Faculty Publications and Presentations   Helms School of Government

2012

Leadership & Statesmanship: An Introduction

Kahlib Fischer
Liberty University, kfischer@liberty.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/gov_fac_pubs

Part of the Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons

LEADERSHIP & STATESMANSHIP

An Introduction

Kahlib J. Fischer, PhD, © 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This course allows us to focus on statesmanship—it's definition, attributes, and application in the political arena. Before doing so, we need to understand the extent to which statesmanship and leadership overlap. After all, to be a statesman is to be a leader, but does that mean that all leaders are statesman? Before that question can be answered, we will look at a basic (and Biblical) overview of the key ideas of leadership which may be relevant to our understanding of statesmanship. In doing so, it is hoped that the reader will look for points of personal application from the principles being discussed. Not all of us will be called to be statesman, but we are called to influence those around us and society as whole, for the better and for God's glory, which is at the foundation of statesmanship, and which, moreover, is what leadership is all about.

CHAPTER 1: THE BASICS OF LEADERSHIP

WHAT IS LEADERSHIP?

Leadership can be defined from numerous and often competing perspectives. Fortunately, there is a lot of common ground in these different perspectives, as will be seen below.

Position vs. Impact
Leadership is often mistakenly related solely to one's position in an organization. But leadership can occur anytime someone is making a positive impact in one's church, job, etc. We are called to glorify God in all that we do, and to be faithful where He has put us. If we serve Him in that way, we will be making a difference and positively impacting those around us as well as the situation God has placed us in. This main calling from God can't be overlooked—it is crucial to living a life for the Lord.

Skills vs. Traits
This is a long held debate. Obviously, much of leadership literature (including the ideas in this course) suppose that leadership consists of skills that can be developed. But this position overlooks that there are certain God-given traits that can help leaders be more effective. Extraversion, a joy of public speaking (not everyone enjoys that—that's for sure! ☺), big picture thinking, having a sense of vision, etc.—all of these could be considered leadership traits that would give someone a natural advantage in leading others more effectively. It could be argued that even these "traits" could be developed, but at the very least, it's important to remember that God gifts people in different ways and has called some people to "positional" leadership. However, God has called all of us to lead in the context He has put us in, even if we are not in a formal position of power. It doesn't take a joy of public speaking, for instance, to lead in every context, but it definitely helps to have that trait for formal positions of leadership in larger organizations.

Moral Behavior
Beyond the debate about skills vs. traits is the notion that in Scripture, to be a successful leader, one must have wisdom and integrity. In the Book of Proverbs, wisdom is defined not just as knowledge, but as righteous behavior. Lots of people know stuff, but not everyone does the right thing—sometimes knowledge is used to manipulate others, bend rule and regulations, and accomplish selfish goals.

A WORKING DEFINITION OF LEADERSHIP

God **gifts** people in different ways for different things. How has the Lord gifted you? Will you use those gifts for his glory, and be faithful wherever the Lord has put you to glorify him by caring for others and pointing them to Christ? Will you seek to ensure that your obedience is real—it's not just talk—and that you really are making a difference and being obedient to the Lord?
Of course, we don't get to determine how the Lord will use us or what He will accomplish in us—duty is ours, results are Gods. We just have to be obedient, and we have to be obedient in **real and practical ways**.

If we keep this in mind, we will be effective leaders regardless of where he places us or how he uses us. This course will focus on leadership in an organizational context. The Lord may have you in a

formal position of power in the future. If so, this course will hopefully help you become better prepared for that. But this course will also hopefully prepare you for being an effective leader regardless of what position you are in.

LEADERSHIP & IDOLS OF THE HEART

We've all heard stories of leaders on power trips, who care more about their own power and prestige than what's' best for the organization. Above, we talked about successful leadership being about wisdom, righteousness and integrity. As you seek to develop your career and advance up the latter, it will be a good idea to look at some of the sinful motives that come with wanting to be a leader.

For instance, if we are seeking to be **promoted over others** as an ends unto itself, it's probably because we want to be viewed as better than others. This runs directly contrary to identifying ourselves with Jesus Christ so that he, not us, gets all of the glory.

If we "need'" recognition, then minimally, perhaps we are focusing on outcomes rather than obedience. As Christians, we don't get to determine the outcomes of our hard work—we just have to obey God and make sure we're doing what we're supposed to honor him. We also never want to put the approval of man—which comes through our own effort—with approval from God—which comes through God's grace in the person of Jesus Christ. If the approval of men becomes an idol, we will not practice wisdom and integrity, or we will do the "right things" for the wrong reasons. Likewise if we find that we "must" be in **control** (as if that were just a personality quirk rather than a fundamental statement about how we view God's role in our lives) then, yet again, we are being wrongly motivated.

What should motivate us? **Living for eternity**—seeing God work through us to change lives around us. There are only three things that will last for eternity—God, God's Word, and people, so we should invest our time and effort into them.   As Romans 2:6-8 (ESV) says: "He will render to each one according to his works: to those who by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, he will give eternal life; but for those who are self-seeking and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, there will be wrath and fury."

LEADERSHIP VS. MANAGEMENT

Many people argue that **leadership** is different from **management** because leadership focuses on casting and communicating vision, grasping the big picture, and getting people excited about what needs to get done. The argument for management, on the other hand, is that it is focused primarily on making sure things get done correctly, measuring success, and making sure people do what they are supposed to do. Are these two functions different? Yes. Leadership asks "what is the right thing?"—that is where communicating the vision comes in. On other hand, management asks, "What is the right way to do things?".

But it's important to remember that leadership is no good if it doesn't lead to changes and behavior that helps an organization or group accomplish its purpose. If leaders just talk a lot but don't deliver, then what good is that message? That is where management comes in. Likewise, for managers to be really effective, they have to motivate people by showing them how what they are

doing connects to the big picture and how the vision is fulfilled. So in the end, for leaders to be effective, they need to think like managers at times—they need to see how their big picture ideas are going to impact every level and process of the organization. Likewise, for managers to be effective, they need to think like leaders—they need to get employees excited about the vision and how they can contribute to it.

