leaders and supervisors who take employees' requests and cut the actual request in half just on general principle. Do I need to remind you of the reciprocal component of this act? Will the employee be motivated to give her best effort? Sometimes leaders and supervisors set production objectives artificially high just to test the employees. This is generally unproductive and can generate mistrust between employees and their leaders.

Another effect that can occur is that employees soon learn their managers' "tricks" and begin to ask for more than what's actually needed to try to ensure that they will have what they need. These reactions are not surprising. Leaders should give employees what they need to do their work, presuming that there are sufficient funds to provide the equipment, and sufficient training as well as sufficient understanding of processes and methods to maximize the investment. In these situations, leaders are in the role of the father giving their child, the employee, the bread or fish they need. Note that bread and fish were staple items of the diet during Jesus' time. Try interpreting this passage in light of staples in today's office setting.

If leaders do not want employees padding budgets and cutting back on targets, then leaders should give employees what they need. Leaders find themselves in the employee role when they must ask for budgets and targets from those above them. How much better would it be if we all asked for what we needed and produced what could accomplish, without playing the "fake negotiating game."

A Tree and Its Fruit (Task Completion Is Central to Leadership Activity)

Matthew 7:16–20:

You will know them by their fruits. Grapes are not gathered from thorn bushes nor figs from thistles, are they? So every good tree bears good fruit, but the bad tree bears bad fruit. A good tree cannot produce bad

fruit, nor can a bad tree produce good fruit. Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. So then, you will know them by their fruits. (NAS)

This passage is a major continuation of Jesus' theme. He stated earlier that people would speak and behave in ways that are consistent with their hearts or values. Here, He admonishes the audience to observe what others do and to judge the results. He is expanding his thought now by warning about people who might temporarily alter their appearance or actions to mislead others.

Jesus advises us to watch for the long-term results of an individual's efforts, explaining that by this you will know the true person. He tells us that as we observe people's values in action, we can tell what kind of fruit they will yield. Sometimes fruit takes a long time to grow, and the appearance of buds and flowers, and even the earliest sign of fruit are not true indications of what the ultimate fruit will look like. In fact, Jesus is training us to become trained observers of people; you might even say people-fruit examiners.

Many times, we interview people and hire them because they appear to be very competent and just what we want and need in a particular job opening. Only later we discover that the person is not as good as we thought. Leaders and supervisors should evaluate people in the workplace for some time before they allow people to have significant responsibility. This requires us as leaders to allow workers to go through the various stages of growth: pollination, blossoming and bearing fruit. We must fertilize and add water if we want to be able to see what kind of fruit we can expect in a person's life. This passage also emphasizes the works of the person as proof of the heart. So often we tend to look at either a person's heart or their accomplishments when we need to observe both.

Palmer (1986) uses this passage to demonstrate the ethical concept of ends vs. means. Palmer believes that Jesus does not see ethical behavior as merely ends or merely means, but rather a combination of the two. Thus, we moved toward situational ethics. This is difficult for most people to accept since it places the ethical decision in the hands of each person to do as they wish. On the other hand, this may not be difficult to accept if we live by the rules Jesus taught in this Sermon.

The Wise and Foolish Builders (if You Know Something Is True—Live by It!)

Matthew 7:24–28:

‘Therefore everyone who hears these words of Mine and acts on them, may be compared to a wise man who built his house on the rock. And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and slammed against that house; and yet it did not fall, for it had been founded on the rock. Everyone who hears these words of Mine and does not act on them, will be like a foolish man who built his house on the sand. The rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and slammed against that house; and it fell -and great was its fall.’ When Jesus had finished these words, the crowds were amazed at His teaching; (NAS)

Jesus concludes His teaching with a wonderful analogy that summarizes the importance of His points. The Greek word for “put them into practice” is *poieo* that implies a wide application without delay (Strong’s word 4160). To make our application clear, Jesus uses the analogy of a home with a firm foundation to demonstrate how we as leaders need to build our lives upon Him. The wise leader and supervisor will listen to lessons Jesus taught from the mountainside and put them into action immediately.

Works Cited

- Augsburger, M. S. (1982). Matthew. In D. Ogilvie (Ed.), *The communicator’s commentary*. Waco, TX: Word Books.
- Belasco, J. A., & Stayer, R. C. (1994). *Flight of the buffalo: Soaring to excellence, learning to let employees lead*. New York: Grand Central Publishing.
- Bowman, J. W., & Tapp R. W. (1957). *The Gospel from the mount: A new translation and interpretation of Matthew, chapters 5 to 7*. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press.
- Eddleman, H. L. (1955). *Teaching of Jesus in Matthew 5–7*. Nashville, TN: Convention Press (Now called Baptist Press).

- Eddleman, H. L. (1957). *Teachings of Jesus in Matthew 5–7*. Nashville, TN: Convention Press.
- Fox, E. (1966 reprinted 1984). *The sermon on the mount*. San Francisco, CA: Harper. Retrieved from <https://reader.bookshout.com/reader/9780062010674/read>.
- Govett, R. (1984). *The sermon on the mount expounded*. Miami Springs, FL: Conley Schoettle Publishing Co., Inc.
- Harvey, J. B. (1988). *The Abilene paradox and other meditations on management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lloyd-Jones, D. M. (1962). *Studies in the sermon on the mount*. London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship.
- Martin, J. (1986). *The sermon on the mount*. Scottsdale, PA: Mennonite Publishing House.
- Palmer, E. F. (1986). *The enormous exception: Meeting Christ in the sermon on the mount*. Waco, TX: Word Books.
- Pelikan, J., & Cardman, F. (1973). *The preaching of Augustine*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.
- Strong, J. (2010). *The New Strong's expanded exhaustive concordance of the Bible*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Winston, B. (2018). *Biblical principles of hiring and developing employees*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.



4

Harvesting the Fruit of Agapao Leadership

My purpose for this chapter is to show you how the Fruit of the Spirit can help you measure how much a leader lives by spiritual principles. At the risk of offending some traditional Bible scholars in this essay, I will take a different path of Scripture interpretation.

First, let me say that there is precious little material to help the common man or woman understand the Fruit of the Spirit passages found in chapter five of Paul's letter to the Galatians. I have found several books that attempt to show how the fruit results from accepting Christ, and I have found a few books written for the professional Bible scholar that provide little to no practical application of Scripture.

The one exception to this dearth of research is Ghezzi's (1987) book. Therefore, much of what you find in this essay is my understanding of the fifth chapter of Paul's letter to the Galatians. Let us first examine the purpose of this passage. Why does Paul take time to write about

This chapter was first published in my prior book *Be a Leader for God's Sake* 2003. Please see Bocarnea, M. et al. (2018). *Evaluating employee performance through Christian virtues*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, ISBN 9783319743431 for a different approach to the Fruit of the Spirit and the subsequent nine measurement scales that we created.

© The Author(s) 2018

B. E. Winston, *Biblical Principles of Leading and Managing Employees*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77137-3_4

these things? The church at Galatia was undergoing a difficult period during which many Jewish Christians believed that the Old Testament laws were binding on the New Testament Church. As a result of much in-fighting, the church (some say many churches) faced radical division among its members. Paul learned that it was more than just legal interpretation that had infected the church. People who had accepted Jesus as the Messiah and who had started to live by His teaching were falling away from the spiritual principles and were returning to a sinful nature.

In the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5), Jesus taught the Jewish community that if they lived according to the principles laid down by God; there would be little need for man to make laws and regulations. At the beginning of Galatians Chapter Five, Paul is instructing the members of the churches about this same topic. Paul reminds the church that it is free, in Christ, to live peacefully, and he admonishes them for not living a life according to spiritual principles. To illustrate the difference between the way the church members live and how they ought to live, Paul describes both.

In Galatians 5:19, Paul describes the characteristics of a life grounded in a sinful nature. He mentions sexual immorality, impurity and debauchery, idolatry and witchcraft, hatred, discord, jealousy, fits of rage, selfish ambition, dissension, factions and envy, drunkenness, and orgies and the like.

He then describes the characteristics of the spiritually principled life based on love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control—or the Fruits of the Spirit.

These characteristics are the result of a life lived according to spiritual principles, not a result of labor or works. These characteristics, or qualities, parallel The Beatitudes found in Matthew 5. The Beatitudes describe the inward traits and principles that a godly person possesses. The nine Fruit of the Spirit represents the measurable outward manifestation of living a life led by spiritual principles. Much debate has ensued over the past several centuries as to what Paul meant by the Fruit of the Spirit. Some say that fruit is a singular word and, therefore, all the terms that follow are simply different ways to describe love. Others say that fruit is also plural, and, therefore, the terms describe different aspects of fervent spiritual life.

A simple look at the Greek in this passage does not support a restrictive interpretation. Rather, the passage is quite simple, and yet very powerful. Paul contrasts the outward characteristics of a life following a sinful nature with a life following a spiritual nature. Paul says nothing that we could interpret about restricting a life based on the spiritual principles to only those who follow Jesus. Some writers claim that Christian virtue comes only from the Holy Spirit. Paul does not say that in this passage. He does say that living out the sinful nature is contrary to living by the Spirit. The Greek word that we translate as spirit is *pneuma*, which means “ghost, life, spirit, angel, and divine spirit” (Strong’s word 4151). *Pneuma* occurs throughout the New Testament when referring to spirit.

Let’s dig deeper beginning with the word fruit since it seems to cause so much trouble for some people. The Greek word *karpos* implies a literal or figurative fruit that someone plucks from a tree or plant (Strong’s word 2590). This word implies a fruit deliberately harvested in contrast to a fruit that is not domesticated or sought by someone. The Greek word implies both the single and plural form just as the English word fruit could mean a basket of golden apples, mixed apples, or mixed fruit. We in the United States think of apples as fruit. In Paul’s time, in Asia Minor where the Galatian churches existed, the grape or fig would be a better symbol for fruit. The word implies something that is the result of growth and care that eventually results in a harvest.

A good harvest occurs because the grower follows the principles of good agriculture and because God provides timely rains and appropriate environmental conditions for excellent growth. Nothing grows because of the law. Regarding Paul’s fruit analogy, let’s think of the fruit as a bunch of grapes for a moment. The grapes provide evidence of the type of vine that is supporting their growth. The appearance and quality of the grapes may even give evidence of the vine grower and the vineyard.

Fruit is the result of a process. Grapes, for example, do not just appear one day on a vine. They must first be planted, then they must be provided with proper nutrients, and given the right environment in which to grow. But once this is done, the fruit naturally grows. Still, there is more process. The grapes form as buds and then develop into fruit. Likewise, when we walk in the Spirit, we are compelled to do as

the Spirit would do, not because we force ourselves through good works to bear good fruit, but because it comes naturally through the Spirit. When we live according to scriptural principles, we will produce good fruit. It's not us alone, though; it's through Him. The fruit is His characteristic, not our own. We produce good fruit as a result of the Vine to which we are attached, and because our Vine provides us with wonderful nutrients, not to mention life itself.

The Clustering of the Fruit of the Spirit

Scripture is fascinating in that there are so many relationships and groupings of ideas and concepts. The Fruit of the Spirit are clustered in groups of three. The first cluster of three includes (1) love, (2) joy, and (3) peace. The second cluster includes (4) patience, (5) kindness, and (6) goodness. The third cluster includes (7) faithfulness, (8) gentleness, and (9) self-control. Of further interest is the relationship of each group to the whole. The first group represents a macro aspect of relationship and behavior. One might say that it represents the fruit of man relating to God. The second group represents a mid-range concept of how a man might relate to society or other groups of people. The last set of three fruits represents a micro view of the fruit that develops when one relates to another using scriptural principles. Although there is little written on this subject, I encourage you to consider these clusters of fruit as they hang on the Vine of life. Consider the fruit as an element of its group as you work through each of the following nine fruits.

Love (Man Relating to God)

We should examine each fruit in sequence to fully understand its significance. The first is love. Love, as used here, comes from the Greek word *agape*, which is the strongest of the four Greek words that translate into love. Each of the individual meanings of the word love includes: *eros*, *philos*, *agapao*, and *agape*. Jesus used the term *agape* when He referred

to God's love for us. The first type of love that is mentioned in the Fruits of the Spirit is Agape love, a self-sacrificing love characterized by one giving of oneself so that another may be blessed. The giver expects nothing in return or as a result of the behavior. This is God-like love for us, and it makes it easier to understand how the word Agape also translates into "a love feast." A love feast is exactly the type of love that God wants to experience with us. Don't let modern images rush to your mind, we are talking about an abundance of pure, undefiled, selfless love streaming from the cross of Calvary to us today.

Joy (Managers Relating to God)

Paul lists joy as the second characteristic of living by spiritual principles. The Greek word that we translate into joy is *chara*, which encompasses exceeding joy, cheerfulness, and calm (Strong's word 5479) Paul used the same word in Romans 14:17; 15:13, 32; and Philippians 1:4, 25. There are over 50 references to *chara* in the New Testament. Other translations of joy come from the Greek words *agalliasis* (Strong's word 20) and *euphrosune* meaning "gladness" (Strong's word 2167).

Joy is the second of the three macro-fruits referring to the leader's relationship with God. The fruit, though, is also demonstrated in the leader's outward behavior toward people in the workplace. Man's relationship with God is often mirrored in his behavior toward others.

When a leader lives by spiritual principles, there is always a sense of calmness about him or her. When stress and pressure surround the workplace, employees always gravitate to the leader who lives by the Spirit, for in that leader there is a sense of calm. The leader who lives by spiritual principles exhibits cheerfulness in all situations and has a kind word for any occasion.

When difficult projects begin to weigh heavily on the minds of employees, the leader's first reaction should be to bring a sense of calm and lightness to the workplace. I remember a time when my company bought a competing company. During the transition period, there was a great deal of stress in the new subsidiary. I remember one of the

leaders who stayed on after the purchase asking me when I thought the transition time would be over. I told him he would know it when he heard laughter in the pressroom. He nodded and commented that there had not been a sense of joy in the workplace for many years. Six weeks later, the same leader walked by my office and stopped to tell me that he had just heard pressmen laughing. He noticed that they all were going about their work cheerfully. The leader smiled, said “Thanks,” and continued with his work.

Deming (2000), in his book, *The New Economics*, taught countless companies in post-WWII that living by his 14 principles would result in joy in the workplace. Deming, a strong Christian, used Scripture at selected times to support his concepts. I believe that Deming considered the Greek word *chara* when he said workers would experience “joy.”

Joy does not always mean hilarity. There is a sense of control in a workplace that has a spiritually led leader. By joy, one might envision people waking up in the morning with a sense of happiness and a positive expectation of what will happen at work that day. As I begin to understand more of the spiritual principles and attempt to live by them, I notice the changes in my workplace and in the people I manage. On several instances, I have found employees coming to work on their days off or vacation days. When I asked them why they have come to the office, each answered in a like manner, “I wanted to get this project finished. Besides, I enjoy being here.” Joy is a ‘communicable’ condition. It infects those around you. This characteristic is closely aligned with the next characteristic—peace. This fruit is one of the three macro fruits that deal with a relationship with God. When a leader enjoys a strong relationship with God, there is an outgrowth of joy and happiness to all others in the workplace.

Peace (Managers Relating to God)

Paul uses the Greek word *eirene* here, and again in 2 Timothy 2:22, to imply quietness and rest (Strong’s word 1515). We find peace used 88 times in the New Testament. Eighty-six of these occurrences are the word *eirene*. Other words that the King James Bible uses for the word

peace are sigao (Strong's word 4601) and hesuchazo, (Strong's word 2270) which mean, to hold silent or keep peace.

One of the principles described by Jesus in The Beatitudes is Blessed are the peacemakers. Paul's use of eirene follows Jesus' teaching that peace is the result of other behaviors and activities. Peace must be created and sustained. It is noteworthy that in The Beatitudes the word for peacemaker is eirenopoios, meaning, to do peace (Strong's word 1518) Paul uses the noun form of the same word that Jesus used as a verb.

Eirene builds upon the concept of calm found in the chara. It is interesting to see how the Fruits of the Spirit build upon each other. Since peace is the last of the macro cluster illustrating the leader's relationship with God, it is interesting to see how having peace with God develops into a relationship with people. Employees seek to work for leaders when peace abounds in the workplace. I interviewed a senior leader at the Christian Broadcasting Network (CBN) who, I believed, exemplified this concept of peace. He had worked for CBN longer than most and seemed to survive a lot of the ups and downs that a major organization undergoes. As a part of my interviewing process, I talked with people who worked for this leader and with others who knew people who had worked for him. I felt that if I went beyond the first circle of employees, I would better understand him. What I found was that a sense of peace surrounded all of this leader's activities. His employees demonstrated the lowest turnover in the organization. There was even a list of people who wanted to work for him. Everyone agreed that more work was accomplished in his department than in most others, yet there was little evidence of stress or overburdened work conditions. His department was busy but peaceful. Employees told me that they felt more rested after a day's work than when they began. Some described what he did as miraculous; I described it as eirene.

Employees can easily spot leaders who live by spiritual principles. These leaders are the people that others turn to in times of strife and trouble, or to learn the truth about the organization. These leaders bring about a sense of order amid the chaos of organizational change. It is only out of peace that one can have patience.

Patience (Managers Relating to Others in Society)

Paul uses the Greek word *makrothumi* to refer to our word *patience* (Strong's word 3115). The King James translation uses the word *long-suffering*, which we might translate today into "forbearance." Another definition that we could use is "fortitude." Paul also uses *makrothumi* in 2 Timothy 3:10 and Colossians 3:12. Paul also used the word *makrothumi* in Romans 2:4, 9:22; 2 Corinthians 6:6; and Ephesians 4:2. It's important to not assign a 'poor me' attitude to the word *patience*, perhaps because of the King James 'long suffering' inference. But there is nothing 'poor me' about living a life according to spiritual principles.

I encourage you to consider the combined definitions of *fortitude* and *patience*. You can recognize leaders who live by spiritual principles because they understand the concept of time and seasons. There is a time to plant, to tend, to wait, and to harvest. Isaiah understood this characteristic when he wrote, "but those who wait on the Lord will renew their strength. They will soar on wings like eagles; they will run and not grow weary, they will walk and not be faint" (40:31). Isaiah used the Hebrew word *qavah*, meaning "to wait patiently" or "to look patiently" (Strong's word 06960). I believe that we can tie this to the Greek word *kairos* meaning "the opportune time" (Strong's word 2540). *Patience* is an observable characteristic of waiting for the right time to act and never rushing an event or person.

