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The author suggests three basic issues to be addressed in developing leadership skills in business students: the biblical mandate in the form of a theology for Christian leadership, accomplishing leadership development within the curriculum without violating the tenets of a liberal arts education, and advantages Christians have over non-Christians in leadership.¹

The Biblical Mandate for Christian Leadership
Unless we can see leadership as ordained by God for His and our purpose, then there can be no applicable systematic biblical theology of Christian leadership development for our students who are graduating into today’s world. It is important at the outset to establish a sound doctrinal basis for leadership because every Christian leader must relate first to God and then to people as God accomplishes His glorified work through His followers. Therefore, what we think of God, Jesus’ atonement, the social character of His redeemed society, and the way to eternal life will have a significant bearing on how we live out our lives as leaders and followers. Attention has been given by Larry Richards and Clyde Hoeldtke to “a theology of Church leadership,” but there has been little comparable effort to look at leadership as a Christian calling in the world outside of the church and para-church organizations.² It is this deficiency that this essay attempts to address as we prepare our graduates to go into the world as Christian leaders in their chosen field of study.

As a starting point, let me suggest that at its basic level good leadership is motivating and mobilizing others to accomplish a task or to think in a certain manner that is for the benefit of all concerned. Since there can be no ultimate benefit to mankind that does not include God’s gift of eternal life, it follows that good leadership must encompass a relationship to God through Jesus Christ. No one person will be a leader all of the time but every university
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graduate will be called upon to give leadership some of the time whether it be in their profession, business, community, church, or family.

The call to leadership from God’s Word is embodied in both the fulfillment of the creation mandate and the fulfillment of the Great Commission, and on through to the establishment of the New Jerusalem (Hebrews 11:3; 13:20-22; Revelation 21: 1-4). It is an important call because we belong to God as part of His creation and, furthermore, as Christians, we have nothing to say on the secular views of leadership and to leaders generally unless we have a perspective beyond the secular world. There are three essential prerequisites for any kind or style of leadership to take place: first, a mission or an identification of something to be accomplished or worked at; second, the identification of the leader or leaders who will seek to accomplish the goal or task through others; and third, the choosing of those followers or community who will work to that end under that leadership. While all three are addressed in the Bible, this essay will focus only on the mission that is derived from a theology of Christian leadership. It begins with the creation mandate.

The Creation Mandate
When God considered the world that He had made He decided to make man “in our image, in our likeness” (Genesis 1:26) for human beings alone, of all creation, are capable of having a conscious personal relationship with the Creator and of responding to Him. We were created to function on His behalf in this world. Or, as one theologian has written, “an all-wise, all-powerful, and good God created the human race to love and serve him, and to enjoy a relationship with him.”
Therefore, meaning in life transcends selfish human desires and finds fulfillment only when directed towards serving and loving our Creator.

God had an identifiable purpose that was to be accomplished through people. God specifically gave man the responsibility to “rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move along the ground” (Genesis 1:28). With God’s blessing of male and female came a task, “Be fruitful and increase in number, fill the
earth and subdue it” (Genesis 1:27). Those who were created in His image had a specific purpose or task to perform. Thus the reason for man’s existence is a product of God’s deliberate intention. There is no call to leadership without a task to be accomplished. Leaders do not exist apart from the task or tasks that they are called to perform. While it may not have been totally apparent to Adam and Eve at the creation how that task was to be accomplished, the creation mandate did provide the task at hand and for all generations to come. Thus “the Lord God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and take care of it” (Genesis 2:15). When God decided to create woman as a “helper” to Adam, the need for leadership arose as long as they were to live together. Someone had to make ultimate decisions and one of the first led to the Fall. Among other things, Eve’s punishment was increased pain in child bearing, a desire for Adam and the assertion that “he will rule over you” (Genesis 3:16), while Adam was consigned to work by the sweat of his brow to obtain his food rather than dwelling in the Garden of Eden (Genesis 3:19). While Adam was “to rule over” Eve, thereby placing him in a position of leadership, this did not mean that Eve was without leadership responsibilities, for she became a mother, thereby having conferred on her leadership responsibilities of her own. It was the very fact that God chose procreation through families that made leadership necessary. Someone had to make decisions as children grew up in families.

The history of God’s people is given to us so that we may know of His faithfulness and the importance of obeying His commandments.

The increased number of people arising out of the “begatting” of Adam and Eve who chose to live together created societal needs requiring leadership in order to avoid chaos in these communities. Thus, some people lived together in tribes, communities, or cities which required another form of leadership. Cain, we are told, built a city, the very act of which called for leadership in construction and governance thereafter (Genesis 4:17). While this was not a direct part of the
creation mandate, it more effectively brought about its accomplishment as an outgrowth of extending families.

Leadership In Old Testament Times
In these earliest times of human habitation here on earth, however, there was not good leadership because we read that God was grieved by human conduct (unrighteousness and violence) and decided to “wipe mankind, whom I have created, from the face of the earth” (Genesis 6:7). Yet out of this destruction came our first real example of Godly leadership recorded in the Bible as Noah was to lead his family to perform the task that God had assigned to him in surviving the flood. We do not know precise details about how this was accomplished but the magnitude of the task must have called for leadership of the highest order. Thereafter, according to God’s everlasting covenant with Noah, nations of distinct peoples were to be established on the earth.