CONCLUSION

An effective leader would need certain gifts and traits, but above all, the leader would need to be humble and willing to live for God's glory and care for others while doing so. An effective leader also needs to be proficient at what he or she does in whatever type of job or capacity they serve. Being a good communicator and a nice person is not enough if a leader is not good at the job and tasks that come with it. How might these ideas, in turn, relate to statesmanship? In the next chapter we will discuss a Biblical perspective which also has relevance for statesmanship.

Back to *Table of Contents*

CHAPTER 2: A BIBLICAL/COVENANTAL PERSPECTIVE

The Biblical idea of covenant provides not only a unifying theme for understanding leadership, but also a guiding normative framework for doing so.

A covenant is a morally informed agreement among various parties to ratify and establish a long-term, mutually-affirming relationship. This idea is largely a Biblical one. In Scripture, God covenants with man, and in so doing, affirms the dignity of man. The result is that humans not only have free will and importance, but also responsibility to choose wisely.

Furthermore, a covenant protects the right of all members by protecting the rights of every individual. Mutual accountability and affirmation are key aspects of any covenantal agreement and relationship: members in a covenant are accountable to one another. No one is an island. By caring for another, covenant members find that they themselves are cared for.

IMPORTANT COVENANTAL TERMS

There are three key terms associated with the notion of covenant and covenantal behavior. The first is the Hebrew term ***hesed***, which means "loving fulfillment of covenant obligation." In Scripture, love and duty are intertwined and it is related to what Christ said when He told His followers to "go the extra mile" in serving one another. We see in Scripture that not only did God keep His promises to His people, but He went above and beyond His stated duties in showing mercy, forgiving, and caring for His people, ultimately through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. We are required to do the same. We shouldn't view our relationships with others as merely contractual obligations, but rather we should see our obligations as opportunities to truly love and care for one another. The implications for this interlinking of love and duty in an organization are significant. We all know leaders who have abused their powers and treated employees poorly, and we all know employees who have done the bare minimum (or worse) to collect a paycheck.

Mutual accountability describes the process of interaction in a covenant in which everyone is accountable to everyone else. Not only are followers accountable to leaders, but leaders are also accountable to followers. Regardless of the nature of the relationship, be it peer to peer or leader to subordinate, mutual accountability is a requirement. This because in a covenant, no one enters into the covenantal agreement without first securing this obligation. Because no can be coerced into such a relationship, the only reason for doing so is to create a binding relationship that assures everyone's mutual benefit. An organization that applies this will have greater integrity, teamwork, and decision-making because everyone is committed to serving and caring for everyone else, and leaders, as a general rule, cannot act arbitrarily and in a manner that mistreats employees.

Federalism is a specific term in the field of covenantal theology that describes the sharing of power among all members of the covenant. It is therefore related to the notion of mutual accountability and is embodied on the organizational level by the ideas of empowerment, participatory decision making and decentralization (or more accurately, non-centralization, which signifies a sense of teamwork and shared responsibility regardless of organizational structure and departmental guidelines).

HISTORY OF COVENANT

Having laid that conceptual foundation, it is helpful to look at how the covenantal idea has influenced the history of mankind by ensuring greater freedom of common people and limiting the excesses of arbitrary leadership. In the **Old Testament**, the covenant idea was introduced by God to man. As mentioned earlier, by entering into a covenant with mere mortals, God affirmed their dignity and gave them both the freedom to choose to enter into the covenant and the responsibility to act within the moral terms of the covenant. It is no surprise, then, that even in Old Testament Israel, during the time of the judges and kings, that no one ruler had all the power nor was free from the accountability of the people and the prophets. Power was further shared among the twelve tribes, and the prophets criticized not only the king but also the people when they forgot the terms of the covenant, became greedy, pursued idols, and stopped caring for one another and for the poor. In the New Testament, the covenant idea is affirmed and expanded upon by Christ, who ushered in a new covenant with God that was now available to all of mankind, and not just the Jews. As the Gospel message spread throughout the world, so did the notion of covenant.

During the **Middle Ages**, the covenantal idea was largely overlooked because Catholic theology emphasized a more hierarchical worldview in which Popes had absolute control and kings were not accountable to the people because they were viewed as being appointed by God. But during the **Protestant Reformation**, Reformers reclaimed the covenantal idea as they articulated the notion of the "Priesthood of a all believers." Protestants argued that the only priest believers needed was Christ, and therefore they could have a personal relationship with God through Christ. This principle once again affirmed the value and dignity of each individual, and many have argued that it played a key role in not only developing the notion of capitalism in the West, but also contributed greatly to the notion that kings are accountable to the people and that Popes should not try to control political affairs. In fact, John Calvin, John Locke, John Knox, among others, argued that when leaders significantly abuse their power, a "material breach" of the covenant has occurred, meaning that the people are no longer under the kings authority because the very covenant has been absolved through the tyrannical behavior.

This theory of civil resistance and covenantal principles in general were carried into the **American Founding Era**. In an effort to flee religious and political persecution in Europe, many Protestants fled to the New World and brought their ideas with them. Research reveals that many of the colonies were further influenced by covenantal pacts and agreements. Often, church covenants made by various groups of Protestants as they came to the New World became the foundation for local governments and state constitutions. As the colonies became more established, the American colonists continued to base their notion of political freedom upon covenantal ideas by providing a rationale for breaking away from Great Britain based upon covenantal principles. Furthermore the very nature of American federalism, in which the national government shares power with the states, is a covenantal notion, as already mentioned. In fact, the word *fedis* is the Latin word for covenant. So America, with all of its political freedoms, has been greatly influenced by the notion of covenant.

The question that we ask here is, given this impressive track record in political development, can these covenantal ideas and principles be **applied to the field of organizational leadership in some way**? Certainly, there is a difference between the relationship of ruler with citizens and business leaders with employees, but it will be demonstrated in this presentation and throughout subsequent presentations that there are indeed many points of application. This is due in large part

because God has commanded all of us to love one another. Covenant is the means by which we do so in real and practical ways.