Leaders who live by spiritual principles demonstrate *patience* when working with employees. This fruit, *patience*, is the first fruit that deals with our relationships with other people. *Patience* is not an all-encompassing acceptance of what employees do, but rather it's an understanding that all people learn and develop at different rates of speed. Leaders also know that after a new program is inaugurated, it needs time to grow without constant intervention. Many times, employees describe leaders who exhibit *patience* as "caring about people." While these leaders certainly care for people, it is probably even more accurate that the leader is simply *patient* with employees. Another word that employees use to describe *patient* leaders is *gentle*.

Auden (1990) wrote in his 1962 poem, *The Dyer's Hand*:

Perhaps there is only one cardinal sin: impatience. Because of impatience we were driven out of Paradise, because of impatience we cannot return. Patience is the result of understanding the “when” as well as the “how.”

When I think of this fruit, I see leaders who do not live by spiritual principles pushing people to make sales too early, to ship products too soon, or to try to perform new tasks before completing all the necessary training. I see the Challenger shuttle disaster. I see product recalls that could have been avoided. I see the Ford Pinto. I see airline leaders pushing pilots and locomotive engineers operating their equipment without enough rest. I see accidents that could have been avoided. Evidence of this fruit is reflected in having patience to see that everything is as it should be.

Gentleness (Managers Relating to Others in Society)

Paul continues the descriptive passage with the Greek word *chrestotes* (Strong's word 5544). We translate *chrestotes* as “being kind or excellent in character.” Jesus described just such a person in the Samaritan who helped the injured traveler after the thieves robbed him and the priests ignored him. The only other word found in the New Testament that we translate, as “gentleness” is the Greek word *pieikeia*, meaning “mildness” (Strong's word 1932).

Leaders who live by spiritual principles might exhibit behaviors that others would describe as kindness, gentleness, or be of excellent character. A leader might demonstrate this characteristic by finding a job in the organization for an employee who had difficulty performing their assigned duties. Rather than firing the employee, the leader might seek a job commensurate with the employee's skills.

If it was necessary to terminate an employee, a leader who lived by spiritual principles might seek a way to ease the employee out of the workplace rather than fire the person in front of others. Unfortunately,

gentleness is not a characteristic that many of today's organizations think leaders should possess. A recent book on the subject of 'bosses from hell' described a leader who enjoyed firing people. This leader would tape a picture of the fired employee on the employee's chair and make rude remarks to the picture for several days after the termination.

A leader might exhibit gentleness by easing change into an organization. Ansoff described a concept called the 'Accordion Method' of change whereby leaders introduced incremental measures of change and allowed employees to adjust to the change before introducing more. Employees could easily describe this type of leader as being gentle and good.

Goodness (Managers Relating to Others in Society)

The Greek word *agathosune* (Strong's word 19), used here for goodness, also translates into virtue or "beneficence." The American Heritage Dictionary defines beneficence as the state or quality of being kind, charitable, or beneficial.

The concept of goodness found in the Greek word brings with it an understanding that the goodness must be good for something. There are only four occasions where we see *agathosune* used in the New Testament: Romans 15:14; Galatians 5:22; Ephesians 5:9; and 2 Thessalonians 1:11.

Leaders might exhibit this fruit by showing more interest in the well-being of employees rather than in the bottom line. This is not to say that there is no concern for fiscal responsibility, but rather that leaders living by spiritual principles must value people above money. This definition includes the word beneficial. This implies that a leader's actions, while charitable to the employee(s), also must be for the greatest good of all. Looking at goodness and patience, we can see many similarities, thus supporting the logic of the group of three fruits that all center on how we treat each other as humans. Gentleness can also be viewed as goodness. Gentleness can become a form of charitable behavior when the well-being of others becomes a higher priority than self. Leaders could exhibit this fruit by sharing information with employees.

So often we see leaders who keep the truth about a change from employees. The sudden introduction of change occurs as leaders try to effect organizational change before employees have a chance to argue or sabotage the works. Yet, if leaders showed the employees the benefits of change and helped reluctant employees make the transition, the organization would be better off in the long run. I think many leaders do not do this because they either do not understand the change, they do not care about the well-being of the employees, or they don't know enough to realize that there is a better way to operate.

Faithfulness (A Manager Relating to Another Individual)

The next fruit in this sequence is faithfulness, translated from the Greek word *pistis*, which means, assurance, belief, fidelity, and constancy (Strong's word 4102) Paul also uses this term in 1 Timothy 6:11 and 2 Timothy 2:22. *Pistis* occurs 237 times in the New Testament. Only nine times do we translate the word faith from other Greek words. Among these few exceptions, the most notable would be the Greek word *oligopistos*, which means lacking confidence or faith (Strong's word 3640). Faithfulness introduces us to the last group of three fruits. Leaders exhibit this fruit in many ways. To begin with, they are dependable. Employees and superiors both know that they can trust leaders who operate by spiritual principles to complete a task. Employees and superiors know that these leaders stay for the long haul. Deming (2000) included too much mobility of leadership as one of his seven deadly sins for United States leaders. Deming believed that there is too little loyalty among leaders toward their firms. Leaders who live by spiritual principles stay with a firm until God calls them to leave. This allows the firm to grow for the long term. Consider the importance of faithfulness in the mentoring relationship between the leader and the employee.

Leaders who live by spiritual principles are trustworthy. You would not expect to find a spiritually principled leader arrested for embezzlement or insider trading. Employees feel confident that they can talk to a spiritually principled leader and not have personal information revealed to others.

Leaders exhibit this fruit by showing belief in employees. Leaders following spiritual principles know when employees are ready for more responsibility and encourage employees to excel in the new areas. There is a sense of encouragement and equipping that pervades a firm led by spiritually principled leaders.

Meekness (A Manager Relating to Another Individual)

Paul uses the Greek word *prautes* (Strong's word 4240), which comes from the root word *praus* implying controlled discipline as we saw in The Beatitudes. *Prautes* also translates as gentleness. We again see the circular entwining of the essence of the fruits. Leaders exhibit this fruit by controlling their organizational strength and using what is necessary to accomplish the task. No one would accuse a spiritually principled leader of throwing his or her weight around.

Employees would see examples of meekness in the leader during times of correction and rebuke. The meek leader corrects employees when necessary but does so in a way that causes the employee to grow. Unprincipled leaders correct people in hurtful ways that leave emotional scars on the employee.

Other employees can recognize the meek leader by how the leader works with other departments. The meek leader does not threaten or demand, but rather negotiates for cooperation in a way that builds goodwill and seeks peace in the organization.

Temperance or Self-Control (A Manager Relating to Another Individual)

The last fruit is temperance, also called self-control. From the Greek word, *gkrateia*, we translate self-control or temperance (Strong's word 1466). *Egkrateia* comes from the root word *egkrates* meaning self-controlled in appetite or being temperate. I see this character in

a leader who exhibits self-control in actions and words. This ties well into the idea of meekness being controlled discipline.

Leaders exhibiting this fruit would not seek to hoard resources or spend unnecessarily at the end of a budget cycle just to ensure money in the budget for the next cycle, but rather would seek to use resources for the greatest good of the organization. I believe leaders would exhibit this characteristic by being controlled in their personal lives, controlling the amount they eat and drink, and the amount of time spent in any one activity. Thus, a self-controlled leader is balanced in their approach to life.

Employees see the spiritually principled leader as balanced and as someone whom they should emulate, often using the leader as an ideal to which they should emulate. Spiritually principled leaders become the person from whom others seek advice and who demonstrate balance in their own lives.

Works Cited

- Auden, W. H. (1990). *The dyers hand and other essays*. New York: Vintage Books and Random House.
- Deming, W. E. (2000). *The new economics*. Boston: MIT Press.
- Ghezzi, B. (1987). *Becoming more like Jesus: Growth in the spirit*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor.



5

The Virtue of Love: A Foundation for Leadership

This chapter presents the virtue of Love as expressed in the New Testament concept of Agape love within the context of leadership. Virtue is defined as the psychological process by which an individual thinks and acts such that the result is that the individual and society benefit (Shryack et al. 2010). Virtuous thoughts and behaviors are those that are deemed the best choices for all concerned. Aristotle determined that a virtue is a choice that exists between two vices (Tucker and Winston 2011). Thus, it is the preferred thought and behavior balancing between two negative conditions. For example, Agape love exists between the two vices of loathing and apathy. Loathing could include conditions such as pride, jealousy, arrogance, love of self over others, and domination. Apathy is a condition in which there is no positive or negative concern for another.

Love, as defined in 1 Cor 13, is Agape (Strong's word 26) that includes God's love for people, people's love for God, people's love for each other, love of husband and wife, or a feast. Since 1 Cor 13 was

This chapter was first presented at the Annual Virtual Conference on Moral Leadership—The classic virtues in leadership. December 11–17, 2011.

© The Author(s) 2018

B. E. Winston, *Biblical Principles of Leading and Managing Employees*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77137-3_5

written as a response to the members of the church at Corinth who were boasting about their speaking in tongues and the prideful behavior toward other people, it is reasonable to presume that the use of Agape in 1 Cor 13 refers to people's love for each other (Liddell and Scott 1996). The use of Agape in 1 Cor 13 is in contrast to Paul's use of Agapao in Romans 13:8. It may be that Agape is more of a way of life or philosophy while Agapao is more of a set of behaviors similar to how one might describe the ontological and axiological approach to love. This makes sense in that Paul, through 1 Cor 13, addressed the attitude and approach of the Corinthians that would tie to the ontological approach. Paul presented 'Love' as a virtue not just between two vices but also between eight vices as he presented what Love was 'not'. Thus, Love fits both Shryack, Steger, Krueger, and Kallie's definition as well as Aristotle's definition. In this chapter, the use of Agape, as translated to Love, in the King James and American Standard versions addresses the attitude and approach of leaders toward people with axiological examples used only to clarify the ontological framework. Love, as presented in this chapter may have a tie to the broadly defined concept of humaneness from the GLOBE Study (Kabasakal and Bodur 2004) in which Kabasakal and Bodur cite Plato's notion that it is 'possible to love someone without feeling affectionate' as they posit that cultures characterized by high to middle inclusion of the humane-orientation should value altruism, benevolence, kindness, and love.

Wesley (<http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/wesleys-explanatory-notes/1-corinthians/1-corinthians-13.html>) provides an insightful pattern of 1 Cor 13 when he points out that 1 Cor 13:1–3 expresses the necessity of love, while verses 4–7 provide what love is and what it is not, and verses 8–13 explain the stamina of love compared to other virtues.

Love as 'Wishing Good'

Aquinas in Question 26 article 4 of the *Summa Theologiae* (Knight 2008) presented love as a means of wishing 'good' to someone and preferring the 'good' to/for someone rather than 'good' to self. This would

tie to the sacrificial nature of *Agape*. Ney (2006), in an analysis of Aquinas' comments, implies that Aquinas is saying that love, as might be paralleled by the concept of Love in 1 Cor 13, is a "willful decision of the intellect" (fifth paragraph) with the intention of wanting 'good' for others. This supports the notion of *Agape* as an ontological construct rather than an axiological construct.

Augustine in his Homily on 1 John 4:4–12 (<http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/170207.htm>) stated:

2. Now that which forgives is none other than Love. Take away Love from the heart; hatred possesses it, it knows not how to forgive. Let Love be there, and she fearlessly forgives, not being straitened. And this whole epistle which we have undertaken to expound to you, see whether it commends anything else than this one thing, Love. Nor need we fear lest by much speaking thereof it come to be hateful. For what is there to love, if Love come to be hateful? It is by Love that other things come to be rightly loved; then how must itself be loved! Let not that then which ought never to depart from the heart, depart from the tongue. (paragraph #2)

Augustine's comments support the notion that *Agape* contrasts with 'hate,' which offers one of the vices that Aristotle would say brackets, the virtue of love.

1 Corinthians 13

This chapter accepts as fact that Paul is the author of Chapter 13 of the first letter to the Church at Corinth although there is some scholarly debate as to whether he wrote the chapter (Corley 2004). There are variations in the grammar and word used by Paul when contrasting to other letters, notably his reliance on *Agape* in 1 Cor 13 compared to the more common use of *Agapao* in Romans. However, Corley makes a strong case that Paul is the author of Chapter 13.

It is helpful to understand why Paul includes this treatise about Love. According to Martin (1950), Paul wrote this treatise on the virtues of Love in reaction to the record of vices noted in the Church at Corinth

by those people who were bragging, boasting, and acting in an unbecoming manner with regard to their ability to speak in tongues. Paul presents Love as a form of 'super' virtue lying not just between two vices but between all forms of vices, then demonstrated by the Corinthians.

The Text of 1 Cor 13

If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but do not have love, I have become a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal. If I have the gift of prophecy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge; and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing. And if I give all my possessions to feed the poor, and if I surrender my body to be burned, but do not have love, it profits me nothing. Love is patient, love is kind and is not jealous; love does not brag and is not arrogant, does not act unbecomingly; it does not seek its own, is not provoked, does not take into account a wrong suffered, does not rejoice in unrighteousness, but rejoices with the truth; bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things. Love never fails; but if there are gifts of prophecy, they will be done away; if there are tongues, they will cease; if there is knowledge, it will be done away. For we know in part and we prophesy in part; but when the perfect comes, the partial will be done away. When I was a child, I used to speak like a child, think like a child, reason like a child; when I became a man, I did away with childish things. For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face; now I know in part, but then I will know fully just as I also have been fully known. But now faith, hope, love, abide these three; but the greatest of these is love. (New American Standard)

Love is the basis of what Bryant (2009) defined 'love leadership':

Love, in the context of love leadership, is not the same as love for your life partner, love for your children, or even love for a big dish of chocolate ice cream. No, I refer to the agape definition of love found so frequently in the Bible: love meaning unconditional love for your neighbor, a love as powerful as humankind's love for God. It means treating others as you want to be treated. (Kindle Edition. Location 262 of 2508)

Bryant positioned love against fear and included characteristics of love such as (a) caring for others, (b) being vulnerable, (c) giving, and (d)

seeking good for others. Bryant included actions of love in addition to thinking in love thus combining the ontological and axiological components. This contrasts with this chapter, that defines *Agape* as ontological and *Agapao* as axiological.

What Love Is

1 Cor 13 explains what Love is and what it is not. This section describes what Love is and ties it to other passages in scriptures and contemporary literature. Paul starts in verse 4 by saying that Love is long-suffering. The word Paul uses here is *makroqumeo* that is like the patience *makroqumia* that Paul used in the Fruit of the Spirit from Galatians 5. This is an important relationship in that Paul, in Galatians 5, points out that evidence of living by the spirit is the Fruit of the Spirit. Love develops by learning how to live by the spirit. This notion of long-suffering applies to contemporary leadership in that leadership is about the relationship and leader–follower development. Mentoring, discipling, and coaching are long-term processes seeking the greater good for the long term and not for a short term, self-serving, period of time. Only the self can be served in the short-term.

Paul continues by telling us that Love is kind (*cresteuomai*) (Strong's word 5541). While different than *praus* (*praei*) (Strong's word 4239) found in the Beatitude 'Blessed are the meek' the concept is similar in that mildness and meekness is a way of life, however, one should not consider mildness and meekness as synonymous with weakness. *Praus* (*praei*) carries with it a sense of controlled discipline, which implies a reaction with controlled strength, whereas love being kind (*cresteuomai*) connotes a sense of focus on others as action rather than reaction. Kindness seeks to do what is good for the other person rather than what is good for self (Bakke 2005). According to Bass (2000), a tenet of servant leadership is that the focus of the leader is on the employee/follower and while an 'unkind' approach can focus on self or organization, a 'kind' focus is on others and what others need. This kindness is like what Kouzes and Posner (1992) refer to in their four points of leadership love: (a) healing/energizing, (b) compassion, (c) service, and (d) honesty. Kouzes and Posner

go on to say “Leaders are in love ... in love with people ... ethical leadership is not simply an affair of the head, it is an affair of the heart” (p. 483).

Love rejoices in truth as we see in verse 6. ‘Truth’ here is *alegeia* meaning truth in any matter under consideration (Liddell and Scott 1996). Love seeks to know and work with the truth and does not hide the truth. This does not mean that leaders today work with a lack of maturity or a lack of discretion in how truth is discussed. However, the truth is not hidden or covered up. Truth is kept in the open.

Love bears all things according to verse 7. To bear here is the word *Stego* meaning to hide from or to hold out against others. This is significant in that Love does not go with the flow of peer pressure but stays with truth and what is right regardless of the personal outcomes and difficulties. Leaders who exhibit Love follow the two beatitudes of seeking righteousness and being pure in heart (Winston 2003). Leaders seek out the right, just, and holy things to do and remove that which might distract them from doing the right things. Leaders must not permit improper behavior toward employees or followers but rather should speak up and defend those who may not have the ability to do so.

Love, according to verse 7 believes all things (*pistuei*) implying to have confidence in others (Liddell and Scott 1996). Leaders need to display confidence in employees, but this should occur in a controlled progressive manner. Luke 16:10 says that, we who are faithful with little are entrusted with much, and so it is with confidence. Leaders, through employee development, engage in education and training and allow people under the leader’s supervision to work alone with small matters and small amounts of resources. Leaders then evaluate and discuss the results with employees helping employees see what should be done better in the future. As the employee gains expertise, the leader’s confident rises. However, the leader should not be overconfident or mislead the employee since we have already learned that Love is about truth. Leaders must be open and forthcoming to the employee about the employee’s limitations.

Verse 7 goes on to say that Love hopes (*elpizo*) all things. Hope and belief tie together in that hope sets expectations for future performance and delivery. Leaders tie hope with positive belief about employees and engage training, education, and evaluation with feedback to reduce

the gap between hope, expectation, and performance. Love endures all things according to verse 7. Paul uses *upomevnei*, meaning to tarry or remain behind and to hold fast on to one's beliefs.

Summary

The seven statements of what love is may be viewed as three describing self: (a) long-suffering, (b) kind, and (c) rejoices in truth; three describing others: (d) bears all things, (e) believes all things, and (f) hopes all things; while the last (g) endures is a combination of both self and other. The focus on self and others aligns with Patterson's (2010) proposition that love encourages employees and followers to take risks, learn, grow, and to demonstrate moral and ethical behavior in the workplace.

What Love Is Not

Paul states that Love is not jealous (*zeloo*) or envious according to verse 4. Leaders should not be concerned about what other people in the organization have or do not have or how others are treated. Jesus points this out in His comment to Simon Peter in John 21:22 after Simon Peter refers to John Jesus says: "If I want him to remain until I come, what is that to you?" (NAS). A lesson found in Romans 12:2 is that we are to know the perfect will of God for our life and as we seek to fit into God's plan it is not important what God does with, or for, other people but only what we each do for God as He directs.