Having divided up the nations, God’s story then focuses on one family and its leader, Abraham. God’s promise to Abraham was that “I will make of you a great nation . . . . and peoples on earth will be blessed through you” (Genesis 12:2-3). Thereafter, the story describes Abraham’s leadership under God’s direction in creating that nation. The history of God’s people is given to us so that we may know of His faithfulness and the importance of obeying His commandments and statutes.

God’s hand is seen on so many of the leaders whose thoughts and exploits are recorded in the Old Testament. Not all of God’s people were to give leadership just in the nation of Israel. Joseph, for example, became a senior official in Pharaoh’s court, where his position of leadership was based on the fact that “the Lord was with Joseph and gave him success in whatever he did” (Genesis 39:23). Moses was called by God “to bring [lead] my people the Israelites out of Egypt” (Exodus 3:10). In Exodus we see Moses as the dispenser of justice, the visionary inspirer of the people, having to exercise leadership in the midst of internal and external opposition; the delegator, exhibiting the importance of self-control and correct perception in leadership; the problem solver, etc. We also learn why it is Joshua and not Aaron who becomes Moses’ successor, experiencing God’s
blessing on his leadership, as Joshua finally leads the Israelites into the promised land. The task should have been Aaron’s but the Lord said to Aaron “Because you did not trust in me enough to honour me as holy in the sight of the Israelites (reference to Aaron leading the people in false worship in Exodus 32), you will not bring this community into the land I gave them.” So Aaron died on Mount Hor and Joshua was given Moses’ mantle with the words from the Lord “Be strong and courageous, because you will lead these people to inherit the land I swore to their forefathers to give them” (Joshua 1:6).

Unfortunately, not all of Joshua’s successors followed the charge: “Be careful to obey all the law my servant Moses gave you; do not turn from it to the right or the left, that you may be successful wherever you go” (Joshua 1:7). The Israelites were led away from and then back to obedience to God over the generations. There were strong and weak leaders. Many leaders emerged as judges and prophets, but God also reluctantly acceded to the people’s request for “a king to lead us, such as all other nations have” (1 Samuel 8:5). There were those like King David, who was a man after God’s own heart but who still failed in his leadership and dishonoured God. There were wise leaders like Solomon and courageous ones like Deborah. There were also many styles of leadership from the autocratic, head-basher, might is right approach of Rehoboam, who scourged his people with scorpions in 1 Kings 12, to the utilitarian Saul, who justified his wrong decisions as the will of the people in 1 Samuel 15. The Israelites are punished by God and carried off into captivity, but even in a foreign and pagan land we see Daniel and Nehemiah giving significant leadership. Even in these circumstances, their leadership is firmly rooted in their knowledge of the will of God and their desire to honour and communicate that will through their actions and words.

Throughout the Old Testament we see God’s hand either directly or indirectly guiding, warning and admonishing, or inhibiting leaders. Of one thing there can be no doubt: it was God who established and removed the leaders over his people. Thus Psalm 75: 6-7 affirms that “No one from the east of the west or from the desert can exalt a man. But it is God who judges: He brings one down, he exalts
another.” It was through human beings that God had chosen to accomplish his will. He repeatedly gave Israel’s leaders instructions as well as forgiveness when they failed to follow those instructions. Despite their failed leadership, God never gave up on his long-range goal to accomplish His purposes through people.

One thing is clear, God did not use any cookie-cutter approach in the leaders He raised up and used. Their particular gifts were related to the tasks that they had to perform as Nehemiah planned and built the wall and Joshua led his army to possess the promised land. It is hard to imagine Nehemiah, the cup bearer, replacing the general, Joshua, or anyone else doing the particular task that God had assigned to each leader. There is, in short, no composite example of a leader that can be fashioned out of our Old Testament models. There is, however, an over-arching theme of leadership that does prevail in each of these examples. The Hebrew word for leader was “nagiyd” which had its roots in the picture of a person under authority who fulfills the wishes of that authority. That was the kind of leader that God wanted to give His people, someone who would listen to His will and execute it faithfully with divinely appointed authority. To be a leader of God’s people in Old Testament times was first of all to be a servant of God and of His people. Leaders were often described as servants: Abraham (Genesis 26:24), Moses (Exodus 14:31), Caleb (Numbers 14:24), Samuel (1 Samuel 3:9), David (1 Chronicles 17:4), Elijah (2 Kings 9:36) and Isaiah (Isaiah 20:3) were all called God’s servants. It is their serving leadership attitudes that made them all God’s anointed leaders for various tasks.

At various times the Israelites required a special kind of directing leadership, so God sent prophets to lead them to a renewed commitment and devotion to God and His statutes. But in the end the people and their leaders failed to glorify God by doing His good works. Thus a Saviour was brought forth in the supreme leader of all times, Jesus. In the life of Jesus we move from animal sacrifices to God’s grace to the death of His Son for our sakes so that we may believe and have eternal life with Him. Here at last was the perfect model and the mentor for the leadership of His church in the future. “Lord,” “Saviour,”
“Redeemer,” and yes, the servant leader of His people.

**Jesus’ Style Of Leadership**

Although we see Jesus’ leadership being exercised in only three short years of his public ministry here on earth, in Him we have greater insight into the kind of leadership that God is calling us to. As Jesus himself prayed, “As you sent me into the world, I have sent them into the world” (John 17:18). Out of his wilderness journey comes a pronunciation of the mission and vision for his leadership. “The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners [captives] and recovery of sight for the blind, to release the oppressed [heal the broken hearted], to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor” (Jesus reading the scroll of the prophet Isaiah 61:1-2 that was to be fulfilled in him, Luke 4:18-19).