A COVENANTAL MODEL FOR LEADERSHIP

Truly effective leadership is not just about what the leader says and does. It's about how the leaders creates a healthy, self-sustaining organization that does things the right way. The covenantal idea provides a unifying theme for organizational leadership. First of all, the idea of *hesed* provides the **attitude** necessary for successful leaders. This attitude embodies notions such as servant leadership, mutual affirmation and care, teamwork, shared vision, "big picture" thinking, and customer care and community service. Big picture thinking is defined as organizational self-awareness, where employees understand the organization-wide goals, constraints, and strategies and where employees furthermore see how their job as well as their department fits into all of that. If leaders can impart that attitude to employees, they will be well on their way to helping the organization grow in a successful manner.

The principle of **mutual accountability** provides the foundation for organizational **processes**, and includes notions such as conflict resolution, participatory decision-making, empowerment, and an active process of dialogue between leaders and employees. These are the types of processes that successful leaders must ensure.

The notion of **federalism** provides a **structure** for healthy organizations, and relates to ideas such as noncentralization, "boundaryless organizations", and organic structures. In a highly competitive, global marketplace, today's organizations need to be able to adapt quickly.

Clearly, all of these concepts are related to one another, and this division of covenantal principles into attitudes, processes, and structures therefore allows for a lot of overlap. The goal of any organization and its leaders should be to create a self-sustaining, healthy culture where employees have taken ownership of organizational processes and goals and are working together to get things done and care for one another. In the next lesson, further application of covenantal principles to the field of organizational behavior will be demonstrated.

Back to

CHAPTER 3: PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES OF LEADERSHIP

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses attributes and behaviors which managers and leaders should exhibit to maximize their effectiveness. As we talked about in Chapter 1, there is overlap between **leadership** and **management**, so successful leaders (and managers) will want to be familiar with best practices in both categories to succeed and grow on the job. The emphasis in this chapter is on personal attributes (skills, behaviors, etc.) of leadership, And certainly, Scripture has a lot to say about how to use power and how to use one's skills. Of course, a lot of these skills speak to interpersonal interactions with others, and the ability to lead an organization, so keep that in mind as you look through this material. But ultimately, the materials in this chapter focus primarily on the leader or manager themselves.

SKILLS, TRAITS & BEHAVIORS

By way of review, **traits** are the God-given gifts that enable us to do certain things well. Leadership traits are often associated with things like extraversion, visionary thinking, etc. We all have different gifts and traits.

Skills on the other hand, are behaviors and aptitudes that we can develop to improve our performance and effectiveness. For instance, this class will hopefully help you develop your leadership skills—including providing you with a better understanding of organizational dynamics. As mentioned earlier, there is a lot of overlap between skills and traits, and many disagree on where one ends and the other begins.

Of course, the goal is not to try to be something we're not, but to be who God has called us to be. However, IF we have been put in a position of formal leadership, it would be a good idea to gain a better understanding of those management and leadership traits and skills.

What should not be uncertain for us as Christians is the notion that moral/righteous behavior is something that can and should be developed. A major contention of this course is that a lot of leadership has to do with how we honor the Lord and how we treat others. The attitude of our heart and how we treat others serve as the foundation for effective leadership.

TASKS VS. RELATIONSHIPS

Now that we've talked a little bit about traits and skills, let's focus a bit more on leadership **behavior**. One way of doing so is to classify leadership behavior as being **task-centered** or **being relationship-centered**.

The definition of these two is probably self-explanatory. **Task-centered behavior** focuses on getting things done and taking care of business. Every leader has to manage a large variety of tasks. That's why we really can't separate leadership skills from management skills.

Likewise, **relationship-centered behaviors** focus on a leader's interactions with others—team-building, interpersonal interactions, etc., etc. A good leader is gifted at relating to people well, which is why one trait of leadership is extraversion. However, the most important relationship-centered behavior would be that of caring for others and loving them with the love of God. This is the type of obedience that God requires from us in every situation—even to the point of loving our enemies. The temptation for many leaders is to focus primarily and almost exclusively on tasks—there is so much to be done on the job! This is especially true for "Type-A" people who are very goal-oriented. But there are serious flaws to being so task-centered.

The first is that **almost every task has a relational component**, because people are the ones doing the tasks! If employees feel like worker drones, are always afraid of immediately being punished if they don't live up to the demands of leaders, are unclear of what is expected of them, or if there is unresolved conflict in the workplace which the leader ignores because he is so focused on tasks, then work productivity may very well decline. Leaders need to remember that employees are not just parts in a machine—they are real human beings made in God's image.

As for being **goal-oriented**, we Christians need to remember that our most important goal is to love God and love others. Isn't it ironic that in Christ, the major emphasis is on relationships, not on tasks. After all, there is nothing that we can DO to earn God's favor—our only hope is a saving relationship with Jesus Christ. This in turn should serve as a point of reorientation for everything we do. Ultimately, the only reason we are so focused on tasks is because we want to be in control—and it's easy to focus on tasks and task-related goals as a means of feeling in control. Of course, we know that really, we NEVER can really be in total control—either God is in control or we are slaves to sin. There is no middle ground. So part of learning to surrender to God is learning to put people above tasks, and to trust God that in doing so, we will have the grace we need to get all of the tasks done in the proper time. Again, the major goal in Christ is to fall in love with the Lord and to love others. There are tasks associated with this goal, but it is clear that relationship (and resting in God's grace as opposed to frantically trying to earn God's favor through good behavior) is the driving force.

SOURCES OF POWER

Certainly, part of the personal attributes of a leader is the power that he/she possesses. There are 5 types of power that are typically assigned to leaders and managers.

Legitimate power is the power that comes with a formal position of leadership. Your professor, for instance, has the legitimate power associated with being a professor.
Related to legitimate power is **coercive power**—the ability to mete out punishment for bad behavior—and **reward power**—the ability to reward good behavior. For instance, your professor has the ability to give good grades (reward power) as well as bad grades (coercive power) depending upon the quality of your work (work hard! ☺).