Verse 4 continues by saying that Love does not brag (*perpereioumai*) or boast about one self. This relates to the concept of pride in that while it is permissible to be joyous and speak well of the accomplishments of others we should not boast of our accomplishments (Winston 2010). Proverbs 27:2 speaks to this: "Let another praise you, and not your own mouth; A stranger, and not your own lips" (NAS). This does not mean that a leader denies his/her accomplishments but graciously accepts the positive comments and awards given by others.

Tied to the notion of Love not bragging is the claim in verse 4 by Paul that Love is not arrogant (*fusioo*) (Strong's word 5448), which means puffing up one's accomplishments and misrepresenting what was done and attributed to oneself.

Verse 5 states that love does not act unbecomingly (*ajschmonei'*) (Strong's word 807). According to Henry (2008), this means not to do anything that is out of place, out of bounds, indecent, or unseemly. Rather Love seeks to do that what is right, just, and holy according to the Sermon on the Mount (Blessed are those who seek righteousness) (Winston 2003).

Paul continues in verse 5 to state that Love does not seek its own (*zhtei ta eJauth*) (Strong's word 2218 and 1438), which implies a negative form of pride, hubris, and puffery as a means of elevating oneself above others. This is in contrast to the teaching of Jesus that if one is to be the first one must be the last (Matthew 20:16). This also ties to the comment written earlier that Love is a virtue that lies between loathing and apathy in that elevating oneself above others is part of loathing. This notion of not seeking its own, or in reverse—caring for others—relates well to Autry's comment that love in the workplace is caring for people rather than manipulating people (Autry 1992). It also relates well to Hoyle's (2001) comment that "effective managers express love by really caring about their employees through helping them succeed both as persons and as productive workers who reach their goals" (p. 8).

Verse 5 says that Love is not provoked (*paroxuwnetai*) (Strong's word 3947). According to Hoyle (2001), this conveys the notion of not becoming exasperated or letting anger get control of you. This seems to align with the beatitude of Blessed are the meek where meek (*praus*) implies controlled discipline (Winston 2003).

Continuing with verse 5, Love does not take into account a wrong suffered (*ouj logivzetai to kakovn*) (Strong's words 3049 and 2556), which according to Henry's (2008) commentary means not to look for evil in others or charge others with guilt but rather to perceive the good in others and to forgive others' errors toward you. This ties to the Beatitude of blessed are the merciful as the axiological pairing to this ontological quality (Winston 2003).

Verse 6 states that Love does not rejoice in unrighteousness (*ouj Chairō Adikia*) (Strong's words 5463 and 93). According to Henry (2008), this means that one would not take joy in hurting another as we might find in a leader with hubris (Winston 2010). Rather leading from Love would seek the well-being of employees and followers. This ties to the beatitude of Blessed are those who mourn (Winston 2003).

Summary

The eight statements of what love is not can be described in terms of self/other as the prior statements of what love is. The following statements of what love is not applied to self: (a) does not act unbecomingly, (b) does not seek its own, (c) is not provoked, and (d) does not rejoice in unrighteousness; while two statements refer to others: (e) not jealous, (f) does not take into account a wrong; and two refer to the interaction of self and other: (g) does not brag, not arrogant. The descriptors of what love is, and love is not, provide an opportunity to evaluate the 'heart/ontological' attitudes and beliefs of a person while the Beatitudes provide an opportunity to evaluate the 'actions/axiological' behaviors of a person (Winston 2003). An opportunity for future research exists for developing an instrument to measure both ontological and axiological expressions of Love follow up with education and development programs for leaders. Gyertson (2007) wrote a head first, heart second, and hands third approach to Christian Leadership that seems to align with this ontological and axiological approach.

Love Referenced in Other New Testament Locations

Paul opens the 14th chapter of 1 Corinthians by summing up his request that the members of the church at Corinth pursue Love and if they wish to pursue spiritual gifts to seek prophecy rather than speaking

in tongues: “follow after Love, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy” (1 Cor 14:1). Paul continues his call upon the members of the church at Corinth to focus on Love in 1 Cor 16:14 where he advises “Let all your things be done with Love.” Paul references Love in Colossians 3:14 when he commands the members of the church as Colosse. “Beyond all these things put on love, which is the perfect bond of unity” (NAS).

Paul advises Timothy regarding Love:

- 1 Timothy 4:12—“Let no one look down on your youthfulness, but rather in speech, conduct, love, faith and purity, show yourself an example of those who believe”. (NAS)
- 2 Timothy 2:22—“Now flee from youthful lusts and pursue righteousness, faith, love and peace, with those who call on the Lord from a pure heart”. (NAS)
- 2 Timothy 3:10—“You, however, know all about my teaching, my way of life, my purpose, faith, patience, love, endurance”. (NAS)

These three statements to Timothy position Love’s focus on Timothy’s inner self or ontological person. Alternatively, as Proverbs 23:7 says: “For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he ...” (KJV). Paul, here, is instructing Timothy on how Timothy should think.

Paul advises Titus in Chapter 2, verse 2 as part of a greater discourse on sound doctrine: “Older men are to be temperate, dignified, sensible, sound in faith, in love, in perseverance” (NAS). This also seems to be a descriptor for leaders in that, among other characteristics, one must possess the ontological component of love.

Peter, in his letters to the people scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, advised in 1 Peter 4:8: “Above all, keep fervent in your love for one another, because love covers a multitude of sins (NAS);” and again in 2 Peter 1:7: “and in your godliness, brotherly kindness, and in your brotherly kindness, love” (NAS). The second reference to Love is important in that it shows a progression of kindness beginning with a focus on God and then to people and the ultimate use of love in the relationship.

John, recording his vision in Revelation 2:18–19, shows God’s message to the angel of the church in Thyatira: “To the angel of the church in Thyatira write: These are the words of the Son of God, whose eyes are like blazing fire and whose feet are like burnished bronze. I know your deeds, your love and faith, your service and perseverance, and that you are now doing more than you did at first” (NAS). Note the separation of ‘Love’ and ‘service’ that supports the notion of Love being an ontological concept rather than an axiological concept.

Summary

Love is a powerful force in the leader–follower relationship according to Patterson (2010):

Servant-leaders lead with love, are motivated by love, and serve their followers with love. This love is a force, a force so intense that it changes lives – the lives of the followers, the life of the organization, and even the life of the leader. (p. 73)

Paul’s treatise on Love in 1 Corinthians 13, while intended to correct the attitude of the Corinthians about how they were thinking and behaving in the church toward themselves and others about their possession and use of spiritual gifts, is a powerful message for all leaders. The ontological descriptors of what love is and what love is not provide, not only a self-check for all leaders to examine their own lives, but also may be a base for selecting, developing, and evaluating leaders by subordinates and peers in the organization.

The ontological nature of *Agape* is balanced with the axiological focus on *Agapao* as described in the Beatitudes (Winston 2003) and it is this balance that provides another evaluation approach by seeking to measure if a leader’s ontological values align with his/her axiological behaviors. The alignment of espoused and practiced beliefs may be indicative of a leader’s integrity (being who he/she says he/she is).

What Love is and what Love is not aligned with Fry’s (2003) concept of altruistic love as a variable of Spiritual Leadership Theory:

For spiritual leadership theory, altruistic love is defined as a sense of wholeness, harmony, and well-being produced through care, concern, and appreciation for both self and others. Underlying this definition are the values patience, kindness, lack of envy, forgiveness, humility, selflessness, self-control, trust, loyalty, and truthfulness. (p. 712)

Fry went on to say that altruistic love overcomes: (a) fear, (b) anger, (c) sense of failure, and (d) pride. Fry's concepts of what altruistic love is and what it is not (that which it overcomes) has a similar feel to what Love is and what Love is not from Paul's treatise in 1 Cor. 13.

Paul concludes 1 Corinthians 13 by showing the eternal existence of Love by showing in verse 8 that Love never fails or becomes less important (*Agape oujdevpote pivptei*) and Love's status among other virtues in that Paul says that while there is faith, hope, and Love, the greatest of these is Love (verse 13). The word for 'greater' is *meivzwn* that connotes being the greater or being the elder; the latter may infer a sense of greater wisdom as well.

Love is not an easy condition to maintain for as Patterson (2010) stated:

It is much easier to control people than to love people, and yet, for the servant-leader, this is not the recipe. The servant-leader is full of love for their followers, and this changes everything. You cannot love and hurt something at the same time: if you love someone, you will care for them and care deeply; your disposition will be the evidence. (p. 73)

Love is the essence of leadership in the relationship of leader–follower. The evidence provided by Paul in 1 Corinthians 13 provides a compelling argument calling the leader to Love first and above all else.

Works Cited

- Augustine in his homily on 1 John 4:4–12 New Advent Fathers of the Church. <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/170207.htm>—Second paragraph.
- Autry, J. A. (1992). *Love and profit: The art of caring leadership*. New York: William Morrow Paperbacks.

- Bakke, D. (2005). *Joy at work: A revolutionary approach to fun on the job*. Seattle, WA: PVG Publishing.
- Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(3), 18–40.
- Bryant, J. H. (2009). *Love leadership: The new way to lead in a fear-based world*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Corley, J. (2004). The Pauline authorship of 1 Corinthians 13. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 66, 256–274.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 693–727.
- Gyertson, D. (2007). Leadership reflection: A devoted Christian's view on development of spiritually formed leadership. *International Journal of Leadership*, 3(1), 126–133.
- Henry, M. (2008). *Matthew Henry's commentary on the whole Bible: Complete and unabridged*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Hoyle, J. R. (2001). *Leadership and the force of love: Six keys to motivating with love*. New York: Corwin Press.
- Kabasakal, H., & Bodur, M. (2004). Humane orientation in societies, organizations and leader attributes. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 564–601). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Knight, K. (2008). *The summa theologiae of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Second and revised edition literally translated by fathers of the English Dominican Province. Online Edition. Retrieved from <http://www.newadvent.org/summa>.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1992). Ethical leaders: An essay about being in love. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11(5, 6), 479–484.
- Liddell, H. G., & Scott, R. (1996). *Greek–English lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Martin, I. J. (1950). I Corinthians 13 interpreted by its context. *Journal of Bible and Religion*, 18(2), 101–105.
- Ney, P. (2006). Love as the perfection of natural friendship in Aquinas' summa theologiae. *Lethbridge Undergraduate Research Journal*, 1(1). <http://www.lurj.org/article.php/vol1n1/aquinas.xml>.
- Patterson, K. (2010). Servant leadership and love. In D. Van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shryack, J., Steger, M. F., Krueger, R. F., & Kallie, C. S. (2010). The structure of virtue: An empirical investigation of the dimensionality of the virtues in action inventory of strengths. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 714–719.

- Tucker, P., & Winston, B. (2011). The beatitudes as leadership virtues. *The Journal of Virtues and Leadership*, 2(1), 15–29.
- Wesley's Explanatory Notes. <http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/wesleys-explanatory-notes/1-corinthians/1-corinthians-13.html>.
- Winston, B. E. (2003). *Be a leader for God's sake*. Regent University's School of Leadership Studies. ISBN: 0-9725819-0-1. Retrieved from www.bealeader-forgodssake.org.
- Winston, B. E. (2010, December 12–18). Pride's forms of joy, esteem, confidence, haughtiness, and hubris: A conceptual discussion for leader self-evaluation. *Annual Virtual Conference on Moral Leadership—The Seven Deadly Sins in Leadership*.



6

The Four 'Leadership' Faces of Ezekiel 1, Ezekiel 10, and Revelation 4 Paralleled by the Four Gospels

Scriptural concepts help leaders understand who to be (the ontological) and what to do (the axiological). I believe that all of us are leaders in one area or another, whether that is in the home, in the workplace, in the neighborhood, in the church, or in the government, and as such this article is helpful for everyone to understand the complexity of leadership.

Ezekiel in Ezekiel 1 and 10, as well as John in Revelation 4, describe the four faces of the 'living beings' that they saw. While there are some differences between these three accounts, there are sufficient similarities to allow us to consider them as a complete description. By 'sufficient' I mean that in Ezekiel 10, Ezekiel records that the living beings that he sees are "... the living beings that I saw by the river Chebar" (Ez 10:15 NAS). We find in Ezekiel 1:1 that Ezekiel was by the river Chebar when he described the four 'living beings.' John, in Revelation 4, describes 'four creatures' and the Greek that we translate 'creature' (*zoon*) means

I first heard about the concept of the four faces from Pastor Ray McCauley in his presentation to students at the Rhema Bible Training Center, Johannesburg, South Africa in 2005. I wrote this message and presented it at Regent University's Chapel on January 18, 2006.

© The Author(s) 2018

B. E. Winston, *Biblical Principles of Leading and Managing Employees*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77137-3_6

‘living being.’ It is my premise for the article that the four faces of the living beings represent four modes of ‘being’ and ‘doing’ in how we should represent Christ in our leading others.

The Four Faces of the Living Beings

Although Ezekiel and John’s descriptions of the four faces do not match exactly, there are strong similarities. When we consider the variances in the Hebrew and Greek, the similarities of the passages outweigh the differences. In each of the following four sections, I will present the similarities and differences of the four faces found in the three passages: (a) lion, (b) ox, (c) human, and (d) eagle.

The Face of a Lion

Ezekiel and John describe one of the faces as that of a lion. Scripture refers to lions metaphorically as a depiction of Judah itself (Genesis 49:9); strength (Judges 14:18, Job 10:16) hiding and waiting for an opportunity (Psalms 10:9, 17:12, Hosea 13:7), confidence in the face of adversity (Proverbs 30:30, Amos 3:8), and for Jesus (Revelation 5:5). The image of a lion brings to mind (a) royalty (the King of the Jungle), (b) a sense of order and process, (c) power, and (d) unwavering focus. We see these same elements in the Gospel of Matthew. We see Jesus’ royal lineage (Mat. 1:1), the process of preparation (Mat 3:13–14), His unwavering focus on God’s calling (Mat 11:27), and the power of God’s elect (Mat 8:8, 8:27, 10:1).

There will be times when each of us will need to operate in the ‘Lion-mode’ of leadership in which we will need to base who we are and what we do on the authority given to us by our superiors and to use the power that we possess to accomplish what God has called us to do. Collins (2001), wrote about ‘great leaders’ maintaining a ‘fierce resolve’ in their approach to the organizations that they lead in both task and the vision/purpose. When the ‘lion’ in the organization speaks—people listen (Mat 8:27).

The lion's strength gives a sense of security to those whom the lion leads and allows the followers to be and do as needed without fear of outside attack. The next time you read the Gospel of Matthew, look for Jesus' admonitions to his disciples to do what they need to do irrespective of the 'storms' or the 'soldiers' they might encounter (Mat 8:23–27).

All of us, as members of the church, are a royal people. You have a lineage from the church as well as from your families.

The Face of the Young Bull Ox

In Ezekiel 1, 10, and Revelation 4 we see references to the faces of a bull, a Cherub, and a calf, respectively. Remember that Ezekiel recorded in Chapter 10, that the faces were the same as he saw the first time (Chapter 1) thus, we can assume that the terms used in Chapter 1 (*showr*) (Strong's word 7794) and Chapter 10 (*keruwb*) (Strong's word 3742) imply the same image of a 'young being' as *keruwb* can be used for and since Ezekiel implied that the faces were the same we should look at John's account in Revelation 4 for clarity. John's account of the face uses the Greek *moschos*, which we can translate as calf, bullock or heifer. *Moschos* (Strong's word 3448) implies a young animal, hence the use of 'calf' that might also explain why Ezekiel used the word *keruwb* in that there is a connotation of 'young animal' in the deeper Hebrew meaning. Note that in Psalms, Proverbs, and Isaiah the word *Showr* is used to mean an ox that works or is sacrificed. The general sense of the three references is a young bull ox, an animal that is referred to in scripture as being fit for service (Ex. 23:12, Deu. 22:10, 25:4, Job 39:9–10, Prov 14:4, Amos 6:12, Isa 30:24, Luke 14:19) and sacrifice (Lev. 4:10, 9:4, 9:18, 2Sam 6:13, 1Kings 18:23) and so it is that we, in our role of leadership and ambassadorship for Christ, will have to serve and sacrifice.

The value of an ox's service lies not in its lineage or authority but its actual service and work. This shift from lineage to service applies to the Gospel of Mark, in that Mark's audiences, the Romans, were not concerned about lineage but about accomplishment and service. Sacrifice

was an important factor to the Roman audience in that it was the highest form of service as long as the sacrifice was in service to the ‘master.’ As leaders, we will serve our followers and we will, at times, sacrifice ourselves as needed in service to our ‘Master.’ The oxen-mode of being and doing is different than the lion-mode and requires a different set of values and desires. This does not negate the lion-mode but augments it.

Consider these elements of evidence about Jesus from the Gospel of Mark. We see the first reference to Jesus’ work in Mark 1:14 showing Jesus preaching—no reference to his lineage, just a reference to the passage that John prepared a way for Jesus. Mark 1:22 shows that people were amazed at the quality of Jesus’ teaching. In Mark 1:26, we see Jesus casting out demons, and the people were amazed at His work. Later, in the first chapter of Mark, we see Jesus acting with compassion as he healed the leper. Service should be done with compassion—the next face.

The Face of a Man

Ezekiel and John both record that they saw among the four faces the face of a man. In the Hebrew, the word *Adam* (Strong’s word 120) and in the Greek the word *Anthropos* (Strong’s word 444) both convey an image of human but not specifically male or female. Thus, we could interpret Ezekiel’s and John’s images as the image of humanity. The face of humanity ties well to the Gospel of Luke in that Luke’s audiences were the Greeks who appreciated the totality of humanness and Luke focused on Jesus’ humanity. In the first chapter of Luke, we see the description of John the Baptist where John is said to be merciful, holy, and righteous. In Luke 2:40 we find “[t]he Child continued to grow and become strong, increasing in wisdom; and the grace of God was upon Him” (NAS) that exemplifies the body, mind, and spirit of Christ. In Luke 4:1–14, we find the account of the temptation of Christ in which Luke presents Jesus as a whole person who withstands the temptations of the body, ego, and self-aggrandizement.

In addition to the power/protection of the lion-mode and the service/sacrifice ox-mode, the human face calls upon leaders to be humane

and compassionate. This is not in place of the first two modes but in addition to—all the modes are to be in use at the same time. As leaders, we will need to demonstrate our humanity and compassion. There must be a sense of mercy and grace to the power and the service in our leadership and ambassadorship. Colossians 3:12 provides an excellent overview of this concept “[s]o, as those who have been chosen of God, holy and beloved, put on a heart of compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness, and patience” (NAS). In Luke 15:20, we see the father of the prodigal son showing humanity for his son and in Luke 10:33, we see the compassion of the Good Samaritan.