**Investing in Followers**

While Jesus had many hearers of his words, it was into the disciples, His closest followers, that He poured his leadership. He chose his followers carefully, calling them to “Come follow me and I will make you fishers of men” (Mark 1:17). They were the ones with whom he would share His leadership and ultimately through them His vision would be advanced. Followership was demanding. When one of the disciples wanted to go and bury his father he was told, “Follow me, and let the dead bury their own dead” (Matthew 8:22). There was to be a deep commitment to that followership.

Jesus was a classic case of what modern leadership theorists would call a “situational leader.” His style, like that of Old Testament leaders, was adjusted (in practice, not in principle) to the situations and people he faced. He could be autocratic in standing up to those who would make a market out of the temple (John 2:13-17) and a gentle shepherd in dealing with children, the poor and the downtrodden. As one analyst of Jesus’ leadership has written: “Jesus was a determined leader whose very character was like granite. He was at times compassionate and tender and at other times furious with the status quo. The poor and powerless stirred the deepest mercy in him. The rich and the powerful religious could arouse his consternation and anger.” The style changed but the purpose did not because his leadership had
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only one goal, to do the Father’s will by bringing in the kingdom of God.

That Jesus was consciously preparing his disciples for leadership cannot be doubted. It is clearly in his promise to them: “I tell you the truth, at the renewal of all things, when the Son of Man sits on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel” (Matthew 19:28). But the nature of this leadership (or “judging,” which is language borrowed from the Old Testament) was not at first understood by the disciples who had grown up under the authoritarian Roman rulers. James and John asked Jesus if he would grant to them the privilege of sitting on his right and left in positions of power and leadership in Jesus’ Kingdom (Mark 10:35-41). The rest of the disciples, whose thinking doubtlessly ran along similar lines, were indignant at their request. But Jesus explained to them that their philosophy of leadership was not to be modeled after that of the “Gentiles” and “great men” of the world: “Whoever would be first among you must be servant of all” (Mark 10:42-44). When their mother tried the same ploy on their behalf we again see Jesus responding in almost identical terms when he set them straight on the kind of leadership they were to model:

You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be your slave—just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many (Matthew 20:25-28).

Servant Leadership

At this point the essence of Christology and Christian leadership intersect. The Jews were convinced that a certain type of power-wielding Messiah would restore the nation, but Jesus championed another style of leadership with the purpose of transforming the world and bringing in the kingdom: the model of servanthood leadership.

While others, like Moses, had practiced servanthood leadership (Exodus 32:11-14; 30-35) and the responsibilities and benefits of leaders who follow had been spelled out in Ezekiel 34:2-10, it was in Jesus’ washing of the feet of the disciples that we have the
classic model for all time. When he had finished washing their feet, he put on his clothes and returned to his place. “Do you understand what I have done for you?” he asked them. “You call me ‘Teacher’ and ‘Lord’, and rightly so, for that is what I am. Now that I, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also should wash one another’s feet. I have set you an example that you should do as I have done for you. I tell you the truth, no servant is greater than his master, nor is a messenger greater than the one who sent him. Now that you know these things, you will be blessed if you do them” (John 13:12-17).

To be a Christian leader is first and foremost to be a trusted servant or follower. If you want to be great, you must be least. If you want to be first, you must be last. If you want to be served, you must learn how to serve. If you want to be a leader, you must learn how to serve sacrificially those whom you lead. The price of this kind of followership required that one “take up his cross daily, and follow me [Jesus]” (Luke 9:23). That was a call to a radically different kind of leadership than what the Jews had been living under and grown accustomed to in their own communities. In Jesus’ washing of the feet of the disciples, even though he should have been served himself, we have an example for all time: “You should do as I have done for you . . . you will be blessed if you do them” (John 13:15,17).

That example was followed. Among Jesus’ followers, to be a Christian was synonymous with being a servant. According to the theologian, Alister McGrath, many Roman writers misunderstood the Latin word Christus and thought that it meant Chrestus which means “useful” and was the name given to slave. Therefore, it was logical for Jesus to be seen as a servant who gave His life for His followers. His disciples identified themselves as serving the believers. Thus Paul wrote to the church in Corinth, “For we do not preach ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus’ sake” (2 Corinthians 4:5). Therefore, it was a privilege to be a Christian leader in order to serve Jesus as He had served His followers.

Domineering vs Serving Leadership
As Arlene Hall has written, “Doing menial chores does not necessarily indicate a servant
leader. Instead a servant leader is one who invests himself or herself in enabling others, in helping them be and do their best.\textsuperscript{76} It was the spirit of servanthood as much as the act of servanthood that Jesus was emphasizing. Jesus invested his life in his followers and at the end reinforced in a very visible and tangible way the model of leadership that he expected them to follow. The contrast is evident in Diotrephes, whose selfish, autocratic leadership style is described and condemned in 3 John 9-11. Jesus was both servant and shepherd. It was the shepherding aspect that brought about a caring and compassionate spirit to His leadership of others.