Expert power is the power one wields because of expertise and knowledge in a particular area. This can either undermine or strengthen legitimate power. For instance, if a professor is teaching a biology class but has a PhD in business, her expert power will be minimized! Likewise, one can accrue expert power even if one doesn't have legitimate power. By working hard and making sure you know the ins and outs of your job, you can be a blessing to your superiors and co-workers, thereby gaining expert power and influence.

Referent power is the power gained by being able to work well with people and relate to them in meaningful and authentic ways. It is closely related to "emotional intelligence". Ultimately, referent power is the most important power to possess because it can either affirm or undermine the other types of power. If a leader is an arrogant jerk, people will not want to work with him. The leader can punish and punish (i.e. "The beatings will continue until morale improves"), but in the end, productivity will decrease because of lowered morale, no matter how smart the leader is or the position the leader holds in the organization. On the other hand, if the leader is humble, cares for employees and knows how to make people feel comfortable and supported on the job, employees will be more willing to work for that leader. As the saying goes, "people don't care what you know until they know that you care." Of all of the powers listed above, referent power is also the one source of power that is most closely related to righteous behavior as defined in Scripture. Again, how we treat others is a direct measure of how much we really seek to honor the Lord.

On a final note, remember that there is a huge difference between **power and authority**. Power is the *ability* to do something; authority is the *permission* to do something. In this sense, legitimate power is most closely linked with the notion of authority. But there is a larger point to be made here. Romans 13 says that all authority comes from God. Regardless of what type of gifts, abilities, and power/influence we might have, we are obligated before God to use all of those things in accordance with what God says is right. A leader may have legitimate power, for instance, but once the leader steps outside the bounds of what Scripture says is right and wrong, the leader has abused his power.

INSECURITY & POWER

One final comment about the personal use of power: in his book *A Christian Perspective on Political Thought*, Stephen Mott talks about what happens when we use our own power to fulfill ourselves rather than trusting God to do so. We will call this **Mott's Insecurity Model.** His basic premise is that when we reject God as our ultimate source of contentment, we will *de facto* be insecure in our position in life. This **insecurity**, of course, results from the fact that only God can fulfill us—only God can fill the "**God-shaped hole**" in our hearts.

When we reject God and his promises, and instead try to find security through our own efforts, we pursue one of two failed options. The first is trying to **find security and control by exploiting other people, situations, etc**. If people don't do what we want and if circumstances don't turn out how we'd like, we will continue to be insecure, and therefore unhappy. We will do whatever we can to make people and circumstances fit our desires, and we will ultimately fail in doing so.

The other extreme is to try to **find security** by essentially giving up, **and allowing ourselves to be controlled and ultimately exploited by othesr**. Rather than running back to the Lord and finding security through submitting to him, we allow others to control us—other people, circumstances, addictive pursuits, etc.—all of these result when we refuse to let God rule our lives completely.

In the end, either extreme is destructive—both on a personal level and a corporate level. Imagine the challenges leaders face when they are relying on people and circumstances (and their power to manipulate them) to make them happy rather than relying on God!

Back to

CHAPTER 4: INTERPERSONAL LEADERSHIP

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter we focus on the interpersonal dimension of leadership. Key interpersonal attributes that are related to this are participative leadership, delegation, empowerment and charismatic leadership and transformational leadership. These two chapters go together well, because part of being an effective transformational leader is casting a vision that excites and motivates employees, and then empowering them to carry out that vision (via participative leadership, delegation, and empowerment).

Undergirding all of that is, of course, **dyadic (interpersonal) relationships** and all of the dynamics associated with those types of relationships. Later, we'll look at **contingency theories**, which focuses leaders on determining how to lead based upon what is going on in a given situation. One key situational aspect is employee skills and motivation. For instance, if employees are not motivated and excited about the vision, they cannot be empowered and entrusted with more responsibility. So it is important for leaders to get a better read on not just the situation, but more specifically, employee-related factors. This in turn relates back to interpersonal dynamics.

Finally, this chapter will talk about interpersonal relationships and the various processes that go with it from a **Biblical/covenantal** perspective. Ideas like *hesed*, **mutual accountability, noncentralization** and **participative decision making** are all related to subsequent chapters.

THE FOUNDATION OF EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP

Interpersonal relationships really are the **foundation** for effective leadership practices. If people don't like or respect those who are in charge, they won't really care about anything those leaders have to say. Sure, they'll do what they're told to do, but only grudgingly. When leaders mistreat employees, the stories of abuse spread like wildfire throughout the organization. Likewise, if leaders truly care about employees on a personal level, those stories spread quickly as well. So in the end, leaders need to be decent human beings!

In Chapter 3, we talked about how it can be easy for leaders to be **task-centered** in their behavior at the expense of being **relationship-centered.** This is a bad idea, because as already mentioned, just about every task has a relational component, since real human beings have to carry out those tasks! If leaders really want to get tasks done well, they need to care for their employees, respect them, and relate well to them.

This also ties into the notion of **referent power** as mentioned earlier. Remember that this type of power—which is the power that leaders possess due to how they relate with and treat other people—can either affirm or undermine the other sources of power a leader possesses, like **legitimate power, expert power**, and **reward** and **coercive power**.

If leaders interact well with employees—if they take care of them, the result will ultimately be a **culture of healthy relationships**, where people enjoy coming to work and are willing to go the extra mile for the company. This is such a simple truth—the great truths usually are simple—and yet so many leaders fail in living up to this truth, perhaps because they are too task centered or

wrapped up in their own ego. But on a more practical level, one main reason leaders fail to care for employees well is because **they are too busy with tasks**. It's not that they hate employees but rather that they feel so stressed that they don't make time to build relationships with employees. If this is the case, leaders probably need to learn to delegate more tasks to subordinates so that they can build relationships. And of course, it's helpful if leaders remember that just about every task has a relational component.