As leaders, we should be known by our humanity and our compassion. There will be times when we make decisions that have the best interest of our followers in mind even to the detriment of the organization. Will we greet our prodigal employees with open arms and sacrifice our belongings to have a celebration? Will we stop along our journey and demonstrate the compassion of the Good Samaritan? Will we ‘be’ and ‘do’ the metaphor of the face of humanity?

The Face of an Eagle

The three accounts of the faces agree on the fourth face as the face of an eagle or as some might translate the Hebrew *neshar* (Strong’s word 5404) and the Greek *aetos* (Strong’s word 105) as either an eagle or a vulture, but most uses of these two words usually refer to an eagle. The Old Testament image of an eagle includes reference to nesting on high (Job 39:27, Obediah 1:4), renewed (Psalms 103:5), flies toward the heavens (Prov 23:5), and swift (Jer. 48:40). The eagle, like the Gospel of John, reaches far beyond the immediate territory, as contrasted to the journeys of the lion that remain close to a small territory. The eagle’s vision is far-reaching but narrow-focused and sees the details, which is similar to the message of the Gospel of John that focused on the details of the truth of who Jesus is.

In addition to the power of the lion, the service of the ox, and the compassion of the human, you will be called upon to rise to new heights, see the details of truth and hunt out what is important in your

organization. As you find the truth, you will bring it back to your nests on high and share it with those who are in your charge. This is the base of the Gospel of John where the message of Truth was conveyed to the broad audience of the Gentiles. Even in the opening of John (Chapter 1: verse 1), we see the reference to the ‘Word’ (used to refer to Jesus), which is the Greek *Logos* that is used to convey a sense of truth or doctrine. John 1:7 continues this theme when John writes that Jesus came as a witness to testify about the light (light here is a metaphor for the Truth). In John 1:50, Jesus indicates that he has ‘seen’ the truth.

The eagle is visible to all as it soars, which is in contrast to the lion, which uses the grass of the Savannah to provide cover as it hunts. In the second chapter of John, we see Jesus’ visibility in the miracle of turning water into wine. The eagle’s call, like the lion’s, is clear and distinct, known by all, thus your message as a leader should be recognized by all. This clarity of message can be seen in John 4:19, when the woman at the well-recognized Jesus. So it is in our leadership that what we do must be seen by all.

Operating in All Four Modes

In conclusion, to be complete, you will need to operate in all four modes of leadership in every way and every time. While the modes may be greater or lesser to each other in every action, you will still find all four working together. Stand firm in the excellence that comes from Christ Jesus. I encourage you to contemplate the four faces each day that you lead and seek to be all the faces all the time.

Work Cited

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap...and others don't*. New York: Harper Business.



7

The Leadership Styles of Jesus as Found in the Four Gospels

In this chapter, I review the four synoptic gospels and look at every situation in which Jesus interacted with followers and determine what leadership style was evident by the gospel author's account. I found the following leadership styles in order of the number of occurrences:

1. Charismatic Leadership
2. Paternalistic/Clan
3. Autocratic
4. Servant

The purpose of this chapter is to present my findings, along with a description of each of the leadership styles. This chapter presents a table of findings from each gospel with a description of the four leadership styles along with the first table and a summary table showing the four gospels in parallel. From the review of the four Gospels, I believe that Jesus was/is a situational leader who used/uses specific types of leadership styles to fit the situation. The value of this chapter is that it provides the reader with an understanding of the leadership styles that Jesus used and a base for further discussion and research.

Jesus' Leadership Styles from Each Gospel

This section contains a subsection for each of the four Gospels showing the specific verses describing Jesus' interaction with followers. The first subsection also contains descriptions of each of the leadership styles.

Jesus' Leadership Styles from the Gospel of Matthew

According to Ulrich (2007), the Gospel of Matthew was written to a Jewish audience with particular support from the Old Testament prophecies emphasizing Jesus' lineage. This support for Jesus being the Messiah may align with a leadership focus on Charismatic leadership and Paternalistic/Clan leadership styles. Table 7.1 shows the verses describing Jesus' interaction with followers and the leadership style that matches. The table shows: (a) the verse(s), (b) the people involved, (c) the actions/communication, and (d) ascribed leadership style. Table 7.2 follows Table 7.1 and presents the frequencies of each ascribed leadership style.

Table 7.2 shows that Paternalistic/Clan is the most commonly ascribed leadership style in the Gospel of Matthew. The authors combined Paternalistic and Clan since the two styles are similar in authority with the Clan style adding the organizational cohesiveness dimension.

Paternalistic Leadership

Recent studies such as Bae et al. (2003), Gorton et al. (2004) as well as Hoppenbrouwers (2002) use the terms 'paternal' and 'paternalistic' without defining it, thus treating it as an a priori form of knowledge. The paternalistic style can be supportive and benevolent as presented by Lee (2001) or domineering as presented by Chou (2002). Farh and Cheng (2000) content that paternalistic leaders use "strong authority [along with] fatherly benevolence and moral integrity" (p. 84).

Table 7.1 Jesus' leadership styles from the Gospel of Matthew

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Mat 3:15	Jesus Baptizes John	Jesus does what John asked. There is no indication that Jesus had a prior intention	Servant, Paternalistic
Mat 4:1–11	Jesus Tempted by Satan	Jesus did not agree to do what Satan asked	Autocratic
Mat 4:18–22	Jesus, Simon Peter, and Andrew	Jesus called them to follow him and become fishers of men	Charismatic
Mat 8:1–4	Jesus Heals a Leper	Jesus does what the leper asks and then commands the leper as to what to do	Servant, Autocratic
Mat 8:5–13	Jesus Heals the Centurion's daughter	Jesus does what the centurion asks. There is no indication that Jesus had a prior intention	Servant, Paternalistic
Mat 8:14–17	Jesus heals Peter's Mother-in-law	He healed her without being asked	Servant
Mat 8:18	Jesus gave the order to leave the crowd	He ordered the disciples to leave by boat	Autocratic
Mat 8:19–22	The lawyer asks to follow Jesus	Jesus rebukes him. The lawyer asks for more time, and Jesus tells him to 'let the dead bury the dead'	Autocratic, Charismatic
Mat 8:26–27	Jesus calms the storm and rebukes the disciples	Jesus describes the disciples as having little faith	Charismatic
Mat 8:28–33	Jesus drives the demons from the two men	Jesus drove out the demons, but he did what the demons wanted relative to the pigs	Autocratic, Paternalistic
Mat 8:32–33	Jesus heals the mute man	Jesus does as he is asked	Servant
Mat 9:1–8	Jesus heals the paralytic	Jesus saw the man and healed him without being asked. He used the phrase 'your sins are forgiven' which was reserved for God	Servant, Charismatic

(continued)

Table 7.1 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Mat 9:9-11	Jesus calls Matthew	Jesus called Matthew to follow Him	Charismatic
Mat 9:23-25	Jesus heals the ruler's daughter	Jesus commands the flute players to leave. The flute players laugh at him	Autocratic
Mat 9:27-30	Jesus heals the two blind men	Jesus does as He is asked and then commands the blind men not to tell anyone	Servant, Autocratic
Mat 10:1	Jesus gave authority to the disciples to drive out demons	Jesus gave authority to the disciples to drive out demons	Autocratic
Mat 10:10-42	Jesus instructs the disciples	Jesus gave specific instructions to the disciples	Autocratic
Mat 11:1-6	Jesus talks with John the Baptist's followers	Jesus instructs the followers what to tell John. Of interest, Jesus doesn't seem interested in helping John	Charismatic
Mat 11:7-15	Jesus tells the multitude who John the Baptist is	Jesus tells the multitude that John the Baptist was the prophet foretold.	Charismatic
Mat 11:16-24	Jesus chastises the multitude	Jesus chastises the towns in which He did miracles	Autocratic, Charismatic
Mat 11:28-30	Jesus calls for people to come to Him and take his Yoke	Take my yoke upon you and learn from me	Charismatic, Paternalistic
Mat 12:1-8	Jesus taking grain on the Sabbath	Jesus chastises the local lawyers who complain about him working on the Sabbath	Autocratic, Charismatic
Mat 12:9-13	Jesus heals on the Sabbath	Jesus continues to push the issue of working on the Sabbath	Autocratic
Mat 12:22-37	Jesus challenges the Pharisees	Jesus casts out demons from a blind, mute man. The Pharisees say that He is Satan. Jesus chastises the Pharisees and shows the illogic of the Pharisees statements	Autocratic

(continued)

Table 7.1 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Mat 12:38–45	Jesus chastises the Pharisees	The Pharisees ask for a sign, and Jesus compares to a wicked and adulterous generation	Autocratic
Mat 12:46–50	Jesus ignores his mother and brothers	People point out to Jesus that His mother and brothers were waiting for him and Jesus refers to his disciples as his mother and brothers	Autocratic, charismatic
Mat 13:1–58	Jesus teaches the masses	Jesus also explains to the disciples why He used parables	Paternalistic
Mat 14:13–14	Jesus shows compassion for the masses and heals them	Jesus shows compassion by healing those who came to him even though He was in mourning for John the Baptist	Servant
Mat 14:15–21	Jesus feeds the multitude	Jesus commands the disciples to feed the people. The focus here is that Jesus commands the disciples to do something	Autocratic
Mat 14:22–23	Jesus wants to be alone	Jesus sends the disciples away by boat	Autocratic
Mat 14:24–33	Jesus interacts with Peter as Peter walks on water	Jesus calms the frightened disciples, calls Peter to walk on the water and then chastises Peter for not having enough faith	Paternalistic
Mat 14:34–36	Jesus heals all the people that are brought to him	Jesus heals all that asked	Servant
Mat 15:1–9	Jesus chastises the Pharisees	The Pharisees ask Jesus why his disciples break the law by not washing their hands before eating bread and Jesus chastises the Pharisees for not honoring their fathers and mothers	Paternalistic

(continued)

Table 7.1 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Mat 15:10–20	Jesus instructs the disciples and the multitude	Jesus follows his message to the Pharisees with a message to the people. The disciples then tell Jesus that He offended the Pharisees. To which Jesus chastises the disciples	Paternalistic, autocratic
Mat 15:21–28	Jesus gives into the woman	A woman continues to ask Jesus to help her daughter until Jesus agrees. He tells her that her faith has gained her request	Paternalistic, Servant
Mat 15:29–31	Jesus heals the multitudes	Jesus went to a hillside, and many people came to be healed and, He healed them all as they requested	Servant
Mat 15:32–39	Jesus feeds the multitude	As in Mat 14:15–21 Jesus feeds the multitude. The focus here is that Jesus has compassion on the people	Paternalistic, Servant
Mat 16:1–4	Jesus chastises the Pharisees	As in Mat 12:38–45 The Pharisees ask for a sign and Jesus compares to a wicked and adulterous generation	Autocratic
Mat 16:4–12	Jesus teaches the disciples	Following the chastisement of the Pharisees Jesus teaches the disciples to beware of the teachings of the Pharisees and Sadducees	Paternalistic, Autocratic
Mat 16:13–20	Jesus teaches the disciples	Jesus uses a Socratic method to teach the disciples who He was	Charismatic
Mat 16:21–23	Jesus rebukes Peter	Jesus teaches the disciples that He must go to Jerusalem and die. Peter argues with Him, and Jesus rebukes Peter	Paternalistic

(continued)

Table 7.1 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Mat 16:34–28	Jesus teaches the disciples	Jesus instructs the disciples about the cost of following Him	Charismatic
Mat 17:1–13	Jesus teaches Peter, James, and John	Jesus takes Peter, James, and John to the top of the mountain where Jesus was transfigured and where Moses and Elijah joined Him. Jesus instructed the three not to tell anyone of what they saw until after Jesus was raised from the dead	Paternalistic
Mat 17:14–21	Jesus rebukes the father and the disciples	A father asks Jesus to heal his lunatic son for the disciples could not. Jesus rebuked the father, healed the son and then rebuked the disciples for having too little faith	Autocratic
Mat 17:22–27	Jesus interacts with Peter	Jesus instructs Peter about taxes and who is to pay. Then He instructs Peter to catch a fish, take the coins that Peter finds in the fish and pay the tax	It is not clear Servant perhaps
Mat 18:1–35	Jesus teaches the disciples	The whole chapter is a lecture in which Jesus instructs the Disciples about who is greatest, negative results of causing others to stumble, forgiveness	Paternalistic
Mat 19:1–2	Jesus heals the people	Jesus travels to Judea. Many people came for healing, and He healed them all	Servant
Mat 19:3–12	Jesus teaches the Pharisees and disciples	Jesus teaches both the Pharisees and Disciples about marriage	It is not clear.
Mat 19:13–15	Jesus rebukes the disciples	The disciples rebuke the children and Jesus rebukes the disciples	Paternalistic perhaps Paternalistic

(continued)

Table 7.1 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Mat 19:16–32	Jesus teaches the rich man	The rich man comes to Jesus and asks about eternal life. Jesus instructs him to sell all that he has. Jesus does not command him but instructs him	Paternalistic
Mat 19:23–30	Jesus teaches the disciples	After Jesus teaches the rich man, He also teaches the Disciples. There is no command here, only a teaching	Paternalistic
Mat 20:1–16	Jesus teaches the multitude	Jesus teaches the multitude using the parable of the vineyard and the laborers	Paternalistic
Mat 20:17–19	Jesus informs the disciples that He would be crucified	Jesus, while traveling with the disciples to Jerusalem Jesus teaches the disciples that He would be crucified	Paternalistic
Mat 20:20–28	Jesus interacts with sons of Zebedee and the mother	The mother of the sons of Zebedee asks Jesus to let her two sons sit on Jesus' right and left hand in the kingdom. Jesus indicates that this is something that he cannot do for only His Father could do this. The other ten disciples hearing this request of the mother became upset with the two sons of Zebedee. Jesus then instructs the disciples about how they should relate to one another	Clan
Mat 20:29–34	Jesus heals the two blind men	Jesus, while traveling, hears two blind men call out to him. The crowd tries to silence the two men. Jesus was moved with compassion and healed the two men	Servant

(continued)

Table 7.1 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Mat 21:1–11	Jesus tells two disciples to go ahead and get a donkey	Jesus tells two disciples to go ahead and get a donkey (colt). The disciples did as they were told. The donkey served to show Jesus as a prophet	Autocratic, Charismatic
Mat 21:12–17	Jesus Drove out the merchants in the temple and then healed the sick	Jesus drove out the merchants, overturned the money tables, then healed the sick. He then chastised the priests and the scribes	Autocratic
Mat 21:18–22	Jesus withers the fig tree	Jesus saw that the fig tree did not produce fruit. He caused the fig tree to wither	Autocratic
Mat 21:23–47	Jesus teaches the priests and the people	The priests challenged Jesus by what authority He taught. Jesus asked a question that would trap the priests. The priests were afraid to answer. Jesus then taught the people through the use of two parables—one about two sons—one who served the father and one who did not. And the other about the farmer who built a vineyard and then went on a journey	Paternalistic, Charismatic
Mat 22:1–46	Jesus teaches the people and the Sadducees	The chapter is a series of teachings by Jesus using parables and Socratic type questions. Part of the focus of His teachings was to present Himself as the Christ	Paternalistic, Charismatic

(continued)

Table 7.1 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Mat 23:1–39	Jesus chastises the Pharisees	The chapter is a series of statements by Jesus against the Pharisees. The focus seems to build animosity by the people against the Pharisees. The language is quite strong and indicates a possible protective desire to the people that Jesus represents	Paternalistic, Clan
Mat 24:1–51	Jesus instructs the disciples	Jesus left the temple, and the disciples joined him. Jesus uses the temple buildings as a metaphor for His own body. He then taught the disciples about the future and what will happen after His death. He points the disciples to the fig tree lesson and warns the disciples of the need to be diligent	Paternalistic, Charismatic
Mat 25:1–30	Jesus instructs the disciples	Jesus uses two parables to teach the disciples—the parable of the ten virgins and the parable of the talents as a means of instructing the disciples of what is required of them	Paternalistic
Mat 25:31–46	Jesus instructs the disciples	Jesus' teaching changes here to more about Himself and who He is	Charismatic
Mat 26:1–5	Jesus foretells His capture	Jesus foretells His capture after the Passover	Not sure—perhaps Charismatic
Mat 26:6–13	The woman pours oil on Jesus	Jesus allows the woman to anoint him with oil. The disciples are concerned about this, and Jesus rebukes the disciples	Charismatic

(continued)

Table 7.1 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Mat 26:14–16	Judas plots to betray Jesus	Judas works with the chief priests to betray Jesus	Not sure—could be any or all (referring to Jesus as the target)
Mat 26:17–26	Jesus identifies Judas	Jesus identifies Judas as the betrayer and warns Judas of the consequences	Not sure—could be Charismatic or Paternalistic
Mat 26:26–30	Jesus presents the communion rite	Jesus instructs the disciples on the meaning of the bread and wine	Not sure—could be Charismatic or Paternalistic
Mat 26:31–35	Jesus warns the disciples that they will all fall away	Jesus warns the disciples that they will all fall away	Charismatic
Mat 26:36–46	Jesus asks Peter and the two sons of Zebedee to go with Him and pray	After praying, Jesus came and found the disciples sleeping. He chastised them	Charismatic
Mat 26:47–56	Jesus is betrayed by Judas and captured by a large crowd	Following the capture, the disciples fled	Not sure
Mat 26:57–68	Jesus interacts with Cephas and the high priests	Jesus argues with Cephas and the high priests	Not sure
Mat 26:69–74	Peter denies Jesus three times	Peter denies Jesus three times	Not sure
Mat 27	The trial and crucifixion	This chapter is about the trial and crucifixion. It is not clear if leadership is shown here. Certainly, character and martyrdom is shown	Not sure
Mat 28:16–20	Jesus talks to the disciples after his resurrection	Jesus tells the disciples that all authority has been given to Him in Heaven and on earth. He then instructs the disciples to go and make disciples of all the nations	Charismatic

Table 7.2 The frequencies of ascribed leadership styles in the Gospel of Matthew

Ascribed leadership style	Frequency
Paternalistic/Clan	23
Autocratic	21
Charismatic	16
Servant	10

Westwood proposed a model of paternalistic leadership that featured: (a) patrimonialism, (b) patriarchy, (c) large power distance (Hofstede 1980), (d) authority acceptance and deference, (e) role conform-ance, and (f) filial piety ('family orientation') (p. 453). Westwood's model also contained a flow of variables described as 'harmony' and while 'harmony' applies to the overseas Chinese sample frame used by Westwood the notion of harmony is not applied in the Gospel of Matthew and is ignored in this current study. Of note, Westwood equated paternalistic leadership in the overseas Chinese context with benevolent autocratic style in the West (p. 454) and chose to not use the 'paternalistic' leadership because of what Westwood described as negative connotations in the west, yet Westwood used the label 'Paternalistic Headship'. It is not clear from Westwood's account why one label is better than another, but it may relate to the perception of the overseas Chinese sample frame in Westwood's study. Westwood purports that only those followers that have a high-quality relationship with the leader. Those, who were outside of this inner-circle, would not be privileged to the benefits of a paternalistic clan culture (p. 468). These characteristics are noted in Table 7.1 with regard to Mat 11:28–30, Mat 13:1–58, Mat 14:24–33, Mat 15:1–9, Mat 15:10–20, Mat 15:21–28, Mat 15:32–39, Mat 16:4–12, Mat 16:21–23, Mat 17:1–13, Mat 18:1–35, and Mat 19:13–15.