Let us look at what that style of leadership means in the language of today's marketplace.\textsuperscript{7}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domineering Selfish Leadership</th>
<th>Servanthood Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective is to be served.</td>
<td>Objective is to serve others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested primarily in the leader's image and advancement. Self preservation and personal image is at the forefront of most decisions.</td>
<td>Seeks to enable subordinates to advance to their fullest potential by downplaying self and exalting others. The team or enterprise and all its members are considered and promoted before self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers are seen and treated as inferiors.</td>
<td>Co-workers are treated with respect as part of a team who work together to accomplish a task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates an atmosphere of dependence.</td>
<td>Creates an atmosphere in which others see their potential being encouraged and developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemns others for mistakes.</td>
<td>Values individual workers and offers praise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejects constructive criticism and takes the credit for accomplishments.</td>
<td>Encourages input and feedback. Shares credit for the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not train others to function effectively.</td>
<td>Equips and invests in others with a view to their advancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority is based on external controls in the rules, restrictions, and regulations enforced by force.</td>
<td>Authority is based on influence from within through encouragement, inspiration, motivation, and persuasion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do our students see their tasks, responsibilities, and ministry as coming from God and respond with a joyful rendering of service to Him? Or, do they view them as chores to be endured or feats to be accomplished for the sake of personal recognition? The first brings joy and eternal satisfaction. The second may produce public applause and short term personal gratification but it is hollow if it does not bring glory to God (Matthew 5:16). Their reward will not be in fame, position or money, but in being judged by our God with the words: “Well done thou good and faithful servant.” (Mathew 25:21) That is the reward for transforming servanthood leadership.

The importance of this model of serving leadership has also been understood by those outside of Christian circles. In 1989 a writer in Harvard Business Review pointed out that “Leadership is not a person but a role, and what distinguishes followers from leaders is not intelligence or character but the role they play. . . . Effective followers and effective leaders are often the same people playing different parts at different parts of the day.” In Servant Leadership, Robert Greenleaf, Jr. urges followers to refuse to follow any leader whose style is not servanthood leadership. The well-known authors of The Leadership Challenge, James Kouzes and Barry Posner have written in their latest book, Credibility: How Leaders Lose It, Why People Demand It:

Leaders serve a purpose and the people who have made it possible for them to lead . . . . In serving a purpose, leaders strengthen credibility by demonstrating that they are not in it for themselves; instead, they have the interests of the institution, department, or team and its constituents at heart. Being a servant may not be what many leaders had in mind when they choose to take responsibility for the vision and direction of their organization or team, but serving others is the most glorious and rewarding of all leadership tasks.

In Christian circles this style of leadership has been further described and developed by Philip Greenslade, Calvin Miller, Henry Hildebrand, Bill Pollard, Oswald Sanders, Hans Finzel and, most extensively, in Eugene Habecker’s Leading with a Follower’s Heart.
Leadership In The Church
With Christ’s redemption there was a new task introduced in building the kingdom of God. The creation mandate continued but there was a second mandate added by Christ. A redeemed community of believers was to be built on this servanthood model of leadership to advance the Great Commission.

Leaders were required to organize and prepare for the fulfilling of this Great Commission that was first entrusted to the disciples and then, through them, to believers everywhere. The church was the means that they would use, and this required their leadership of the faithful followers and new converts to spread the Good News. They and all followers were to become his ambassadors with that message and as his witnesses to influence the world as salt and light. In two notable passages we have the qualifications of leader-elders of the church set out for us (1 Timothy 3:1-7 and Titus 1:5-9).

In Paul’s teaching to the young Timothy we have instructions on how to be a pastoral leader. And most important, we have the confirmation that “To aspire to leadership is an honourable ambition.” (1 Timothy 3:1 NEB)

We also have Peter’s exhortation to leaders of the church:
To the elders among you, I appeal as a fellow elder, a witness of Christ’s sufferings and one who also will share in the glory to be revealed: Be shepherds of God’s flock that is under your care, serving as overseers—not because you must, but because you are willing, as God wants you to be; not greedy for money, but eager to serve; not lording it over those entrusted to you, but being examples to the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd appears, you will receive the crown of glory that will never fade away (1 Peter 5:1-4).

In the early church we see several examples recorded for us in acts of leadership, both good and bad. But there is no question that leadership was required as when seven men were appointed to be in charge of the ministry to widows. (Acts 6:1-6) It is also part of the priesthood of all believers which gives us access to God and therefore the ability and responsibility to do His will. We are God’s labourers or fellow workers, as the apostle Paul told the church in Corinth (1 Corinthians 3:9). There is also much in the New Testament
about how believers were to dwell together that required leadership. "Let us not give up meeting together, as some are in the habit of doing, but let us encourage one another—and all the more as you see the Day approaching" (Hebrews 10:25). They were reminded in Hebrews 11 of the great leaders of faith of the past whom they should emulate. And in the final exhortation in the epistle to the Hebrews we read: "Remember your leaders, who spoke the word of God to you. . . . Obey your leaders and submit to their authority. They keep watch over you as men who must give an account. Obey them so that their work will be a joy, not a burden, for that would be of no advantage to you."(Hebrews 13:7;17)

Leadership and leaders were therefore to be a very important and necessary part of the early church and the spreading of the gospel message unto salvation.

We also find in Paul’s writings to the believers in Rome the expectations that they should have for pagan leadership. There were governing authorities (leaders) of the state whose authority to lead had been established by God. (Romans 13:1-7) Citizens had responsibilities to these leaders and were to submit to their leadership “not only because of possible punishment but also because of conscience” (vs. 7 and 1 Peter 2:13-14). Just as Jesus had submitted to Pilate’s authority as having come from God, so we are to conduct ourselves as prayerful followers of those in authority over us (1 Timothy 2:1-8). The point here is that leadership was of God, ordained by him and used for his purposes here on earth.