COVENANTAL PRINCIPLES

Because interpersonal relationships are so important to effective leadership, applying covenantal principles will help leaders better relate to others. For instance, the Biblical/covenantal principle of *hesed* reminds leaders that in performing their duties as leaders, they need to love and care for employees and customers—Scripture doesn't allow us to just do our job without this notion of loving others.

Mutual accountability reminds the leader that employees are not just accountable to him; he is accountable to them. He has to keep his word, accept their ideas and feedback with humility, and be willing to admit when they are wrong.

Federalism/empowerment means that leaders need to be willing to share power with employees. For starters, this means that leaders should be willing to delegate to employees. This can be a hard thing to do because leaders are too busy to train employees to assume new duties or they don't trust employees to do the job right. Another heart attitude related to the challenges of delegation is "essentialism"—the belief that we are far more important than we really are that therefore we must do everything. It goes hand in hand with the "martyr syndrome", where we feel a bit sorry for ourselves for all of the work we must do, and yet we're unwilling to share any of the work with others!

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP & CHARISMA

Transformational Leadership and Charismatic leadership are included in this unit because they also focus on how a leader can motivate employees through **casting a vision** and empowering employees to accomplish tasks. Certainly, there is a corporate element to vision-casting, but for that to really work, leaders need to be able to relate to employees in real and meaningful ways.

The notion of vision casting is important for a successful organization. Employees have to be willing to buy into the vision and work towards it. In a covenant relationship, everyone has to agree on the vision before they enter into the covenant. Without that vision, there is no basis for covenantal relationships.

To make vision casting work, leaders need to be grounded in **mutual accountability** with followers. In other words, they need to make sure the vision makes sense to followers. One of the biggest challenges of organizational communication is that leaders see all of the big picture constraints and challenges, whereas employees only see the details of their specific jobs. Leaders and followers need to come together and make sure that the vision actually works in the real world of organizational details and realities. Likewise, employees have to learn to think above and beyond just their job or department. This is what mutual accountability is all about.

Another main challenge with transformational leadership and charisma is that they can often lead to **hype**, especially when leaders get caught up in their own ego, the approval of others, and their emotional attachment to their own vision. As mentioned above, leaders need to make sure the vision works in the real world. That involves some dialogue with followers even while the leader is trying to persuade followers; so in other words, the leader needs to hold the vision with an open hand. Leaders can't take themselves too seriously, or assume that they know it all. This takes humility and patience—both of which require Divine intervention! ☺

CONTINGENCY APPROACHES

Contingency approaches to leadership assume that not every leadership style works for every employee. Good leaders are effective because they know their employees well enough to gauge what they can handle. Not every employee is willing or able to handle **empowerment**, for instance. So even though much of the reading for this week talks about "empowerment"-related ideas, a wise leader is going to go slowly and get to know employees well enough to understand where they are at mentally, emotionally, etc.

In the end, it takes time to **build trust** and have authentic, covenantal relationships with others, even in the workplace. Sure, at some point, people just need to do their jobs, regardless of how they feel about their coworkers, bosses, etc. But IF leaders can create a caring environment based upon the Biblical idea of *hesed*, it will be a lot easier to get things done in a professional and effective manner.

Back to *Table of Contents*

CHAPTER 5: LEADERSHIP IN STRUCTURE & PROCESSES

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we will talk about leadership in the context of **organizational structure** (such as teams and at the executive level) as well as in **organizational processes**, specifically in the context of **leading change** . This presentation will conclude with a brief discussion of leadership training.

TEAMS, GROUPS, & COVENANT

In leadership perspectives, there is a significant difference between **teams** and **groups**. One way of looking at those two is to say that groups are a collection of people put together to accomplish a particular task for an organization. However, a **team** consists of a group of people who are committed to a greater purpose than just doing the bare minimum. They enjoy working together and they have a positive identity in which they pride themselves on doing good things for the organization and working well together. Obviously, leaders would love to see teams as opposed to merely groups.

The question then is how to successfully **form** and **sustain** healthy team activity. Covenantal principles will certainly help. As a team forms, people feel one another out—they get a sense of each other's strengths and weaknesses and how to interact with one another. This initial process can be a stumbling block for many groups—they never evolve into teams because of personality differences. However, if members practice the Biblical/covenantal ideas of *hesed* and **mutual accountability**, they realize that they need one another—those respective differences of perception and insight. People realize that disagreements can be constructive because it allows a team to work through an issue in a well-developed way rather than a reductionistic way in which certain options and perspectives are overlooked. Loving and being accountable to one another can free people from feeling the need to compete with other team members, and instead, it allows people to celebrate one another and appreciate different strengths and giftings.

As the team develops and builds momentum by successfully accomplishing tasks and objectives, the danger of **groupthink** emerges. Groupthink is the process whereby a team puts its own positive self-image above reality. It keeps teams from considering their own weaknesses and blind spots, and therefore causes them to stifle any meaningful points of debate that might run contrary to the prevailing viewpoint of the group (this can be an organization-wide challenge as well). This is obviously a dangerous tendency fueled by a woeful combination of pride and laziness. But if people are really loving one another and accountable to one another, they will operate in a spirit of humility and will therefore be willing to consider opposing viewpoints. As always, we know that to truly love others in a spirit of humility requires Christ to capture our own hearts. As Christians, hopefully we can emulate this type of love in the teams and groups in which we serve.

A final concept about teams for the purposes of organizational leadership and communication is that **cross-functional teams** can help increase **"Big Picture Thinking"** and **"Active Dialogue"** within an organization. Cross-functional teams consist of members from different organizational departments who meet together to solve problems and accomplish tasks. Because they represent different departments, they bring to bear the concerns and agenda of their respective departments. If done right, in a covenantal manner where mutual accountability and *hesed* are practiced, this can

really help to get everyone on the same page. As an organization grows, people interact less and less with other people outside their department. Therefore, people began to think solely in terms of what is good and necessary for just their own department as opposed to what is good for the entire organization. This leads to **"Me (or us) vs. Them" thinking**, which tears at the fabric of a healthy organization and undermines a sense of teamwork and covenant. Cross functional teams can help to remove this attitude by creating a context for people from different departments to become more familiar with the goals and challenges of other departments, and above all to be reminded about how each department can work together to accomplish organizational goals.