Although Liang et al. (2007) posit that paternalistic supervisory is limited to China, and this is presumed in Westwood's (1997) it seems that the paternalistic style was common to the Mediterranean culture at the time of the writing of the gospel of Matthew.

Clan Culture

Few studies exist in the recent organizational literature on the use of the clan culture and supervisory style with the noted exception of Chan's (1997) case study of DHL. Chan includes among the characteristics of a clan organization: (a) the importance of the individual clan member, (b) importance of internal stability, (c) internal cohesiveness and a sense of we/they, (d) differentiation of the clan from the external environment, (e) minimum dilution of the clan culture, (f) importance of clan identity, (g) greater acceptance of deviance by clan members than deviance of non-clan members, and (h) a set of clan elders who establish the law and mete out justice (p. 95). According to the University of Manitoba anthropological studies website, the clan member derives his/her rights from the father or mother figure in the clan (<http://www.umanitoba.ca/faculties/arts/anthropology/tutor/descent/unilineal/clans.html>—retrieved July 2005). Ouchi (1980), Cameron (1985) as well as Cameron and Quinn (2005) define clan culture as being inward focused with a sense or feeling of family, shared goals, participativeness, individuality, with transactions controlled by the congruence of beliefs and objectives. There is a sense of autonomy with people acting more out of a sense of duty toward vision rather than compliance to rules. According to Cameron and Quinn clan leaders take on a parental role in the organization, which is why for this current study the authors combine paternalistic and clan leadership styles. Clan culture is evident in Mat 20:20–28 and Mat 23:1–39.

Autocratic Leadership Style

Pelz (1956) labeled autocratic leaders as 'directive' "characterized by high influence by the chief, little freedom for subordinates to make decisions, and a moderate frequency of contact between them" (p. 323). Eagly et al. (1992) did not define autocratic, per se, but implied that from their findings men use autocratic leadership more so

than do women. Bass (1981) describe autocratic leaders as being task-directive and are usually more concerned about getting the task done than in meeting the needs of the followers (p. 417). Autocratic leaders tend to rely on rank and regulations to gain desired behavior from followers. Autocratic leadership, according to Bass, is most appropriate when speed and accuracy of a group are paramount and/or when the leader knows more about the problem than the followers (p. 423). According to Van de Vliert (2006) “autocratic leaders make decisions more unilaterally supervise subordinates work more closely” than would their democratic counterparts (p. 43). Van de Vliert contents that there is a socio-political-economic reason for using and valuing an autocratic leadership style when the local conditions are warmer (versus colder), less demanding bioclimates, and economically poorer. This may be a factor in the Mediterranean cultures at the time of the writing of the Gospel of Matthew. Table 7.1 shows evidence of the autocratic style in Mat 4:1–11, Mat 8:18, Mat 9:23–25, Mat 10:1, Mat 10:10–42, Mat 12:9–13, Mat 12:22–37, Mat 12:38–45, Mat 14:15–21, Mat 14:22–23, Mat 16:1–4, Mat 17:14–21, Mat 21:12–17, and Mat 21:18–22.

Charismatic Leadership

Conger and Kanungo (1987, 1998) posit that charismatic leaders can get followers to accept and internalize the leader’s vision and goals (1998, p. 54) and go beyond just being liked but being considered separate from ‘others’ because of the leader’s vision. According to Conger and Kanungo, this setting apart involves both the articulation of the vision in such a manner to make the follower discontent with the present and to desire the future as well as articulate how the vision might be implemented (1998, p. 55). The authors of this current study have consulted with visionary leaders in South Africa and the USA and have noted that it is the second element that can set apart ‘effective’ charismatic leaders from ineffective.

Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) add to Conger and Kanungo’s (1987, 1998) description of charismatic leadership by saying that “charismatic leaders speak with a captivating voice tone; make direct eye contact;

show animated facial expressions; and have a powerful, confident, and dynamic interaction style” (p. 38) however, Kirkpatrick and Locke’s study did not show that this third element of charismatic leaders contributed significantly to followers’ performance. Table 7.1 offers evidence of charismatic leadership in Mat 4:18–22, Mat 8:26–27, Mat 9:9–11, Mat 16:13–20, Mat 16:34–28, and Mat 25:31–46.

Servant Leadership

Bass (2000) explains the difference between servant leadership and transformational leadership and in doing so sets the framework for defining servant leadership when he said that servant leaders seek to serve the needs of employees while transformational leaders seek to serve the needs of the organization. Bass described servant leaders like this:

Servant leaders have a ‘natural’ feeling that they want to serve. They consciously make the choice to lead. The servant leaders have as concomitant goals helping others to grow as persons, to become wiser, healthier, freer, more autonomous, and more likely to become servant leaders themselves. The less privileged are benefited when the servant leaders succeed. The servant leader succeeds whenever the followers gain and achieve the goals set forth above. (p. 33)

At first blush, it would seem that Bass’ (2000) definition of servant leadership would apply to Jesus until we attempt to apply the ‘whole’ of the definition. Jesus was not dependent on his followers for success nor is there evidence in the Gospel of Matthew that Jesus sought to create more autonomy for his followers, although there is evidence that Jesus wanted his followers to do certain things after Jesus’ departure, even then Jesus indicated that the Holy Spirit would arrive to assist his followers as evidenced in John 14:26.

Servant leadership is further defined by Patterson (2003) as “the servant leader (a) demonstrates agapao love, (b) acts with humility, (c) is altruistic, (d) is visionary for the followers, (e) is trusting, (f) empowers followers, and (g) is serving” (p. 8). While this definition also seems

to apply to Jesus the key is to look at the characteristic of ‘is visionary for the followers’ in that, according to Patterson, leaders seek to know the followers’ visions and seek to help the followers achieve their individual visions. There is nothing in the Gospel accounts that imply that Jesus sought to help followers to fulfill their visions but, contrast, called followers to follow Him and achieve his vision, even to the point of reframing the followers vision as seen in Matthew 4:19 when Jesus called Simon and Peter to follow Him and become ‘fishers of men’—an act that reframed the ‘fishers of fish’ to ‘fishers of men’.

Although this section defines servant leadership and implies that this section doesn’t apply to Jesus, there are incidents in Matthew that imply servant leadership. The point of this section is to show that the notion of Jesus as the epitome of servant leadership is a myth. The reality is that the writer of Matthew does show incidents of Jesus using servant leadership as evidenced by the following verses shown in Table 7.1 that emphasize Jesus healing people: Mat 8:14–17, Mat 8:32–33, Mat 14:13–14, Mat 14:34–36, Mat 15:29–31, Mat 19:1–2, Mat 19:1–2, and Mat 20:29–34.

Jesus’ Leadership Styles from the Gospel of Mark

Stein (2003) posits that Mark wrote to an audience of Gentiles who understood Greek. Mark’s Gospel assumes that the audience had some understanding Paul, and John the Baptist. According to Stein, the audience may well have been both Greeks and Romans. The structure of the messages in the Gospel of Mark emphasizes action and immediacy, which supports the notion of the audience either being or including Romans. This form of action and immediacy would support the use of authoritarian, charismatic, and paternalistic/clan leadership styles.

Table 7.3 shows the verses describing Jesus’ interaction with followers and the leadership style that matches. The table shows: (a) the verse(s), (b) the people involved, (c) the actions/communication, and (d) ascribed leadership style. Table 7.4 follows Table 7.3 and presents the frequencies of each ascribed leadership style.

Table 7.3 Jesus' leadership styles from the Gospel of Mark

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/ communication	Leadership style(s)
Mark 1:1–13	John, Jesus, Crowds	Jesus is baptized and is driven into the desert to be tempted by the devil	Not sure
Mark 1:14–20	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus preaches his first sermon and calls the first disciples	Autocratic, Paternalistic
Mark 1:21–28	Jesus, Crowds	Jesus teaches in the synagogue and cast out a demon	Charismatic
Mark 1:29–34	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus heals Peter's mother-in-law, heals others and cast our demons	Charismatic
Mark 1:35–39	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus prays and directs disciples on mission	Autocratic
Mark 1:40–45	Jesus, Leper	Jesus heals a leper	Charismatic, Servant
Mark 2:1–12	Jesus, Crowds, Paralytic	Jesus heals a paralytic	Charismatic, Servant
Mark 2:13–17	Jesus, Levi, Pharisees	Jesus calls Levi and addresses the Pharisees	Paternalistic
Mark 2:18–22	Jesus, Crowds	Jesus is questioned about fasting	Clan
Mark 2:23–27	Jesus, Disciples, Pharisees	Jesus is questioned about the Sabbath	Clan
Mark 3:1–6	Jesus, Crowds, Pharisees	Jesus heals a man with a shriveled hand on the Sabbath	Charismatic
Mark 3:7–12	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Large crowds follow Jesus	Charismatic
Mark 3:13–19	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus appoints the twelve Disciples	Paternalistic, maybe Clan
Mark 3:20–30	Jesus, Crowd, Disciples, teachers of the Law	Jesus is confronted by the Teachers of the Law	Charismatic

(continued)

Table 7.3 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/ communication	Leadership style(s)
Mark 3:31–35	Jesus, Siblings, Mother, Disciples	Jesus is confronted by his family	Clan
Mark 4:1–20	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Sower)	Paternalistic, maybe Clan
Mark 4:21–25	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Lamp on a Stand)	Paternalistic, maybe Clan
Mark 4:26–29	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Growing Seed)	Paternalistic, maybe Clan
Mark 4:30–34	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Mustard Seed)	Paternalistic, maybe Clan
Mark 4:35–41	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus calms the storm	Charismatic
Mark 5:1–20	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds and Demon-possessed man	Jesus delivers a demon-possessed man in the region of the Gerasenes	Charismatic, Servant
Mark 5:21–43	Jesus, Disciples, Ruler of the Synagogue and his family, the woman with the issue of blood, Crowds	Jesus heals the woman with an issue of blood and raises the daugh- ter of the ruler of the synagogue	Charismatic, Servant
Mark 6:1–6	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus is rejected by his hometown	Charismatic
Mark 6:7–13	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus sends out the twelve	Charismatic, Autocratic
Mark 6:14–29	No action of Jesus	No action of Jesus	NA
Mark 6:30–44	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus feeds the Five Thousand	Paternalistic, Clan
Mark 6:45–56	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus walks on water	Charismatic

Table 7.3 provides evidence that Jesus did not use servant leadership as a dominant style but rather seems to have used specific styles to fit specific situations, thus supporting the notion of Jesus as a situational leader.

Table 7.4 The frequencies of ascribed leadership styles in the Gospel of Mark

Ascribed leadership style	Frequency
Charismatic	39
Paternalistic/Clan	24
Autocratic	9
Servant	7

Table 7.4 shows the frequencies of the ascribed leadership styles and it notable that in the Gospel of Mark Charismatic leadership tops the list followed by Paternalistic as compared to the Gospel of Matthew in which Paternalistic was first followed by Autocratic. This may be due to the focus of the writer of each gospel on the audience in that the Gospel of Matthew was written to a Jewish audience showing the historical evidence of Jesus as the Messiah whereas the Gospel of Mark was written to a Roman audience showing Jesus as the Son of the ‘real’ God as compared to the many gods worshiped in the Roman empire.

Jesus’ Leadership Styles from the Gospel of Luke

Moscato (1976) presents support from the literature that Luke may have written to Gentiles, or to Jewish-Christians. While Moscato’s research does not provide a definitive scope of the audience, she points out that the literature supports a possible sub-group of audience members who were Jewish-Christians referred to as Nazoreans. Moscato concludes her study by positing that the most-likely audience were Gentile-Christians. Luke’s Gospel contains a decidedly Greek consider of Jesus as being a complete person—body, mind, and soul, which seems to align with Greek philosophy. This whole-person approach to Jesus would support the use of Charismatic, Authoritative, and Servant Leadership styles.

Table 7.5 shows the verses describing Jesus’ interaction with followers and the leadership style that matches. The table shows: (a) the verse(s), (b) the people involved, (c) the actions/communication, and (d) ascribed leadership style. Table 7.6 follows Table 7.5 and presents the frequencies of each ascribed leadership style.

Table 7.5 Jesus' leadership styles from the Gospel of Luke

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Luke 1:1-2:40	No Leadership Action of Jesus	No Leadership Action of Jesus	NA
Luke 2:41-52	Jesus, Parents, Teachers of the Law	Jesus teaches in the Temple	Charismatic
Luke 3:1-20	No Leadership Action of Jesus	No Leadership Action of Jesus	NA
Luke 3:21-37	Jesus, John the Baptist, and Ancestors	The Baptism and Genealogy of Jesus	Charismatic, Clan
Luke 4:1-13	Jesus, Devil	The Temptation of Jesus	Charismatic
Luke 4:14-30	Jesus, Crowds	Jesus teaches in the Synagogue in Nazareth and is rejected	Charismatic
Luke 4:31-37	Jesus, Crowds, Demon-possessed man	Jesus teaches in the Synagogue in Capernaum and delivers a demon-possessed man in the Synagogue	Autocratic, perhaps Servant
Luke 4:38-44	Jesus, Simon, Simon's mother-in-law, crowds	Jesus heals the mother-in-law of Simon and delivers and heals many others	Servant, Charismatic (in His utterances)
Luke 5:1-11	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus calls the first Disciples	Autocratic
Luke 5:12-16	Jesus, Leper, Crowds	Jesus heals a man with Leprosy	Servant, maybe Paternalistic
Luke 5:17-26	Jesus, Pharisees, Teachers of the Law, Crowds, Paralytic Man	Jesus heals a paralytic	Charismatic, Servant
Luke 5:27-32	Jesus, Levi, Pharisees, Teachers of the Law	Jesus calls Levi	Autocratic, Clan
Luke 5:33-39	Jesus, Pharisees, Teachers of the Law	Jesus is questioned about fasting	Charismatic
Luke 6:1-11	Jesus, Disciples, Pharisees, Teachers of Law, Crowds, Man with a shriveled hand	Jesus is questioned about the Sabbath	Autocratic, Charismatic

(continued)

Table 7.5 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Luke 6:12-16	Jesus; Disciples	Jesus calls the 12 Disciples	Clan, Paternalistic
Luke 6:17-49	Jesus; Crowds; Disciples	Jesus teaches the Sermon on the Plain	Clan, Servant
Luke 7:1-17	Jesus; Crowds, Centurion, Widow	Jesus heals the servant of the Centurion and raises the son of a widow	Servant, Autocratic
Luke 7:18-35	Jesus, John the Baptist, John's Disciples, Crowds, Pharisees, Teachers of the Law	Jesus is questioned by John the Baptist and the Pharisees and Teachers of the Law	Charismatic
Luke 7:36-50	Jesus, Pharisees, "Sinful woman"	Jesus is anointed by a "sinful woman" and questioned by Simon the Pharisee	Charismatic
Luke 8:1-18	Jesus; Disciples, Women following	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Sower and the Parable of the Lamp)	Clan
Luke 8:19-21	Jesus, Mother, Brothers, Crowds	Jesus is confronted by His family	Clan
Luke 8:22-25	Jesus; Disciples	Jesus calms the storm	Charismatic
Luke 8:26-39	Jesus; Disciples, Demon-possessed man, Crowds	Jesus delivers a demon-possessed man in the region of the Gerasenes	Servant, Charismatic
Luke 8:40-56	Jesus; Crowds, Jairus, Woman with the flow of blood, Disciples	Jesus heals a sick woman and raises a girl from the dead	Servant, Charismatic
Luke 9:1-9	Jesus; Disciples	Jesus sends out the Disciples	Autocratic, maybe Paternalistic
Luke 9:10-17	Jesus; Disciples, Crowds	Jesus feeds the Five Thousand	Charismatic, Clan
Luke 9:18-27	Jesus; Disciples	Jesus questions the disciples on His identity	Charismatic
Luke 9:28-36	Jesus; Disciples	Jesus is transfigured	Charismatic

(continued)

Table 7.5 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Luke 9:37–45	Jesus, Crowds, Disciples, Man with demon-possessed boy	Jesus delivers a demon-possessed boy	Charismatic, Servant
Luke 9:46–50	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus is questioned by His disciples on who is the greatest	Servant, Clan
Luke 9:51–56	Jesus, Crowds, Disciples	Jesus is resisted in Samaria	Not sure
Luke 9:57–62	Jesus, Crowds, Disciples	Jesus speaks about the cost of following Him	Autocratic, Charismatic
Luke 10:1–24	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus sends out the Seventy-two	Charismatic, Autocratic
Luke 10:25–37	Jesus, Disciples, Teacher of the Law	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Good Samaritan)	Servant
Luke 10:38–42	Jesus, Disciples, Martha, Mary	Jesus spends time at the house of Martha and Mary	Charismatic, maybe Paternalistic
Luke 11:1–13	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus teaches of prayer	Paternalistic
Luke 11:14–28	Jesus, Crowds	Jesus is questioned about ministry of exorcism	Autocratic, Clan
Luke 11:29–32	Jesus, Crowds	Jesus teaches (The Sign of Jonah)	Autocratic
Luke 11:33–36	Jesus, Crowds	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Lamp)	Autocratic
Luke 11:37–54	Jesus, Pharisee, Teacher of the Law	Jesus pronounces the six woes	Autocratic
Luke 12:1–12	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus gives warnings and encouragements to His Disciples	Autocratic, Charismatic
Luke 12:13–21	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Rich Fool)	Autocratic, Charismatic

(continued)