**On To Glorious Eternity:**

**Leadership In The New Jerusalem**

Living according to God’s will and redeemed by the blood of Jesus, we are also being prepared as the lamb for the New Jerusalem. At that time we will reign with Him and all will be followers of Him in that glorious day when God will reassert His triumphant presence in this world. Therefore, the decisions that we make in this life as leaders and followers will govern our future condition throughout all eternity. Leadership cannot be treated lightly. It requires extraordinary care and diligence in serving God’s purpose for our lives here on earth. Because we are all as human beings fallen and finite, there will be no perfect
leadership, but in His word and the example of Jesus, we have been given a model and lessons to point us in the right direction. But each of us will still be accountable to God on that day when “we will all stand before God’s judgment seat” (Romans 14:10), whether as leaders or followers. Like Solomon, in assuming his new mantle of leadership, we might also ask of our God to “give your servant a discerning heart to govern your people and to distinguish between right and wrong. For who is able to govern this great [magnitude] people of yours?” (1 Kings 3:9)

Thus from creation to revelation, through the fulfillment of God’s mandate for mankind, leadership will be required. In His word we have guidance for exercising that leadership to His glory. Our testings and blessings while we dwell on earth are preparing us for that day when we will reign with him. It is important to understand our existence in God’s scheme of things if we are to understand what he wants us to accomplish as leaders. As theologian Millard Erickson has put it:

All of our life is rightfully his, by virtue of our origin and his continued ownership of us. It has been entrusted to us for our use, but it still belongs to God and must be used to serve and glorify him. This means that man is not the ultimate value. Man’s value is derived from, and conferred upon him, by a higher value, God. Thus the essential question in evaluating anything is not whether it contributes to man’s pleasure and comfort, but whether it contributes to God’s glory and the fulfillment of his plan.¹²

Thus our commitment, devotion, love and service as followers of God should enable us to make proper responses as leaders to those who are also made in His image. That leadership is patterned on Jesus, who is the complete revelation of what God is. It is for this reason that we as Christian educators must give leadership development its proper prominence in our total educational enterprise, not only in student affairs but through our academic curriculum, to facilitate the development of Christian leadership qualities and skills in our students.

Why Leadership Development Is Important For Christian Colleges

“One of the most universal cravings of our time is a hunger
for compelling and creative leadership," Although this was written in 1978 as the opening statement by James MacGregor Burns in his classic book on leadership, it could have just as easily been taken from today’s editorials. A decade and a half later we are still living in a world that is crying out for a different kind of leadership. Perhaps it has always been that way. Consider Aesop’s Fable on Leadership:

The frogs wanted a leader. They bothered Jupiter so much with their requests that he finally tossed them a log into the pond, and, for a while, the frogs were happy with their new leader. Soon, however, they found out they could jump up and down on their leader and run all over him. He offered no resistance nor even a response. The log did not have any direction or purpose in his behavior, but just floated back and forth in the pond. This practice exasperated the frogs, who were really sincere about wanting ‘strong leadership’. They went back to Jupiter and complained about their log-leader and appealed for much stronger administration and oversight. Because Jupiter was weary of the complaining frogs, he gave them a stork who stood tall above the members of the group and certainly had the appearance of a leader. The frogs were quite happy with their new leader. Their leader stalked around the pond making great noises and attracting great attention. Their joy turned to sorrow, however, and ultimately to panic, for, in a very short time, the stork began to eat its subordinates.

The need for leaders

The Lord does not want his leaders to be like logs who allow the people to run affairs willy-nilly. Neither does the Lord want his leaders to be like storks that eat up the people or only take advantage of them.

When you study organizations, movements and institutions in general, you quickly discover that a leadership vacuum extends to many fields. As Leroy Eims of Navigators has written: “A crisis of leadership engulfs the world. Political leaders, economic experts, editorial writers, newsmen, spokesmen in the fields of education and religion raise the hue and cry, for men [and women] who know the way and can lead others on the right path are few.”

A leadership vacuum

What has brought us to this
leadership vacuum in North America? Among the many instructive reasons for this would be the failure of a past generation of leaders to mentor equally competent successors, our fascination with specialists rather than leaders who can see and act on the broader picture, contemporary skepticism towards authority of any kind, the rise of a generation with different situational values, critical rather than analytical thinking and reporting in the media, the difficulty and complexity of exercising leadership in a shared-power world, and the loss of a universal spiritual vision.

Those factors will not be changed overnight and to some extent will always be with us. But we cannot let them deter us from reaching out for a better leadership style. While analysts on leadership, even within Christian organizations, may not be able to agree on the precise fundamentals that would make systematic leadership development possible, we must not use this as an excuse to abandon the search for a better means of understanding leadership development.15 What the current dilemma makes abundantly clear, however, is the crying need for a new style of transformational leadership in all levels of society.16 What do universities, and specifically Christian ones, have to offer to this dilemma of contemporary society?

In March 1990, the board of directors of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada established an independent Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education under the direction of Dr. Stuart Smith. In several places in his report Smith drew attention to the universities’ responsibility for leadership development. His report began with the statement: “In modern Western society, the exercise of judgement, leadership and professionalism in all forms of work is now, or soon will be, open only to those with a university education.”17 He pointed out: “There is universal agreement... that universities have a critical role to play in developing the leaders, the workforce, and the citizenry necessary to compete in the modern economy.” Under curriculum redesign he cited the Evers and Rush study of 1986 on “Making the Match Between University Graduates and Corporate Employers”18 to illustrate what skills employers
found missing among university graduates. The three most
deficient areas were 1) written communications, 2) visioning
(the ability to conceptualize the future direction of the company),
and 3) leadership/influence.