LEADING CHANGE & COVENANT

When leaders have to take a company through a **process of change**, they can do it in a way that is very hierarchical and "top-heavy", meaning that they basically tell employees what needs to happen and how it needs to happen. This is probably the least effective way to lead change. Sure, employees will comply because they have to. But if they don't understand and appreciate the reasons for change, they won't embrace the change as well as they could have. People will grumble and complain, question the intelligence of the leadership team, and do the bare minimum.

On the other hand, using covenantal principles, leaders can more successfully motivate employees to embrace change. For instance, through the process of **Active Dialogue**, leaders will hopefully have had a long-standing process of two-way communication with employees before the change ever needs to be made. This in turn means that leaders are talking about what they see as necessary for future change so that employees can filter that into their own workplace experiences. In many cases, employees, who work in the trenches and interact with customers more than leaders do can furthermore provide a lot of valuable feedback about changes as well. This is especially so if leaders have **empowered** employees to make decisions to best help customers and keep them in happy. Furthermore, empowerment can allow a company to stay more nimble without having to make huge changes because employees have more discretionary power to keep customers happy. Related to this, through the process of **participative decision-making**, employees can provide valuable feedback into the types of products and services that need to be changed or developed, again because employees often have unique insight into what customers want and need.

In fact, one way of staying ahead of the game in a very, very competitive global economy is to allow employees to **innovate** based upon their sense of customer needs. This is a form of empowerment as well, and another name for it is "**intrapraneurship**"—where employees are encouraged to act entrepreneurially in the company itself by creating new ideas, products, strategies, etc.. Companies would do well to give employees some freedom in this regard.

Not every employee can provide the same type of valuable feedback- be it for necessary change or new or improved products or services. But at the very least, employees can share with leaders how proposed changes will impact their workplace practices. It is perfectly understandable that leaders would not know how every aspect and detail of an organization is going to be impacted by a change in strategy, technology, etc. By listening to the concerns of employees about the change, answering their questions and explaining why the changes are necessary, leaders will not only be better able to communicate the need for change, but in many cases, they might even change their own understanding of what changes are necessary. All of this is about **getting buy-in** from employees— which is the "grease" that can cause all of the many gears of the organization to shift appropriately to make necessary changes.

STRATEGIC CHANGE & COVENANT

As mentioned in the previous slide, a huge part of doing change well—i.e. "**strategic change**" is having everyone on the same page. That means that employees need to understand what the **big picture** is, and leaders need to know—from the perspective of employees—how the big picture ideas will work in the context of **organizational details**—with the employees in the trenches. If leaders and employees alike remember that they are in covenant with one another and therefore mutually accountable to one another, this process of communication and interaction will be much more viable. It also helps when leaders actually take the time to communicate the big picture—something that a lot of leaders fail to do, perhaps because they see themselves as being too busy with other tasks.

And yet, communicating the big picture is one of the most important things they can do, because in doing so, they are contributing to a **"self-sustaining organization"**, where employees are actually thinking in terms of the big picture and pursuing big picture goals, and leaders are getting good feedback from employees about changes and improvements that might be necessary. There are a lot of effective leaders out there who can accomplish great things in an company on their own merit. But when those leaders leave, who will replace them? A **personality-driven organization** will not survive in the long term—true leadership mandates that organizations learn to be self-sustaining. A covenantal approach ensures this by helping employees to take ownership of their company (big picture thinking). Another part of creating a self-sustaining organization is through having a well-developed **training program for upcoming leaders**—something that will be discussed a bit in the next slide.

Finally, if leaders really want to ensure a healthy, self-sustaining organization that is proactive in meeting the demands of ministry or a hyper-competitive global economy, they must be sure to avoid **vision-killers**. Vision-killers are ethical and moral lapses on the part of leaders. It need not be a huge lapse—it could be as seemingly insignificant as leaders mistreating employees by shouting at them. Nevertheless, these vision killers spread through the organization's grapevine, and sooner rather than later, everyone knows about them. They cause resentment and cynicism towards the organization's stated mission, values, and big picture ideas. Leaders become construed as big talkers and hypocrites who are out of touch with employees—especially when those vision-killers are directed at employees in some form or another.

STRATEGY, LEADERSHIP & TRAINING

If leaders are really going to be effective, they must ensure that followers are properly trained to carry out the organization's mission. In terms of **strategic leadership**, organizational training is vitally important because it is used to prepare employees for what the leadership team is trying to accomplish long term. An offshoot of this is the specific need to **train future leaders**. Millions of jobs will be available in the American workforce once the Baby boomer generation fully retires—all of those positions formerly held by people with years of experience. In the previous slide, we talked about the importance of organizations being self-sustaining. Leadership training and development is an important part of achieving this goal. It also helps to motivate hard-working employees—the types that really do want to see the big picture and do good things for the company. If they feel cared for and feel like their careers are going to be enhanced, they will be more apt to stay with the company or ministry rather than moving on. An organization will be able to keep its best and brightest and attract others of the same type. But leaders aren't the only people

that need to be trained. Anytime the leadership team sees a need for some change—whether it be to a new technology, a new product or service, an improved process, or a new customer segment—it helps to have a good training program in place to help employees get up to speed.

But to do it properly, leaders have to embrace an **"organizational development" approach to training**. As the name indicates, organizational development pertains to the practices, strategies, behaviors, and processes that are used to develop, restructure, improve, etc. an organization. It is about a big picture approach to organizational success. As applied to training, it means that training solutions must be **multi-faceted—the solutions must address every aspect of the problem that is being solved by the training**. For instance, if customer service numbers are low, the temptation might be for leaders to procure some form of customer service training. But what if the real problem is that customer service agents are experiencing low morale due to poor management, bad working hours, low pay, etc., etc.? An organizational development approach to training mandates that leaders take the time to make sure they really understand the problem before throwing a training solution at it.