Table 7.5 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Luke 12:22–59	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus teaches on watchfulness, not to worry, unity and interpretation the times	Autocratic, Charismatic, maybe elements of Clan
Luke 13:1–9	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Fig Tree)	Autocratic, maybe Clan
Luke 13:10–17	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus heals crippled woman	Servant, Charismatic
Luke 13:18–30	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Mustards Seed/Yeast and Parable of the Narrow Door)	Clan, Paternalistic
Luke 13:31–35	Jesus, Pharisees	Jesus is confronted by the Pharisees about Herod Antipas	Autocratic, Charismatic
Luke 14:1–14	Jesus, Pharisee, Teacher of the Law	Jesus is questioned on the Sabbath	Servant
Luke 15:15–24	Jesus, Pharisee, Teachers of the Law	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Great Banquet)	Maybe Clan
Luke 15:25–35	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus teaches on the Cost of being a Disciple	Charismatic, maybe Paternalistic
Luke 16:1–31	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Shrewd Manager, on Adultery, Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus)	Paternalistic, Clan
Luke 17:1–10	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus teaches (On Sin, Faith, Duty)	Paternalistic, Clan
Luke 17:11–19	Jesus, Lepers	Jesus heals the Lepers	Servant
Luke 17:20–37	Jesus, Disciples, Pharisees	Jesus teaches on the coming of the Kingdom of God	Paternalistic, Clan

(continued)

Table 7.5 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Luke 18:1–14	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Persistent Widow and Parable of the Pharisee and Tax Collector)	Charismatic, maybe Autocratic
Luke 18:15–17	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	People bring babies to Jesus	Paternalistic, maybe Charismatic
Luke 18:18–30	Jesus, Ruler	Jesus confronts a rich ruler	Paternalistic
Luke 18:31–34	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus predicts His own death	Charismatic
Luke 18:35–43	Jesus, Crowds, Blind man	Jesus heals a blind man	Servant, Charismatic
Luke 19:1–10	Jesus, Tax Collector	Jesus stays at the House of a Tax Collector (Zacchaeus)	Autocratic, Clan
Luke 19:11–27	Jesus, Tax Collector	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Ten Minas)	Autocratic, maybe Charismatic
Luke 19:28–48	Jesus, Disciples, Crowds	Jesus enters Jerusalem and cleanses the Temple	Charismatic, Autocratic
Luke 20:1–8	Jesus, Crowds, Chief Priests, Teachers of the Law	Jesus' authority is questioned	Charismatic
Luke 20:9–19	Jesus, Crowds	Jesus teaches (Parable of the Tenants)	Charismatic
Luke 20:20–26	Jesus, Chief Priests, Teachers of the Law	Jesus is questioned on paying taxes	Not sure
Luke 20:27–47	Jesus, Sadducees, Teachers of the Law	Jesus is questioned on the Resurrection and Marriage	Charismatic
Luke 21:1–4	Jesus, Disciples, Poor Widow	Jesus comments on Poor Widow	Not sure
Luke 21:5–38	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus teaches about the end of the Age	Not sure

(continued)

Table 7.5 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
Luke 22:1–6	No Leadership Action of Jesus	No Leadership Action of Jesus	Charismatic, Paternalistic
Luke 22:7–38	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus celebrates a Last Supper with His Disciples	NA
Luke 22:39–46	Jesus, Disciples	Jesus prays on the Mount of Olives	Charismatic, Servant
Luke 22:47–53	Jesus, Judas, Crowd, Disciples	Jesus is betrayed by Judas and arrested	Paternalistic
Luke 22:54–62	No Leadership Action of Jesus	No Leadership Action of Jesus	Servant
Luke 22:63–23:25	Jesus, Soldiers, Council of the Elders, Chief Priests, Teachers of the Law, Pilate, Herod	Jesus is mocked by the soldiers and is on trial before Pilate and Herod	NA
Luke 23:26–49	Jesus, Crowds, Criminals	Jesus is crucified	Charismatic
Luke 23:50–24:12	No Leadership Action of Jesus	No Leadership Action of Jesus	Charismatic
Luke 24:13–35	Jesus, Two Disciples on the Road to Emmaus	Jesus appears to two disciples on the road to Emmaus	NA
Luke 24:26–53	Jesus, Disciples	Appearance and Ascension of Jesus to His Disciples	Servant, Charismatic

Table 7.6 The frequencies of ascribed leadership styles in the Gospel of Luke

Ascribed leadership style	Frequency
Charismatic	27
Autocratic	16
Servant	12
Paternalistic/Clan	7

Table 7.5, as in Tables 7.1 and 7.3 provides evidence that Jesus did not use servant leadership as a dominant style but rather seems to have used specific styles to fit specific situations, thus supporting the notion of Jesus as a situational leader.

Table 7.6 shows the frequencies of the ascribed leadership styles, and it is noted that in the Gospel of Luke we see Charismatic Leadership as the most commonly ascribed leadership style. This may be that the focus of the Gospel of Luke is on a Greek audience in which the ideal leader would be charismatic, at the time of the writing of the Gospel.

Jesus' Leadership Styles from the Gospel of John

It is less clear as to the audience for the Gospel of John. Wallace (2004) proposed that John wrote to a Gentile audience because he referred to the 'Jews' as an enemy of Jesus (Location the web page—Section C fourth paragraph). The focus on Jesus in the Gospel of John is one of authority and power, which would support both the Authoritarian and Paternalistic/Clan Leadership styles. Table 7.7 shows the verses describing Jesus' interaction with followers and the leadership style that matches. The table shows: (a) the verse(s), (b) the people involved, (c) the actions/communication, and (d) ascribed leadership style. Table 7.8 follows Table 7.5 and presents the frequencies of each ascribed leadership style.

Table 7.7, as in Tables 7.1, 7.3, and 7.5 provides evidence that Jesus did not use servant leadership as a dominant style but rather seems to have used specific styles to fit specific situations, thus supporting the notion of Jesus as a situational leader.

Table 7.7 Jesus' leadership styles from the Gospel of John

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
John 1:1-5	none—this is what the author wrote about Jesus	He is the beginning; He is source of all Truth. He is God. He is all things. The majority of the universe didn't understand him	Charismatic
John 1:15-36	John	This is about John speaking about Jesus. John testifies to the deity of Jesus	Charismatic
John 1:37-42	Jesus and two disciples	The two men follow Jesus. Jesus asks the two men what they want. The two men call Jesus 'teacher,' and Jesus asks the men to follow Him	Charismatic and/or Paternalistic
John 1:43-51	Jesus along with Philip, Nathanael	Jesus demonstrates that He knows the men and knows things about them that no one other than the individual himself would know	Charismatic. Possibly shows the use of emotional intelligence
John 2:1-11	Jesus and wedding at Cana	Jesus does as his mother asks and provides more wine for the wedding	Clan/Paternalistic/ Maternalistic
John 2:12-22	Jesus and the money changes in the temple	Jesus shows no tolerance for inappropriate behavior in the temple	Autocratic
John 2:23-25	Jesus keeps to himself	Jesus does not show himself to most folk	Charismatic in that he is selective regarding who he allows to get close to him
John 3:1-21	Jesus and Nicodemus	This is a long passage about Jesus teaching Nicodemus about the Kingdom	Paternalistic/Clan in that He is interested in teaching members of the clan
John 3:22-27	Jesus, John and the disciples of both	Both Jesus and John are teaching and baptizing	Paternalistic/clan

(continued)

Table 7.7 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
John 3:28–36	Jesus, John and the disciples of both	continuing in the passage, John re-confirms the power and vision of the Jesus thus helping to establish the sole authority and power of Jesus	Charismatic in that Jesus is proclaimed as having all power and vision
John 4:4–26	This is the story of Jesus and the woman at the well	Jesus teaches about Himself, the Kingdom and tells the woman things about herself that she believed a stranger could not know	Paternalistic/cian in that Jesus taught the woman and cared for the woman
John 4:27–42	Jesus teaches the disciples and talks with the Samaritans	Jesus explained that He was here to do the work of his Father (transformational leadership) He taught about one who sows and one who reaps rejoicing together (participative/team leadership). He agreed to stay with the Samaritans at the Samaritans' request (servant leadership)	Charismatic in that Jesus taught about Himself and his position in the Kingdom Transformational, participative/team, and servant leadership
John 4:43–54	Jesus, the Galileans, Cana, and the royal official	The royal official asks Jesus to heal his son. Jesus heals the son at the moment based on the faith of the official	Servant in that He did as he was asked
John 5:1–16	Jesus and the ill man at the pool of Bethesda	Jesus healed the man. The man later told folk that Jesus healed him	Authoritative since Jesus commanded the man to do something. The man did not ask for something

(continued)

Table 7.7 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
John 5:17-47	Jesus and the Jews	The Jews plotted to kill Jesus and challenged Jesus as to He claimed to be	Charismatic in that Jesus proclaimed a higher authority was guiding him
John 6:1-14	Jesus, the disciples, and the multitude	Jesus left the crowds to be alone, but the crowds followed him. Jesus saw that it was time to eat and the people had nothing. Jesus fed the multitude with a few loaves and fishes. The people marveled at what they saw	Servant Leadership in that Jesus was concerned about the people and not interested in building knowledge about himself
John 6:15-71	Jesus, the disciples, the people of Capernaum	Jesus walks on water as the disciples sail across the sea to Capernaum. The people knew that Jesus did not go with the disciples and did not take a boat. The people questioned Jesus. Jesus used the time to teach about himself and to show the people His relationship with God and Heaven	Some Charismatic, some authoritarian and some paternalistic in that he taught the people what they should do
John 7:1-53	Jesus secretly goes from Galilee to Judea for the Feast of Booths	Jesus teaches in the temple and about himself. The people challenge him about who he is and who the Messiah will be. Jesus argues that He is the source of salvation	This is hard to tell. It is charismatic in that he teaches about himself and with great conviction, but paternalistic in that he teaches about Heaven
John 8:1-11	Jesus and the adulterous woman	Jesus is asked to judge the adulterous woman. After he writes something in the ground, he asks for those without sin to cast the first stone. When the men are all gone he asks the woman to go and sin no more	Could be paternalistic in that he passed judgment. It could be autocratic in that he had one opinion and it was to be the only opinion for the event

(continued)

Table 7.7 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
John 8:12–59	Jesus and the people who still made up a crowd	Jesus presented to the people who He was and Who He represents. His words were harsh here in that he condemned crowd of being from Satan	Could be paternalistic in that he passed judgment. It could be autocratic in that he had one opinion and it was to be the only opinion for the event
John 9:1–41	Jesus heals the blind man	Jesus is asked if the blind man sinned or if his parents sinned. Jesus responded neither but that the blind man was blind so that the works of God might be shown through him. The man told people that Jesus healed him. The Pharisees questioned the man	This is a tough call for leadership. Perhaps paternalistic/clan in that Jesus is trying to establish his authority of clan—God then Jesus then...
John 10:1–43	Jesus and the Jews who did not believe Him	This is a long passage in which Jesus discusses/argues with the Jews at the temple about who Jesus is. The Jews want to stone Him for blasphemy. Jesus uses logic to attempt to persuade the crowd of who he is	This is a tough call for leadership. Perhaps paternalistic/clan in that Jesus is trying to establish his authority of clan—God then Jesus then...
John 11:1–57	Jesus, Mary, Martha, Lazarus, disciples, Jews	This is the story of Jesus healing Lazarus. Jesus waited until by all normal indications it would be impossible to raise Lazarus from death. Jesus arrives and does so while in the process teaching about who Jesus is	This is more charismatic since it is about Jesus rather than about Lazarus or Mary or Martha. Servant Leadership would have shown Jesus going to help Lazarus as soon as Jesus heard

(continued)

Table 7.7 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
John 12:1–12	Jesus, Mary, Martha, Lazarus, disciples, Jews	Mary anoints Jesus with perfume. The disciples chastise Mary, but Jesus advised to leave Mary alone saying that the poor would always be with them but that He (Jesus) would not be there for long	This is more charismatic since it is about Jesus.
John 12:13–19	Jesus, disciples, the Donkey Colt	Jesus locates a donkey and rides it into town to fulfill the prophecy	This could be charismatic or clan. Charismatic in that it is about Jesus but Clan in that it is about supporting ritual, rites, and prophecy
John 12:20–50	Jesus, the disciples, the crowds	Jesus proclaims that he will die so that many can live. The heavens open and God speaks. Some heard thunder, some heard an angel. Many people in the crowds began to believe	Charismatic in that the effort seeks to establish authority and vision in the leader
John 13:1–38	Jesus, the disciples	This is the story of the last supper	Paternalistic and servant leadership
John 14:1 to 17:26	Jesus, the disciples	Jesus teaches about His departure, the coming of the Holy Spirit, and he chastises those who may not love Him. He calls upon His Father to glorify Himself through Jesus	Paternalistic, charismatic
John 18:1–12	Jesus, the disciples, the arresting soldiers	Jesus is arrested in the garden after Judas betrayed Him	There is insufficient data here

(continued)

Table 7.7 (continued)

Verse(s)	People involved	Actions/communication	Leadership style(s)
John 18:19-24	Jesus, the priest, and the soldier	The priest questions Jesus	There is insufficient data here
John 19		This is the story of Jesus' persecution and execution	There is insufficient data relative to leadership since there is minimal interaction between Jesus and others that can relate to a leadership exchange
John 20:26-31	Jesus, Thomas	Jesus shows Thomas the evidence	Possibly paternalistic in that he did not refuse to show evidence. Possibly servant in that he thought enough about the follower to do what the follower needed
John 21:1-25	Jesus, disciples, specifically Peter	Jesus restores Peter through the process of getting Peter to declare love for Jesus three times.	Paternalistic and servant leadership

Table 7.8 The frequencies of ascribed leadership styles in the Gospel of John

Ascribed leadership style	Frequency
Charismatic	10
Paternalistic/Clan	10
Autocratic	1
Servant	2

Table 7.8 shows the frequencies of the ascribed leadership styles, and it is noted that in the Gospel of John we see both Charismatic Leadership and Paternalistic sharing the position as the most commonly ascribed leadership styles. This may be that the focus of the Gospel of John is on a broad audience (everyone not covered by the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John) with the intent of showing Jesus as the Messiah.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to determine if Jesus used servant leadership as the main style and the data presented indicates that servant leadership, while present in the Gospels, is the least ascribed leadership style. The data in Tables 7.1, 7.3, 7.5, and 7.7 imply that Jesus used a style that fit the situation making Jesus a situational leadership. Had a specific leadership styles showed at the top in each of Tables 7.2, 7.4, 7.6, and 7.8, then we might be able to claim that Jesus had one dominate style the data in Tables 7.2, 7.4, 7.6, and 7.8 show otherwise. From this study, we conclude that Jesus was a situational leader.

Works Cited

- Bae, J., Chen, S., David Wan, T. W., Lawler, J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2003). Human resource strategy and firm performance in Pacific Rim countries. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(8), 1308–1332.
- Bass, B. M. (1981). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. San Francisco: Free Press.

- Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(3), 18–40.
- Cameron, K. S. (1985). *Culture congruence, strength, and type: Relationships to effectiveness* (University of Michigan Work Paper No. 401). Retrieved from <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/2027.42/35463/2/b1407934.0001.001.pdf>.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2005). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework* (Rev. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chan, A. (1997). Corporate culture of a clan organization: A case study of DHL international. *Management Decision*, 35(2), 94–99.
- Chou, W. (2002). The transformation of industrial authority and paternalistic capitalism in the global economy: Case studies of Taiwan's textiles industries. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(3), 550–568.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *The Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 637–647.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Farh, J., & Cheng, B. (2000). A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations. In J. T. Li, A. S. Tsui, & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Management and organizations in the Chinese context* (pp. 84–130). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111, 3–22.
- Gorton, M., Ignat, G., & White, J. (2004). The evolution of post-Soviet labour processes: A case study of the hollowing out of paternalism in Moldova. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(7), 1249–1261.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. London: Sage.
- Hoppenbrouwers, F. (2002). Winds of change: Religious nationalism in a transformation context. *Religion, State and Society*, 30(4), 305–316.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership: Components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(1), 36–51.
- Lee, H. (2001). Paternalistic human resources practices: Their emergence and characteristics. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 35(4), 841–869.

- Liang, S., Ling, H., & Hsieh, S. (2007). The mediating effects of leader-member exchange quality to influence the relationships between paternalistic supervisory and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 10(2), 127–137.
- Moscato, M. A. (1976). Current theories regarding the audience of Luke-Acts. *Currents in Theology And Mission*, 3(6), 355–361.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1980). Markets, bureaucracies, and clans. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25(1), 129–141.
- Patterson, K. A. (2003). Servant leadership: A theoretical model. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(2), 570 (UMI No. 3082719).
- Pelz, D. C. (1956). Some social factors related to performance in a research organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1(3), 310–325.
- Stein, R. H. (2003). Is our reading the bible the same as the original audience's hearing it? A case study in the gospel of mark. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 46(1), 63–78.
- Ulrich, D. W. (2007). The missional audience of the gospel of Matthew. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 69(1), 64–83.
- Van de Vliert, E. (2006). Autocratic leadership around the globe: Do climate and wealth drive leadership culture? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37(42), 42–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022105282294>.
- Wallace, D. B. (2004). *The gospel of John: Introduction, argument, outline*. Bible.org. Retrieved March 6, 2018, from <https://bible.org/seriespage/4-gospel-john-introduction-argument-outline>.
- Westwood, R. (1997). Harmony and patriarchy: The cultural basis for 'paternalistic headship' among the overseas Chinese. *Organization Studies*, 18(3), 445–480. <https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069701800305>.



8

Compensation

In this chapter, I present the scriptural principles and cautions about compensating employees. Compensation is the “human resource management function that deals with every type of reward individuals receive in exchange for performing organizational tasks” (Ivancevich and Konopaske 2012, p. 298). The focus of scripture is on farmers and business owners, and if you are not the owner of the business, you may not have much latitude in decision-making about compensating employees. The value in understanding what scripture says about compensation is in the manager being an advocate for employees and guiding the firm’s senior leaders in how to care for employees. According to Brack and Kelly (2012) compensation is a high-priority for Millennial employees along with a sense of knowing that the firm values their employees.

Workers Are to be Paid

The verses below carry strong demands of business owners and overseers. The focus includes a clear sense that wages are not a gift, or charity, but what is due to the worker for his/her efforts on behalf of the firm. There

is a general sense of equity as called for Psalm 9:8 NAS “And He will judge the world in righteousness; He will execute judgment for the peoples with equity.” The Hebrew term we translate as equity is ‘Meyshar’ (Strong’s word: 4339) that means evenness, uprightness, straightness, and equity. This carries with it a sense of integrity and credibility. To me, this seems to relate to the Beatitude of seeking what is righteous.