Smith’s conclusions can also be corroborated by reference to a
study published by the Conference Board of Canada in
July 1992 called “Employable Skills Profile.” The study comes
from the Corporate Council on Education made up of 25 of
Canada’s largest employers, including Bell Canada, Canadian
Pacific Rail, Canada Post Corporation, Royal Bank,
General Electric, IBM, Noranda Forest Inc., and Trans Canada
 Pipelines, which are concerned with ensuring Canada’s
competitiveness and position in the global economy. Among the
critical skills which the Council listed under academic, personal
management and teamwork skills was the ability to “lead when
appropriate, mobilizing the group for high performance.”¹⁹ Like
Smith, the Council recognized a fundamental need to develop
leadership skills through a good university education. Studies
conducted by the University of Michigan and the National
Alliance of Business have come to similar conclusions.²⁰

Compelling Reasons For
Christian Colleges and
Universities To Emphasize
Leadership Development

There are also several operational reasons why Christian North
American universities and colleges should become involved
in leadership development.

1. University education usually
leads to leadership opportunities
for which students need to be
prepared if they are to utilize
effectively, and to the maximum,
their disciplinary expertise.

2. According to all recent
studies on employability,
leadership skills enable graduates
to have a better opportunity for
obtaining and retaining
employment. Leadership skills
enhance ones employability
prospects in a competitive and
professional labor market where
technical skills are no longer
rated as the key to employment.

According to the management
experts success in today’s
workforce and society is based on

- 15% technical competence
- 30% people skills
- 55% how well you manage
yourself.

Employment will not be based
just on what you have studied
and your GPA, but on how well
you manage yourself, your
abilities, and your attitudes. We
have to do better than our
competitors if we expect to attract students in the first place and expect our graduates to find employment and places in grad schools.

3. Graduates who demonstrate leadership in the marketplace are more likely to bring credit to their universities and the individual professors who taught them. The world is crying out to the universities for a different kind of leader. In Christian terms we are to be fruitful not stagnant. John 15:2 states, “Every branch in Me that beareth not fruit He taketh away.”

4. Ideas are most likely to be transmitted and developed through our graduates who will be in leadership positions. Nothing excites a dedicated teacher more than to learn that a graduate has caught the vision and the means for transmitting what was taught in the classroom to a wider audience.

5. As graduates come to appreciate the value of their total educational experience, which includes the development of their leadership skills, they will be more supportive of their alma mater which has prepared them to learn, to earn, and to live in the post-graduate world in which they find themselves.

6. As responsible citizens our graduates will continually be asked to evaluate leaders at the polling booths, in interviews, and in committees. They need some basis for evaluation if they are to make sound choices that will impact not only themselves but others. How will they decide what constitutes good leadership unless they study it?

7. Many healthy campus activities require strong student leadership and the opportunity for learning and developing leadership skills in this realm will benefit the whole educational environment of the university.

8. Leadership development is our contribution in Christian higher education to the lay leadership that is so necessary in the churches where our graduates will serve and worship. Many in the pew will come from public education systems that are built on philosophies that are antithetical to Christianity, and these philosophies will influence their thinking in the church.

9. Finally, and most important for university administrators, leadership development is fundamental to mission fulfillment. This is especially true for Christian universities. If we are to do something significant, our endeavours must be firmly
rooted in God's will for us as believers. Christians have something to say about leadership development and specifically about the servanthood model of leadership that is rooted in Jesus' example for us as in John 13:1-17. Society, businesses, and institutions, whether they are Christian or not, will always require leaders. Are we content to accept leadership from pagans and by so doing deny the call of God to accept leadership positions as Daniel, Joseph, Nehemiah and others did? Our task is to provide good leadership directed towards proper and eternal ends as we influence the world as His ambassadors and as salt and light. If we did not believe this, we would not be in Christian higher education in the first place.

As Bruce Larson points out in his book Wind and Fire, sandhill cranes have some interesting features of leadership that we would do well to learn from. "These large birds," Larson points out, "who fly great distances across continents, have three remarkable qualities. First, they rotate leadership. No one bird stays out in front all the time. Second, they choose leaders who can handle turbulence. And then, all during the time one bird

is leading, the rest are honking their affirmation." (Cited in John C. Maxwell, Developing the Leader Within You. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, p.v.)

Some Reservations About Focusing On Leadership Development In Christian Colleges and Universities

We must also be aware of the opposition towards institutionalized leadership development. This is not the old question of whether leaders are born or made, but a legitimate concern with the current status that leadership development programs have within academia.

In the December 1993 issue of Harper's, Benjamin DeMott, Mellon Professor of Humanities Emeritus at Amherst College, attacked what he described as "the leadership studies racket." The leadership cult stretches from the Kennedy School's Leadership Education Project at Harvard to leadership institutes springing up at on-the-make private universities and a cluster of Eastern liberal arts colleges like the University of North Carolina at Greensboro with its center of creative leadership. It is also reaching into military academies, summer leadership schools of the YMCA, and
university extension departments that support 4-H and other leadership-training initiatives. There is also the $10 million Dwight D. Eisenhower Leadership Development Program that Congress approved to “stimulate and support the development of leadership skills among new generations of American college students.” This program “identifies, recruits, inspires, and educates outstanding young men and women regarding leadership roles.”