Likewise, as much as possible, leaders should be able to demonstrate that the training actually brings a **return on investment (ROI)**. The common means of evaluation for training programs are "smile sheets"—surveys completed by trainees after the training session is completed. But these surveys don't really measure improved performance do they? Just because a trainee enjoyed a session or felt it was helpful doesn't mean that the training really WAS helpful. Minimally, a training program needs to lead to a change in behavior desired by the leadership team. So if the problem is poor customer service skills, the training should lead to an measureable increase in certain customer service skills. Ideally, leaders should be able to link training to an actual increase in profit, but that can be a very hard thing to measure.

Finally, we should not forget the importance of **personal development**—the steps you need to take to prepare yourself to be more effective in leadership in an organizational (or ministry)-related context. Whether or not your supervisor is willing to take an active interest in your personal development as a leader, remember that true leadership is about taking ownership and caring for others, and using your gifts as best as you can for the Lord.   This means that you will need to avoid seeking recognition and achievement for the sake of seeking recognition and achievement. Seek obedience to the Lord and the results will take care of themselves in God's timing. You also need to be able to be comfortable talking about your own shortcomings; remember this is what **mutual accountability** is all about. Leaders are much more willing to work with employees who are humble and aren't afraid of accepting responsibility for their own shortcomings than the types of employees who are quick to blame-shift. Going to school to earn your degree, pursuing some form of professional certification, or taking advantage of mentoring or other formal training opportunities on the job are all great ways to improve your own performance. But in the end, do all of that knowing that God is the one who ordains your career and ministry. You don't have to feel threatened when other people succeed and get promoted, and you can trust that your life will be lived for God's glory. If you can trust God with your life and with your heart, you will see that achievement and promotion are just means to the end—which is to **live for eternity**—rather than the ends themselves.

Back to *Table of Contents*

CHAPTER 6: LEADERSHIP & ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

INTRODUCTION

An organization's **culture** is a vital part of its success or failure. How people relate to one another, how people feel about their company, its mission/vision, and the actions and words of leadership all comprise the culture of that company and can make or break the company.

Organizational culture is hard to quantify, but because it is based upon people's relationships with one another and their feelings about the organization, it is often viewed as more of a living, organic entity. Many of the topics in this chapter speak to this same sense—that leadership should be more about intuition, relationship, and authenticity then about hype, rules or mere business activity.

EXPLAINING POSTMODERNISM

A big part of understanding the material in this chapter involves coming to terms with the notion of **Postmodernism**. Postmodernism as a worldview and perspective on life came into vogue in the second half of the 20th century. As the name suggests, it is meant to signify that we live in a time that has apparently moved on from the "Modern" Era. In turn, the Modern Era was based upon "**Modernism**" which evolved during the time of the Enlightenment and the development of Secular Humanism.

Modernism basically argued that religious and spiritual beliefs were superstitious and outdated and that what mankind really needed was the use of logic, rationalism, science and technology to solve all of its problems. Instead, the following things happened in the "Modern" era which eventually caused a rejection of Modernism in its many forms:
   a) The exploitation of indigenous peoples in other parts of the world due to the assumption that Western civilization was superior to other ways of life;
   b) The Industrial Revolution which many argued stifled human creativity and expression because of the factory/machine mindset it created;
   c) The use of science and technology to kill incredibly large numbers of people (in World War I and II and other wars)
   d) The creation of "rational" states like the former Soviet Union, which instead of bring a modern utopia, brought tyranny, poverty, and torture and death of millions upon millions of people
   e) Chauvinism and the devaluing of women.

All of these major failures of Modernism caused people in the West to begin to rethink how to live life. Sadly, rather than turning back to the God of the Bible, many people went to the other extreme and begin to talk about making sense of life in non-rational, **mystical**, and very **personal** ways. Absolute truth as a notion was rejected, since after all, it was nations who believed that their way was the only way to live who killed, enslaved and went to war with others. In the Postmodern view of life, people are encouraged to make sense of life on their own terms, to do what works best for them regardless of any sense of absolute truth and morality, and to find "God" in a way that best

makes sense to them. Often that view of God lends itself to a deification of nature and the cosmos, rather than an embrace of the Christian God, because the Christian God believes in absolute truth.

In terms of application in the workplace, ideas like "**Spirituality in the Workplace**", "**multiculturalism**" and "**feminism**" have all sprung from the Postmodern viewpoint. Spirituality in the Workplace derives from the notion that humans aren't just corporate slaves or machine parts—they could and should be able to find personal fulfillment on the job through the personal expression of work as well as in community and working with others. Multiculturalism emphasizes that each cultural perspective is valuable and that organizations would do well to draw from these various cultural experiences by hiring people of diverse ethnic backgrounds (as opposed to just white men). Likewise, feminism argues that chauvinism has exploited women for too long and that it's time for women to have a place and a say in the workplace, as opposed to the way things were in the Modern Era, where women were relegated to the home and to child-rearing.

COVENANT, POSTMODERNISM, & MULTICULTURALISM

So what does the Bible say about Postmodernism and Multiculturalism? For starters, Scripture does indeed affirm a position of **absolute truth**, and an absolute sense of right and wrong. This is a good thing because it means that there really are things like love, justice and beauty. Moreover, in a Biblical, covenantal worldview, each **individual and has rights** and unique contributions that can be offered.

A belief in absolute truth need not hinder an appreciation of cultural diversity; in fact, cultures and people express the character of God in unique ways. From a covenantal perspective, these unique perspectives are valued.

What is **rejected** however, is a belief in **moral and cultural relativism**. There are values and truths that transcend cultural and personal boundaries. This is a good thing, for the reasons mentioned above. Organizations that are imbibed in a Biblical worldview affirm both the rights and value of each organizational member, while at the same time upholding integrity and ethical values.