- Deuteronomy 24:14–15 NAS You shall not oppress a hired servant who is poor and needy, whether he is one of your countrymen or one of your aliens who is in your land in your towns.
- Jeremiah 22:13 NAS Woe to him who builds his house without righteousness And his upper rooms without justice, Who uses his neighbor’s services without pay And does not give him his wages.
- Proverbs 3:27–28 ESV Do not withhold good from those to whom it is due, when it is in your power to do it. Do not say to your neighbor, “Go, and come again, tomorrow I will give it”—when you have it with you.
- Malachi 3:5 ESV “Then I will draw near to you for judgment. I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, against the adulterers, against those who swear falsely, against those who oppress the hired worker in his wages, the widow and the fatherless, against those who thrust aside the sojourner, and do not fear me,” says the Lord of hosts.
- Luke 10:7 ESV And remain in the same house, eating and drinking what they provide, for the laborer deserves his wages. Do not go from house to house.
- Romans 4:4 ESV Now to the one who works, his wages are not counted as a gift but as his due.
- James 5:4 NAS Behold, the pay of the laborers who mowed your fields, and which has been withheld by you, cries out against you; and the outcry of those who did the harvesting has reached the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.
- 1 Timothy 5:18 ESV For the Scripture says, “You shall not muzzle an ox when it treads out the grain,” and, “The laborer deserves his wages.”
- Leviticus 19:13 NAS You shall not oppress your neighbor, nor rob him. The wages of a hired man are not to remain with you all night until morning.

The Bible also talks about severance pay when a slave was set free. Deuteronomy 15:12–15 explains how long a slave should work for the owner and what happens at the end of six years. The passage says that in the seventh year the owner of a slave was to release the slave and provide a severance allowance: “You shall furnish him liberally from your flock and from your threshing floor and from your wine vat; you shall give to him as the LORD your God has blessed you” (Deuteronomy 15:14 NAS). The passage does not describe how much was to be given to the slave.

The verses above provide guidance about the obligation to pay workers and pay them quickly, but there is not much in scripture about how much to pay. The parable of the Vineyard presents information that may help understand the minimum pay rate and the Parable of the Talents may help us understand how pay should be related to performance.

The Parable of the Vineyard

The parable of the vineyard describes a landowner who goes into town and hires a group of men to come work in the vineyard. According to the Matthew 2: 1–16 passage, the landowner offers the men a denarius for a day’s work. The men accept and go with the landowner to work in the fields. The landowner, for an undisclosed reason, returns to town and sees more men standing around and offers them work, but he does not state the exact compensation. The men agree to work. Later that day, the landowner, again, goes to the town and sees more men, whom he hires to work the remaining hours of the day.

When the day’s work was finished, the landowner, followed the admonition of the verses included above and paid the workers. The workers who worked all day were not satisfied with the knowledge that the workers who came to the field later in the day received the same day’s wages as those who started early in the morning. This parable is about the Kingdom of Heaven, but Jesus used common occurring situations to illustrate his lessons, and we can draw an inference from this parable. The clearly stated reference to a denarius as the amount

of payment is interesting in that this was the same amount paid to a low-ranking Roman soldier (Alston 1994; van Heesch 2007; Whiston 1875). Therefore, we might infer that the landowner paid his workers a minimum wage, which is why he paid all of the workers the same amount. The idea of paying a minimum living wage by the day makes sense since a person has to live for a day regardless of how many hours he, or she, might work.

The notion of a minimum living wage is not a new concept in economics as demonstrated by Ryan (1906), who argued in favor of a minimum living wage and saw that this conflicted with the then-common, view of pay being set by constant negotiation between management and labor. But the concept did not receive much attention in the employment literature until recently. Studies and position papers by Prowse et al. (2017), Pollin (2007), and Figart (2001) present the notion of a minimum living wage as an appropriate and ethical thing for firms to do, thus tying the concept back to the Hebrew concept of *Meysar* (evenness, uprightness, straightness, and/or equity) mentioned above. It seems to me that leaders and managers should advocate for a minimum living wage.

There have been arguments against raising the minimum USA Federal wage that points out the reduction of jobs as a result of higher minimum wages in some parts of the USA such as Seattle, Washington. Ehrenfreund (2017, June 26) reported that employers reduced their workforce and reduced hours, whereas Spielberg (2017, June 27) reported that the increase to the minimum wage did not have a negative impact. The difference in accounts, according to Spielberg was in the research method and analysis that Ehrenfreund reported about.

While there is logic in some of the comments by opponents of raising the USA federal minimum wage, there is nothing in scripture that supports the notion that paying less than a minimum living wage is acceptable. Also, there is nothing in scripture that supports the notion that people have to be employed. Industries and specific firms have turned to automation to reduce their workforces and, in some cases, improve quality where precision is needed. Automation also removes people from hazardous jobs. All one has to do is drive down the street and see that we use automated traffic signals, that once were handled by traffic

police, we drive by ATMs that replaced bank tellers. We fill our car's gas tank at a gas station where we pump our gas, which use to be done by an attendant. What I see in scripture is that 'IF' we hire someone we must pay a minimum living wage.

An excellent resource about the minimum wage is Card and Krueger's (1997) book about the reported negative impact of raising the minimum wage. Card and Krueger analyzed prior increases in the USA Federal minimum wage and examined short-term and long-term effects. Card and Krueger include an interesting reason, among several reasons why we should study the minimum wage:

Another reason for the prominence of the minimum wage in economics and policy discussions is the fact that, at some time during their lives, most individuals are paid the minimum wage. (p. 5)

This was certainly true for me. When I was 15, I worked on farms, much like the workers in the Parable of the Vineyard and was even picked up from town by the farmers and driven out to the fields where I helped with baling hay, back when hay was baled into rectangular bales. I earned \$1.00 an hour then, which was slightly below the federal minimum wage of \$1.25. When I turned 16, I worked for a grocery store stocking shelves, cleaning the floors, unloading trucks of groceries and produce, as well as bagging groceries and carrying the bags to the shoppers' cars and trucks. I earned the minimum wage of \$1.25. Then, in 1967, the minimum wage increased to \$1.40 and as Card and Krueger pointed out, firms, like the grocery store I worked at reduced hours, but it was short-lived since the same amount of work still had to be done. After a few months, all of the hourly employees' hours were increased back to the prior level, and prices were increased slightly to cover the higher hourly wage.

Pay for Performance

The Parable of the Talents (Mat 25: 14–30) is a means of conveying to others what it will be like when Jesus returns in the second coming.

Like other parables, Jesus uses the common activities of the day to explain spiritual concepts, and we can draw an inference from the common activity about how we should live and work. The parable is about a wealthy person who is going on a trip and gives resources to three of his employees to manage and grow in his absence. He gives one employee ten talents, another he gives two talents, and to the third, he gives one talent. The parable said that each employee got the number of talents that aligned with the owner's perception of the employees' abilities.

To help understand the probable value of what was given to the employees, a talent of silver at the time of parable weighed about 100 pounds (45 kilograms) (Strongs Word 5007 definition of 'Talanton'). As of March 2018, the value of silver is \$16.23 per ounce. Thus, a talent was equivalent to just about \$26,000 in today's USA dollars. This means that employee one got \$260,000 to work with, employee two got \$130,000, and employee three got \$26,000. As the parable goes, the owner was gone for some time and when he returned he asked the employees to return the talents and the earnings that each employee gained. The employee with five and the employee with two talents each doubled the value, and the owner praised each. The employee with one talent returned the one talent and explained that he was afraid and just buried the talent to keep it safe. The owner was not pleased with the third employee and took the talent and gave it to the one who doubled the five talents.

The parable offers several insights for managers and leaders. First, be sure to match expectations and demands with employees' abilities. Second, know that unengaged employees, such as the one who buried the talent, will not achieve the organization's objectives. Third, compensation should be aligned with accomplishment. Thus, the employee who doubled the five talents received more compensation than the one who doubled the two talents. And, fourth, if the employee is not engaged and there is no reasonable expectation of improvement, the employee should be removed. Note that there are ethical ways of removing employees, especially if the problem is one of person-organization and person-job fit, as might have been the case with the employee who received one talent.

Compensation for performance can be done by higher hourly wage, higher salary, or bonuses. As long as the wages and salaries are aligned with overall costs and earnings, the firm should be financially better off by paying a portion of unanticipated revenues to the employees who were responsible for the results.

Conclusion

This chapter presented a brief look at the scriptural admonition of compensating employees and made the point, that while managers and leaders may not be in a position to create policy about compensation, they should be advocates for employees and seek to help employees receive at least a minimum living wage and should have compensation that aligns with performance. Compensation in organizations should be ethical and demonstrate equity (Meshar).

Works Cited

- Alston, R. (1994). Roman military pay from Caesar to Diocletian. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 84, 113–123. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/300872>.
- Brack, J., & Kelly, K. (2012). Maximizing millennials in the workplace. University of North Carolina Kenan-Flager Business School. Retrieved from Kenan-Flager University of North Carolina. <http://www.kenan-flagler.unc.edu/executive-development/custom-programs/-/media/files/documents/executive-development/maximizing-millennials-in-the-workplace.pdf>.
- Card, D., & Krueger, A. B. (1997). *Myth and measurement*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ehrenfreund, M. (2017, June 26). A ‘very credible’ new study on Seattle’s \$15 minimum wage has bad news for liberals. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2017/06/26/new-study-casts-doubt-on-whether-a-15-minimum-wage-really-helps-workers/?utm_term=.9e773c8704ce.

- Figart, D. (2001). Ethical foundation of the contemporary living wage movement. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 28(10, 11, 12), 800–814. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eum0000000006125>.
- Ivancevich, J., & Konopaske, R. (2012). *Human resource management* (12th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Pollin, R. (2007). Economic prospects: Making the federal minimum wage a living wage. *New Labor Forum*, 16(2), 103–107. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40342937>.
- Prowse, P., Lopes, A., & Fells, R. (2017). Community and union-led living wage campaigns. *Employee Relations*, 39, 825–839. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-03-2017-0053>. Permanent link: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-03-2017-0053>.
- Ryan, J. A. (1906, reprinted 2017). *A living wage: Its ethical and economic aspects*. New York: Macmillan. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=mNA2AQAAAMAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA3&dq=minimum+living+wage&ots=DbXuEsKH7X&sig=nMSCrV1LArtR3pUQJB4W5xkcYqM#v=onepage&q=minimum%20living%20wage&f=false>.
- Spielberg, B. (2017, June 27). Seattle's higher minimum wage is actually working just fine. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/posteverything/wp/2017/06/27/seattles-higher-minimum-wage-is-actually-working-just-fine/?utm_term=.2b175c1a9b1d.
- van Heesch, J. (2007). Some aspects of wage payments and coinage in ancient Rome, first to third centuries AD. In J. Lucassen (Ed.), *Wages and currency: Global and historical comparisons* (pp. 77–96). Bern-Berlin: Peter Lang. Retrieved from <http://kbr.academia.edu/JohanVanHeesch>.
- Whiston, R. (1875). Stipendium. In W. Smith (Ed.), *A dictionary of Greek and Roman antiquities*. London: John Murray. Retrieved March 27, 2018, from http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/secondary/SMIGRA*/Stipendium.html.



9

Leadership According to Proverbs 31

As a leader, would you like to move above the level of mediocrity and stretch toward perfection in your work life? If so, this chapter is must read for you. In it, you will find advice from a collection of 22 verses that tell you how to behave and how to work so you might move closer to perfection as a leader.

Introduction to the Passage

Proverbs 31:10–32 contains 22 verses, each beginning in the Hebrew with a successive letter in the Hebrew alphabet (an acrostic). Although Cohen (1946) ascribes the author's name, Lemuel as a code name for Solomon, translating Lemuel as meaning: towards God, most writers, including Gibson (1987), Farmer (1991), and Ironside (1908) believe that the writer was a king named Lemuel.

This chapter was first published in my prior book *Be a Leader for God's Sake* in 2003.

© The Author(s) 2018

B. E. Winston, *Biblical Principles of Leading and Managing Employees*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77137-3_9

Verses 10 through 32 are words of advice from the mother of a king, or perhaps a young prince, who is looking for a wife. Throughout the Book of Proverbs, we see authors talking about the dangers of evil women. This passage of Proverbs is refreshing in its positive approach to women. Its placement in the passage is important since Hebrew teachings always ended with an important lesson.

Cohen (1946) points out that these 22 verses were recited from memory in the Jewish home on the Sabbath eve, thus setting a high standard for the Jewish wife and the young women of the household who aspired to attain this level of perfection. It also set a standard for the young men of the household who received constant instruction about the type of wife they were to seek. Now let me show you how this has a bearing on the workplace. Consider, the impact on United States organizations if the human resource departments, all leaders, and all hiring supervisors, repeated the qualities of a perfect leader for the firm once each week. Would we not strive to live up to these high ideals and strive to hire new leaders that fit our concept of perfection?

Although the acrostic form of writing makes it easier to memorize the verses, it causes a literary problem of message construction because the first letter of the first word of each verse must fit the acrostic structure. Thus, we find the author of these 22 verses skipping from subject to subject. I encourage you to read the whole of Proverbs 31:10–21 and then focus on how the messages are grouped into the following categories: (a) an introduction to the passage; (b) relation to the workplace; (c) relation to self in the workplace; (d) relation to employees in the workplace; (e) relation to superiors in the workplace; and (f) relation to rewards in the workplace.

In case you're wondering, here's why you should study a passage on the ideal wife to understand the perfect leader. Several authors on Proverbs refer to the wife as a leader and a caretaker of the home (Toy 1904; Aitken 1986; Cohen 1946). Rylaarsdam (1964) adds to this understanding by pointing out that the wife, like many leaders, did not have ownership rights in the household. Thus, her labors could not increase her wealth. If you want a solid definition of a hardworking overseer, this is what you're looking for. I think you'll be pleasantly surprised at the clear and powerful correlations.

Proverbs 31:10, “An excellent wife, who can find? For her worth is far above jewels”. (NAS)

The first verse of this passage implies that the senior leader of the organization recognizes that a leader of virtue and skill is invaluable. Note that virtue, from the Hebrew word *chayil*, has a broader depiction than just being morally righteous. The word also refers to ability, efficiency, and wealth (Hamel 1992). It is rare to find a leader who not only has integrity, but also has the skills to perform the job, and a track record of efficient leadership that produces wealth for the organization. Knowing this helps to further justify the value in finding a perfect leader (wife).

This collection of 22 verses does not address the feminine characteristics of a wife. Thus, they have a greater interpretation of the area of leadership in general. The writer of this passage may not have downplayed the feminine characteristics on purpose, but rather simply emphasized other characteristics.

Relation to the Workplace

Proverbs 31:

12–14 “She does him good and not evil All the days of her life”. (NAS)

16 “She considers a field and buys it; out of her earnings she plants a vineyard”. (NAS)

18 “She senses that her gain is good; Her lamp does not go out at night”. (NAS)

19 “She stretches out her hands to the distaff, And her hands grasp the spindle”. (NAS)

21 “She is not afraid of the snow for her household, For all her household are clothed with scarlet”. (NAS)

27 “She looks well to the ways of her household, And does not eat the bread of idleness”. (NAS)

We can better understand the relationship of the perfect leader to the workplace through verses 12–14, 16, 18, 19, 21, and 27. Verse 12 shows a leader

who actively seeks the highest quality goods and services to use in the workplace, examining all potential services for best quality and price. The implication from this verse is that there is ample quantity to assure that other employees have plenty of material with which to work. This is not grudging work for the leader since the second part of verse 13 indicates that she works from a spirit of willingness, not of coercion (Cohen 1946; Farmer 1991; Plaut 1961; Ironside 1908).

Verse 14 further demonstrates the resourcefulness of the leader (wife) by comparing her with merchant ships. Throughout the ages, cultures have benefited from trading resources and goods not available in their local area. Likewise, a leader should go outside to discover new trends, ideas, and products to bring back to the organization, thus, emphasizing the importance of continuous improvement through training and development.

Verse 16 teaches us that the perfect leader considers buying assets that will expand the value of the organization (household). These wise purchases result in remaining funds. Within an organization, a leader strives to accomplish the same result, spending less than budgeted and using the remainder to expand the value of the department. (This presumes that the more-senior leaders allow this behavior.)

Verse 16 defines the leader's role; she considers a field, which represents an idea that is barren without strategic plans. Then, the leader purchases the field or "buys into" an idea and generates detailed plans to move the idea into reality. Then, with profit or remaining funds (from a well-managed budget), the leader produces a vineyard that becomes fertile ground that yields fruit (more profit) in its season. This is similar to verse 24, which indicates that the perfect leader (wife) not only produces what the organization (household) needs, but also strives to produce an excess that she could sell in the marketplace for profit. She would then sow this increase back into the organization (Cohen 1946; Farmer 1991; Bridges 1846; Collins 1980).

While the previous verses address the practical behavior of leaders, verses 18 and 19 refer to three traits of the perfect leader. The leader knows that what she does is good; she exhibits confidence in the work that she produces and puts any spare time into industrious endeavors. Here, the word "perceive" in Hebrew means, "to taste or eat" (Hamel 1992).

This implies a great responsibility to leaders who should believe and support their products or services to the extent that they themselves are willing to use them.

The latter part of verse 18 refers to the practice of keeping a lamp lit all night. Cohen (1946) posits that the Bedouin saying: “He sleeps in darkness” refers to a condition of poverty. Plaut (1961) takes a different view by commenting that keeping a lamp lit all night might indicate that the leader (wife) works long hours, or that she lives in a state of prosperity, for only the prosperous could afford to keep a lamp lit during the night. Regarding the parable of the Ten Virgins, this verse, as well as verse 21, indicates the practice of preparation. Leaders should have contingency or crisis plans to ensure the organization’s welfare and productivity during unexpected or extraordinary events.

Verse 27 indicates that the perfect leader (wife) places the workplace first in need and desire. This character trait does not mean that the leader goes without important goods and services for herself. Several other verses imply that she profits from her labor. This indicates that the perfect leader (wife) knows who she is in relation to the workplace.