“As leadership scholars snuggle to the new public teat,” DeMott points out, “a new industry and special interest is born.” His fears stem from the fact that “Leadership-cult top dogs have managed, in short, to convince bottom dogs as well as themselves that the country’s problems stem not from evaded issues of injustice or inequality but from technically faulty administration.” This focus on leadership is being used as an excuse to avoid dealing with the real and substantive problems confronting society. DeMott and his colleagues are convinced that “this leadership racket was only the latest stage in the depressing struggle for the American soul waged by elitism and populism, twin killers of democratic hope—only another sign of Establishment enthusiasm for replacing politics with social science, open argument with manipulated consent. . . . It is, finally, a mere incidental that the leadership cult squanders tax dollars; what matters is that the cult appears eager to squander the democratic essence as well.”

One of America’s foremost researchers on leadership, Fred Fiedler, said it well in “The Trouble With Leadership Training is That it Doesn’t Train Leaders.”21 Edgar Elliston of Fuller picked this theme up in the Spring 1991 issue of Faculty Dialogue. There is no question that many of our graduates become leaders but to what extent can that be attributed to our input? Writes Elliston:

Spiritual leadership is not just: cognitive input, skill development, affective development, selecting the right people, providing the right experience, spiritual or character development, and/or motivation. . . . even if they are all present, one cannot guarantee that leaders will emerge. . . . The Holy Spirit sovereignly oversees, provides the capacity (gifts), calls, commissions, prepares the
context, stimulates, motivates, reveals God's will through the Word and leads the existing leaders. . . . however, to the extent that we discern and cooperate with the Holy Spirit, equip the learners with sensitivity to their gifts and calling and to their ministry functions and context, we may facilitate their development as leaders. . . . God creates in the nature of the plant the capacity to grow and produce fruit. He provides the sunshine. He is responsible for the growth, maturation, and fruition. As educators we remain as servants to carry out His commission; shepherds to care for the women and men He places in our care; and trustees of His mysteries (126).

To derive the real benefits from studying leadership, we shall have to overcome this anti-leadership development hype and focus on a biblically based call to servanthood leadership development that will transcend in its definition and application the popular concerns about leadership. Leaders will always exist and be needed; the question is from which philosophical and moral base we want our leaders to emerge from. In answering that call the Christian college has a vital role to play in higher education.

Despite The Concerns, Why The Need For Formal Leadership Development?
Some have argued that since we did not have leadership development before and we had leaders, why do we need it now? The answer is quite straightforward. Today's world calls for more sophisticated leaders as well as a different kind of leadership. People now have the freedom, if not the right, to question more, which makes leading more difficult. Traditional ways of doing things are under review or attack and more creative leadership is needed.

Methodology has become as important as ends in accomplishing a task. Significant changes are afoot. Followers have changed:
• they want to know why and why not.
• there are fewer loyalists and more non-conformists.
• they are less willing to follow with blind devotion, sacrifice and suffering.
• they are less responsive to traditional stimuli such as national honour and pride in a job well done.
• they are more conscious of their rights than their responsibilities.
• they are more prone to evaluate leaders and to dismiss those who fail or are deemed to be phoney or insincere.
• in western society they are more likely to be part of the “pleasure explosion” rather than the caregivers.
The World has changed:
• there is more interdependence among peoples.
• we live in a global village with rapid communication.
• we witness more turmoil requiring new leadership.
• youth has lost its role models.
• the role of the state in our lives has increased.
• we witness a reversal of values and a challenge to our traditional standards.
• we need modern day prophets who have credibility.
• we have few leaders who look to God for guidance and direction.
• the world is not prepared for the return of Jesus.
• the church of Jesus Christ is in trouble and losing its mission.
• too many nominal Christians are wallowing in the sin of the world and hoodwinked by the ways of the world.
• true believers are becoming more of a minority in society.

Some Possible Faculty Concerns About Developing Leadership Among Christian College Students

Can there be man-made Christian leaders?

Is it really possible to develop all students as leaders? Obtaining a degree from a Christian college does not automatically produce graduates who will always become leaders—some may, but surely not all. Furthermore, isn’t it God who raises up Christian leaders (Psalm 75:6-7), and is it our prerogative humanly to designate who will be a Christian leader?

These are legitimate concerns and our focus has to be in developing the skills, attitudes and behaviours that would better prepare one for a leadership role if that was God’s will for that person’s life. We should not be a factory producing leaders but, rather, an organization developing leadership potential in our students.

The purpose in teaching leadership development is to produce change that will enable one to improve and grow as part of life long learning process:
• change in knowledge by adding to or changing the contents of the reservoir of knowledge
• change in skills as we move
from an apprentice to a journeyman or amateur to professional

- change in attitudes that makes one better able to lead others
- change in behavior

When we stop learning, we stop growing as leaders and in our leadership potential. Every situation is different and may call for a different combination of skills, attitudes and behaviors in order to motivate others to accomplish the task. It is really people development that is involved and this includes both training and experience.

Isn’t leadership just a current fad?

To some faculty, “leadership” may be just another buzz word. Furthermore, it is often a secular term that is now being “dressed up” by Christians who want to add a simplistic biblical spin to it.