COVENANT & SPIRITUALITY IN THE WORKPLACE

Likewise, the Bible has much to say about the idea of **Spirituality in the Workplace**. Of course, true spirituality is linked to a personal relationship with God through Christ. In keeping with the postmodern emphasis on mysticism and a rejection of absolute truth, popular notions of spirituality in the workplace don't affirm the centrality of Christ in all that we do. But for Christians, work is an **expression of worship to God** in which we use our unique gifts from God to serve him and glorify him. Work, therefore, is holy and must not be demeaned. Certainly, as leaders we should never force employees to believe in Christ, but we can affirm our faith in Christ as we love them, encourage them, support them, and help them maximize their gifts through their work. All of this can occur within the context of a "spiritual" workplace**.**

But the Biblical idea of "covenant" goes further in affirming spirituality in the workplace, insofar as we are called to live covenantally with one another and recognize that our actions and decisions affect those around us. We do not live in a vacuum. Biblically, the most important thing we can do is care for others as an act of worship and devotion to God. We can't forget that. To some extent,

the topic of acknowledging and caring for employees relates to the topic of "spirituality in the workplace" since there can be more than just doing of the task—there's a sense of **community, mutual care**, and **teamwork**.

In this "community-based" approach to spirituality in the workplace, everyone in the organization realizes "that we're all in this together" and that we should work hard to get things done with excellence and that we should care for one another. The act of "living well" and "doing well" perhaps become even greater than merely making a profit. The Bible calls us to love our neighbor and to live covenantally with one another. These Biblical ideas are a solid foundation for what spirituality in the workplace should resemble. Finally, this sense of community and mutual care should go beyond the workplace—a healthy organization is going to involve **collaborative partnerships** with other stakeholders and **community members**.

COVENANT & AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP

One of the main topics in this chapter is **Authentic Leadership**, in which leaders, rather than trying to wow followers through clever words and hype, instead avoid such shallowness and invest in true authentic relationships with followers. The leader should be open to critique and feedback from followers, quick to admit mistakes, and above all, willing to work with followers as co-equals. This is in keeping with the Biblical/covenantal notion of **mutual accountability**, in which leaders and followers are accountable to one another, and *hesed,* in which leaders and followers care for one another.

With these types of attitudes as the foundation, it is hoped that authentic leadership will lead to **self-sustaining organizations** who are not personality-driven but rather powered by any number of people, regardless of their position, who care for one another and for the organization. Obviously, there is much similarity between these ideas and those associated with **spirituality in the workplace**.

SERVANT LEADERSHIP

Likewise, **Servant Leadership** ties in with authentic leadership, because it mandates that the servant leader put employees first and care for them. If they are cared for, then the organization will succeed. Once again, this ties in with the notion of **mutual accountability** and *hesed*.

However, there are a couple of concerns with servant leadership. The first is that in Greenleaf's writings on servant leadership, **Christ** is viewed as an **excellent example of servant leadership**, but not as the **Savior of mankind**. In contrast to that, Scripture tells us that apart from Christ saving us and changing our hearts, we can't truly love others and care for them.

Another concern with servant leadership is that service itself often becomes the end all, but for the sake of organizational success, leaders have to be able to communicate vision to employees. To be sure, by serving employees, leaders can do a better job of casting vision; it's just that sometimes, servant leadership doesn't really focus much on the **vision-casting** as a vital role of leadership. In fact, part of leadership is explaining to followers the value of the vision and how they can participate in bringing the vision about. Certainly, leaders should allow employees to have a say in what that vision looks like—that is what ideas like active dialogue, empowerment, and participative

decision-making are all about. But in a covenantal perspective, employees have to realize that the organization is not just there to serve them—they have an opportunity and an obligation to care for the organization and help it succeed. Leaders need to be able to convey the importance of the vision and excite employees.

COVENANT AS AN INTEGRATIVE PARADIGM

Throughout these chapters, the Biblical idea of covenant has been presented as an **integrative paradigm** for leadership practices. *Hesed* describes the attitude that leaders should have with others in the context of **interpersonal relationships**. **Mutual accountability** describes the **processes** that leaders should set in place in organizations—practices like empowerment, participative decision-making, active dialogue, and big-picture thinking. To carry out those processes, leaders need to create **structures** based upon ideas like **federalism** and **non-centralization**, so that power can be shared among cross-functional teams, decentralized departments, and flatter communication networks. With structures in place, people will be better equipped to stay on the same page and communicate with one another. All of these things will hopefully lead to a **culture** that is **self-sustaining**—leaders and followers alike will embrace the ideas of big picture thinking, hesed and mutual accountability and therefore take ownership of the processes and structures mentioned above.

Back to *Table of Contents*

CONCLUSION

The preceding chapters have attempted to provide the key ideas associated with leadership. But are those ideas and concepts entirely and exclusively descriptive of statesmanship?

In seeking to answer this question, a couple of ideas should be considered:

- *An effective statesman must lead well.* That much we know. A person who is driven by greed, myopia, and power will not take a stand for truth and principles in difficult times, nor will he or she care for followers.

- *An effective statesman must think systematically and holistically.* Just like a leader must understand that his or her actions should impact not just interpersonal relationships with followers but also organizational structure, processes, and culture, a statesman should be thinking of the big-picture impacts of current events, worldview ideas, national and institutional (political) norms, etc. Having good ideas or pure convictions, in other words, are not enough. In this course we will study statesman who not only demonstrated integrity and courage, but also a keen understanding of the political process and how to get things done.

- *An effective statesman must live for eternity.* It takes a lot of work living this life, even if we are not in a life and death struggle with the Nazis, Stalinists, or slaveholders! To do well in the fight, we have to remember that despite the many obstacles and setbacks we will face in life, that we are not home yet and that in the end, God is sovereign. This conviction allows us to do our duty and not get discouraged when things do not go our way (and they will not). In turn, we can model the joy of the Lord and truly love our enemies instead of hating them.

In short, to lead well, is to live well, and a statesman must do both if he is to succeed at his task. Consider these leadership concepts and principles as you progress through the course and evaluate the examples of statesmanship provided.

Back to *Table of Contents*