Relation to Self in the Workplace

Proverbs 31:

17 “She girds [fn]herself with strength And makes her arms strong”. (NAS)

20–22 “She extends her hand to the poor, And she stretches out her hands to the needy. She is not afraid of the snow for her household, For all her household are clothed with scarlet. She makes coverings for herself; Her clothing is fine linen and purple”. (NAS)

25–26 “Strength and dignity are her clothing, And she smiles at the future. She opens her mouth in wisdom, And the teaching of kindness is on her tongue”. (NAS)

30–31 “Charm is deceitful and beauty is vain, But a woman who [fn]fears the LORD, she shall be praised. Give her the [fn]product of her hands, And let her works praise her in the gates”. (NAS)

Verses 17, 20–22, 25–26, and 30–31 provide insight as to how the perfect leader sees herself and relates to herself in the workplace. Verse 17 refers to the perfect leader (wife) girding her loins. Writers differ on the meaning of this. Collins (1980) says that this verse indicates that she is not adverse to moving beyond her femininity and getting dirty in her work. Hubbard (1989) refers to the use of the metaphor ‘girding,’ to describe the intensity with which she labors, for “to gird the loins” in Hebrew means to get to fight or to work hard. Cohen (1946) believes that she pulled her skirt up from the back and tucked it into her girdle (belt) to ensure that her movements were unrestricted, allowing her to participate with the employees in hard work. Cohen’s comment implies that the perfect leader (wife) is not afraid to engage in work that is usually handled by lower level employees. This is similar to the phrase ‘rolling up your sleeves and joining the work.’ We see a similar reference to women of status who willingly perform hard work in Genesis as when Rebekah willingly brought water to the travelers and to their camels.

The Proverbs 31 leader is not only humble and versatile enough to work alongside those of lesser rank in the organization but, as verse 20 indicates, the perfect leader (wife) also meets the needs of the poor. This may imply the poor within or outside the organization. The perfect leader would not withhold resources from other departments that needed them, even if they could not afford them. In the Hebrew, we translate “hand” from the Hebrew *Yad* (Strong’s word 3027) as open-handed – palm up. This shows the liberality with which she gives to the poor (Cohen 1946).

In this set of verses, the servant heart of the Proverbs 31 leader begins to unfold. Verses 21–22 show a relationship between the perfect leader (wife) and her employees. She provides for those whom she oversees before she provides for herself. McKane (1970) states that the reference to scarlet, fine linen, and purple demonstrates the leader’s interest in quality.

By serving, the leader feels fulfilled, and as verse 25 demonstrates, the perfect leader (wife) finds self-esteem in her performance in the workplace. Cohen (1946) says that the reference to ‘laughing at the time to come’ implies that she is quite comfortable with whatever may occur in

the future because of her foresight in making provision. This preparedness improves her feeling of self-esteem and self-efficacy.

Verse 26 reveals that when the perfect leader (wife) speaks, her words are clear and full of wisdom. What she says shows kindness in her instruction (Alden 1983). She does not participate in biting gossip or speak evil of anyone. Scripture has several references about women not speaking in public, similar to what many junior leaders must follow. This verse shows that when someone, like the perfect leader (wife), speaks with such wisdom and kindness, she is always welcome in conversation and finds many listeners.

Ironside (1908) reveals the secret of the perfect leader's success in verses 30–31. Her success and comfort are that she fears the Lord and holds Him in high esteem. Ironside goes on to say that although others may take pride in their beauty and winning words, the perfect leader rests in true character that comes from God. Hubbard (1989) helps us understand that the perfect leader (wife) relies on inner strength, not outward cosmetics that belie what is underneath the surface. Some leaders use charm or vanity to bluff their way up the corporate ladder.

A scriptural principle indicates that whatever one hides will not remain hidden, but will be exposed. In the long run, others discover that leaders who rely on these temporal qualities lack the substance and genuine insight needed to manage an organization. We do not cognitively learn this quality. It comes from the character developed in a relationship with God. It is this character that sets the stage for how the perfect leader relates to employees. It is noteworthy that the Book of Proverbs begins and ends with a reference to the importance of having a fear of the Lord (Farmer 1991).

Relation to Employees in the Workplace

Proverbs 31:

15 “She rises also while it is still night And gives food to her household and portions to her maidens”. (NAS)

21 “She is not afraid of the snow for her household, For all her household are clothed with scarlet”. (NAS)

27–29 “She looks well to the ways of her household, And does not eat the bread of idleness. Her children rise up and bless her; Her husband also, and he praises her, saying: ‘Many daughters have done nobly, But you excel them all’”. (NAS)

Verses 15, 21, 27, 28 give us some insight into how the perfect leader (wife) relates to employees. Verse 15 indicates that she arrives before other employees and prepares the workplace if needed, so that all work can begin on time with the desired raw materials. The perfect leader ensures that all employees have what they need to do a good day’s work. This implies both resources for the job and compensation for the day’s labor.

The latter part of verse 21 and the first part of verse 27 indicate that the perfect leader (wife) provides only the best for her employees.

Because of what she does, verse 28 indicates that employees (the verse refers to children) regard her kindly. “Her children rise up and call her blessed.” A positive relationship with employees results in employees thinking highly of her. This implies a probable willingness to work hard for her. The perfect leader (wife) should model this behavior in her relationships with her superiors.

Relation to Superiors in the Workplace

Proverbs 31:

10–12 “An excellent wife, who can find? For her worth is far above jewels. The heart of her husband trusts in her, and he will have no lack of gain. She does him good and not evil all the days of her life”. (NAS)

23 “Her husband is known in the gates, when he sits among the elders of the land”. (NAS)

29 “Many daughters have done nobly, but you excel them all”. (NAS)

Verses 10–12, 23, and 29 reveal the two-way relationship characteristics between the perfect leader (wife) and her superiors (husband). Verses

10 through 12 provide a statement of value, as recognized by the superior leader. Alden (1983) implies that the use of the word trust in verse 11 might imply that she inspires full confidence from those above her. Her superiors would repay this trust by giving her full control of what she did. The latter part of verse 11 says that the superior has “no lack of gain.” Different writers offer different interpretations of this verse. Alden (1983) says that the superior has no unmet needs because of the efforts of the perfect leader (wife). Cohen says that the Hebrew word for “gain” implies the spoils of war, meaning that the superior gained what was not originally his. Bridges (1846) offers a different view by showing that the perfect leader (wife) provides so well that the superior (husband) does not need to go away from the organization (home) in order “to enrich himself with the soldier’s spoils” (p. 621). These interpretations show the perfect wife/leader as providing such an abundance that the superior has no unmet needs.

Verse 23 indicates that as a result of the perfect leader’s work quality, the superior’s peers highly regard him or her. The reference in this verse to the city gates implies that the superior is so confident in what the perfect leader (wife) does, that the superior can dedicate time to activities of a higher order. This permits the organization to gain the most from both the perfect leader and her superior’s labors.

Verse 29 shows the value of the perfect leader to the superior. The reference to daughters is a Hebrew language method of referring to all women rather than the literal daughter (Cohen 1946). Valuing someone translates into rewards.

Relation to Rewards in the Workplace

Proverbs 31:

16 “She considers a field and buys it; from her earnings she plants a vineyard”. (NAS)

22 “She makes coverings for herself; Her clothing is fine linen and purple”. (NAS)

28–29 “Her children rise up and bless her; her husband also, and he praises her, saying: “Many daughters have done nobly, but you excel them all”. (NAS)

31 “Give her the product of her hands, and let her works praise her in the gates”. (NAS)

Verses 16, 22, 28–29, and 31 give insight as to the types of rewards that the perfect leader (wife) receives and how she handles them. Verse 16 indicates that the excess she generates is first put back into the organization to make it stronger. Verse 22 shows that she provides herself with the best only after the organization and her employees have what they need (Cohen 1946; Bridges 1846; Alden 1983).

Verses 28–29 indicate that both her subordinates and her superiors recognize her value and contribution and tell others how good she is. Verse 31 indicates that she gains praise from the marketplace. Earlier, verses 11 and 23 showed that the superior gained from the perfect leader. Now, in verse 31, the superior does what is necessary for the world to see who truly was responsible for the organization’s well-being. What a wonderful reward.

Conclusion

From these 22 verses, we see the perfect leader as one who places the needs of others before her own, yet she is not ashamed to participate in the returns when there is excess for distribution. We see a leader who strives to perform so well that her peers esteem the superior because of her excellent work. We see a leader who considers the needs of the less fortunate in the organization and provides what she can to help them. We see a leader who is always willing to “roll up her sleeves” so to speak, to allow her to get in and work alongside her employees, without regard for the level of work at hand.

The driving force of this leader is that she has a fear of the Lord. She strives to do all that she can for her organization to make the

organization and its employees the best that they can be. In summary, the Proverbs 31 leader:

- Does good—v. 12
- Seeks to find materials—v. 13
- Willingly works—v. 13
- Brings in valuable outside resources—v. 14
- Rises early to work—v. 15
- Provides for the workers—v. 15
- Considers purchases, ideas, and solutions—v. 16
- Girds with strength—v. 17
- Perceives, believes in the organization—v. 18
- Stretches out—v. 19
- Holds (stability)—v. 19
- Extends himself or herself—v. 20
- Reaches out—v. 20
- Is not afraid (unprepared)—v. 21
- Makes (willing to roll-up his sleeves)—v. 22
- Supplies—v. 24
- Rejoices—v. 25
- Speaks with wisdom—v. 26
- Watches over the workers—v. 27
- Doesn't partake in idleness—v. 27
- FEARS THE LORD!—v. 30

Selah

If you would like to become a Proverbs 31 leader, consider which of these behaviors you currently exhibit and then strive to improve them. If there are behaviors listed here that you currently do not exhibit, begin now to change. It is never too late to begin to become a Proverbs 31 leader.

Works Cited

- Aitken, K. T. (1986). Proverbs. In C. L. Gibson (Ed.), *The daily study Bible (old testament)*. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press.
- Alden, R. L. (1983). *Proverbs: A commentary on an ancient book of timeless advice*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Bridges, C. (1846). *A commentary on proverbs*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust.
- Cohen, A. (1946). *Proverbs*. London: The Soncino Press.
- Collins, J. J. (1980). *Proverbs—Ecclesiastes*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press.
- Farmer, K. A. (1991). *Who knows what is good?* Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Gibson, C. L. (Ed.). (1987). *The daily study Bible (old testament)*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Hamel, K. (1992). *The online Bible* (Macintosh Version 2.0). Oakhurst, NJ: Cross-Country Software.
- Hubbard, D. A. (1989). Proverbs. In L. J. Ogilvie (Ed.), *The communicator's commentary*. Dallas, TX: Word Books.
- Ironside, H. A. (1908). *Proverbs and the song of Solomon*. Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers.
- McKane, W. (1970). *Proverbs: A new approach*. London: SCM Press.
- Plaut, W. G. (1961). *Book of proverbs: A commentary*. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
- Rylaarsdam, J. C. (1964). *The proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the song of Solomon*. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press.
- Toy, C. H. (1904). *A critical and exegetical commentary on the book of proverbs*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.



10

Stepping Out of the Way When It Is Time to Leave—Ecclesiastes 3:1

This brief chapter is about ending one's time as a manager or leader and doing so in an appropriate manner, which makes it a perfect last chapter in the book since it is time to finish the book. Ecclesiastes stresses the importance of knowing when a season of time begins and when it ends as shown in Ecc 3:1 "There is an appointed time for everything. And there is a time for every event under heaven" (NAS). Contemporary leaders should know when it is time to lead and when it is time to step out of the leadership role. The writer of Ecclesiastes points out that God is one who decides when we should start something and when we should end it—Ecc 3:11: "He has made everything appropriate in its time. He has also set eternity in their heart, yet so that man will not find out the work which God has done from the beginning even to the end" (NAS).

A key to knowing how long to remain in the role of manager or leader begins with asking God for insight as to what He wants us to do and how we will know when we are finished. I have found this true in my own life, and when I step out of a given role at the appropriate time, I find peace in my decision and the organization is well-served with by the change in manager/leader. Sometimes we have done what God

called us to do, and a different person is needed for the next season, or we may be tired and need a time of fallow ground. The farming concept of fallow ground is appropriate in our own lives. Successful farmers know that certain crops take specific nutrients out of the ground and add waste products to the soil. These waste products may be toxic to the preferred crops but are nutrients for other plants. When a farmer decides to not plant for a season, plants that are attracted to the waste products from the prior crop will take root and grow, using up the waste products as nutrients and leaving behind their waste products, which can be helpful for the next season of crops. Farmers also use crop rotation to achieve the balance of nutrients and waste products in the soil.

This concept of fallow ground can be applied to managers/leaders helping people to balance their own work-related nutrients and waste products. Sabbaticals and reassignments can be used as both fallow ground and crop rotation. Personally, I have noticed a five-year “crop rotation” pattern in my own life. I am OK in a position for about five years and then find that I need to change positions—not necessarily leave the organization but have a change in position. I have been with my current employer for over 27 years and have held eight different positions. Not exactly five years, in each cycle, but generally at the end of five years, I am ready for a change. I am aware that my performance begins to degrade after five years, but when placed in a new position, or stepping back to a prior position, my performance improves dramatically.

The Peter Principle (Peter and Hull 1969) refers to people who keep getting promoted until they reach a position for which they are not competent, and they stay there. If people sought to be placed in positions for which they are competent might see better performance and happier people, which is a part of the person-job fit concept (Farzaneh et al. 2014; Sekiguchi 2007). Somewhere, somehow, we developed an aversion to stepping back to a prior position where we were competent and happy. Regrettably, we adopted the Peter Principle and either remains incompetent, or our employment is terminated for incompetence. Managers, their employees, and their organizations would be well-served if we thoughtfully, and honestly assessed our abilities and competencies and stayed in positions where we perform well.

Founders Syndrome

Founders Syndrome is a situation in which the founder of a firm needs to retire but continues to interfere in the running of the organization (Block and Rosenberg 2002). This can be in any organization but is prevalent in businesses, churches, and professional organizations such as medical and law firms. Much has been written about this in the context of family businesses. Founders must be sensitive to God's timing and the readiness of the next CEO for the organization. It is also important to know that if the founder served God well and accomplished what He called the founder to do that the founder was successful. God has a way of talking with each of us and letting us know when it is time to step out of the position, or out of the organization, for that matter.

There is nothing wrong with the retiring founder remaining as a consultant as long as the new CEO requests the founder to provide information or insight. But, unsolicited advice by the founder is a form of meddling and interfering. New CEOs would be wise to interview and determine which employees should be kept and which should be replaced to have the right people (person-organization and person-job fit) for the organization, moving forward (Collins 2001; Farzaneh et al. 2014; Sekiguchi 2007). There are kind and gentle ways to help employees leave the organization and find new places of employment. The outgoing founder can help the transition by preparing employees for what might happen and help the employees to understand the logic and reasoning of the incoming CEO.

It is important to note that God needs to appoint and anoint the successor. It may be that God created an organization to accomplish specific goals and when those goals are achieved the organization should cease to exist. The scriptural account of Moses' succession by Joshua (Joshua 1:1–9) is a good example of God informing the founder of when it is time to pass control on to a new person and God's selection of the new leader. God called Joshua (Deu 31:14), and Joshua learned how to lead by following Moses' requests as presented in Exodus 17:9–14 and elsewhere in the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy. Joshua was ready to succeed Moses when God was ready for him to do so. While in this example Joshua took over as leader when Moses

died, which certainly avoids the Founders Syndrome, but the principles of understanding God's calling, development of competence, gaining confidence, and building character (Winston 2018) can be followed by founders who sense that it is time to pass the baton of leadership on to someone else.

In concluding this brief chapter, it is important to realize that there is a time to lead and a time to follow. The key is knowing God's current and next call on our lives and if leading, to lead well, and when it is time to follow, to follow well.

Works Cited

- Block, S. R., & Rosenberg, S. (2002). Toward an understanding of founder's syndrome: An assessment of power and privilege among founders of non-profit organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 12(4), 353–368.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap...and others don't*. New York: Harper Business.
- Farzaneh, J., Farshah, A. D., & Kazemi, M. (2014). The impact of person-job fit and person-organization fit on OCB: The mediating and moderating effects of organizational commitment and psychological empowerment. *Personnel Review*, 43(5), 672–691.
- Peter, L. J., & Hull, R. (1969, reprint 2011). *The Peter principle: Why things always go wrong* (Kindle Edition). New York: HarperCollins.
- Sekiguchi, T. (2007). A contingency perspective of the importance of PJ fit and PO fit in employee selection. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(2), 118–131.
- Winston, B. E. (2018). *Biblical principles of hiring and developing employees*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Conclusion

The chapters in this book examined the ontological and axiological concepts of leading and managing people using scriptural concepts. The chapter from the Sermon on the Mount follows up on the virtues of leadership that I presented in a prior book (Winston 2018) and provide examples from Jesus's sermon about how we should relate to our neighbors through agapao love. The chapter on the fruit of the Spirit provided insight into how we might see outward evidence of leaders who live a life by the Spirit, and, for that matter, what our employees should see in us. The chapter on love from 1 Corinthians 13 provided a contrast in behaviors that show what love is and what love is not. The chapter on the four faces of leadership presented four modalities of leading and managing that we must live in at all times. The chapter on the leadership styles of Jesus gave examples of Jesus' leadership events and how we might categorize these events by contemporary leadership theories. The chapter on Proverbs 31 gives an example of a leader who lived and worked according to the concepts presented in the book. Finally, the chapter on stepping out of the role of leader helped to show how to end well and bring glory to God through our service.

May we all be leaders that bring glory to God and support/edify the employees that God entrusts to us.

Works Cited

Winston, B. (2018). *Biblical principles of hiring and developing employees*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN: 9783319705262.

Index

A

Administrator 1, 2, 5
Agapao 22, 31, 33, 35, 52, 97, 143
Agape 53, 63, 65, 67, 73, 74
Autocratic 83, 85–89, 91, 94–96,
99–106, 108, 109, 115

B

Behavior 130, 134

C

Charismatic 7–11, 83–89, 91–94, 96,
98–113, 115
Contingency 7

F

Faithfulness 50, 52, 59

G

Goodness 50, 52, 58

J

Joy 40, 50, 52–54, 71

K

Kindness 35, 50, 52, 57, 64, 67, 72,
74, 81, 131, 133

L

Leader 1–5, 7–13, 17, 18, 20–22, 24,
25, 30, 35, 38, 43, 45, 47, 49,
53–61, 67–69, 71, 73, 74, 82,
83, 94, 96, 97, 100, 108, 113,
115, 127–137

Love 18, 28, 29, 32–34, 50, 52,
63–67, 69–74, 97, 113, 114

M

Manager 1, 2, 4, 5
Motive 7–13, 34–37

P

Paternalistic/Clan 83, 84, 94, 101,
108, 115
Patience 20, 50, 52, 55–58, 67, 72,
74, 81
Peace 50, 52, 54, 55, 60, 72

S

Self-control 50, 52, 60, 74
Servant 10, 35, 73, 83, 85–90, 94,
97, 99–108, 110–112, 115

Servant leadership 7, 8, 10, 67, 97,
98, 100, 108, 110, 113–115

T

Training 130
Transactional 7, 8, 10, 11
Transformational 7, 8, 10, 12, 31,
97, 110

V

Virtue 51, 58, 63–66, 70, 129