As we noted earlier in this essay, in the Hebrew word for leader, nagiyd, we have the kind of leader that God wanted to give the people, a man who would listen to His will and execute it faithfully with divinely appointed authority. Thus David became a man after God’s own heart, a nagiyd for Israel. Nagiyd is translated as a captain, ruler, prince, governor or noble of the people of God, a person who must first come under the authority of God. The nagiyd receives the commands of God and then boldly stands forward to announce and manifest them. He takes the forefront and models them by example whether this be doing battle with the enemies of God, or establishing His truth and justice. We have often ignored the fact that God chose His leaders but they were also given training, usually through mentoring as in Moses work with Joshua, Paul with Timothy and Jesus with the disciples. The church has not, to its regret, placed the same emphasis on leadership development in its seminaries and colleges. Yet, without good leadership, the church cannot survive.

As the well-known Christian businessman and author of several books on leadership, Max Depree once stated, “Succession is one of the key responsibilities of leadership.” John Maxwell, who quoted Depree, went on to explain, “It is not enough to focus on our own personal growth and the successes that we achieve. At some point the most effective thing that you or I will do as leaders is to step aside and let that young person we have ‘grown’ take the reins and
lead.”22 Surely that is part of our business in Christian higher education as reflected in the mission statements of so many Christian colleges. 

Isn’t leadership often a form of elitism?

Leadership is often an elitist term and Christian colleges are not simply in the business of training and educating presidents and prime ministers. It is also a term used in business and therefore is not appropriate for a liberal arts curriculum. Since leadership is associated with power, shouldn’t it be regarded in academic circles with suspicion?

In the words of Frank Damazio, “In the Old Testament, a leader of God’s people was, first of all, a servant of God and of His people. Servanthood went before leadership, and was a vital part of leadership.”23

Shiela Murray Bethel, who is promoted as America’s most motivational speaker, has written in her book, Making a Difference: 12 Qualities That Make You a Leader. New York: Berley Books, 1990,

To make a difference we must be willing to serve. Real service has a high value. If we contribute our time, emotions, energy, and effort, we can have real impact on people and problems. When we contribute to the well-being of others, our joy and fulfillment are immeasurable. . . . The philosophy of history’s leaders who have had a positive effect on our world has been one of service. It is invariably servant-leaders who have advanced mankind. . . . Only when service for a common good is the primary purpose are you truly leading” (16-19).

restraints upon it and the beneficial results that can be attained through the appropriate use of power.” That is why the Indianapolis Business Journal announced that “Servant leadership has emerged as one of the dominant philosophies being discussed in the world today,” and Fortune magazine sees it as a growing movement that “works like the consensus-building that the Japanese are famous for. Yes, it takes a while on the front end; everyone’s view is solicited, though everyone understands that his view may not entirely prevail. But once the consensus is forged, wham bam!”

Do we really know enough to teach leadership with confidence? The literature on leadership development is confusing and often contradictory. We do not know what makes for effective leadership therefore how can we develop effective leaders. Madeline Green, the Vice President of the American Council on Education has concluded:

Leadership is both studied and intuitive, affective and cognitive, teachable and unteachable, an art and a science. But because leadership is untidy, difficult to capture and to measure, that is hardly sufficient reason to dismiss the important efforts we can make to teach and learn leadership. It is inherent in God’s call to us to be salt and light and to prepare the church to be the bride of Christ. Employability is increasingly dependent upon leadership skills if our graduates are to be competitive in the job market. Since society so desperately needs leaders in all walks of life, we can be influencers for Christ in our leadership in the world and the church. The world is crying out for a different kind of transforming leadership that we can respond to because of our servanthood model in Jesus Christ.

Is leadership too narrow a focus? Our mission in Christian higher education is to develop Christians who have a Christian worldview. Why would we want to distort this by packaging everything under the title of leadership just because it sells? To teach about leadership will distort the discipline when it does not arise naturally from the subject.
No class or subject will cover everything there is to learn about leadership. We need to focus on the skills, attitudes, and behaviours of leadership that emerge naturally from the subject and to think about our pedagogy as a means of enhancing leadership development.

While several members of the Christian College Coalition have courses in leadership offered in their education, physical education, business, psychology, or church ministries departments, in order to make our theology of Christian leadership a reality, aspects of leadership must be taught in all courses. While each course must retain its disciplinary distinctives and purposes, the professor has considerable liberty in what is to be emphasized and how it is to be treated or viewed. It is in this context that important lessons on leadership can be taught or learned within but without violating the fundamental tenets of the discipline. Precisely how that is done will vary from course to course, instructor to instructor, and the level of the course and its prerequisites. Our very pedagogy can enhance student leadership development, i.e., through collaborative research projects that promote leadership through team work.

While it is true that our mission is to develop sound Christian thinkers and doers of the Word, the Bible reminds us: “To aspire to leadership is an honourable ambition” (1 Timothy 3:1). We must be driven by our mission, not the academic guild, if we are to be leaders in producing leaders.

Advantages For Christians In Leadership
It should also be stressed in our teaching that Christians have distinct and significant advantages over non-Christians as leaders in society. In our humility, we should not minimize what God has given to us. Here are some examples.

1. While others may find their direction faltering under certain circumstances, Christian leaders have a lifelong purpose in life to sustain them. That purpose and vision is not rooted in situational circumstances or private desires, but in the unfolding of creation itself under a sovereign God. In God a Christian leader finds strength for handling weaknesses, direction in planning, vision for seeing the needs of others, and greatness in being a servant.
2. Instead of timidity in decision making, Christian leaders can afford to take risks and make mistakes because
through Christ’s atoning death on the cross they are assured of forgiveness and eternal reconciliation. In being able to forgive oneself and others for their mistakes, they learn of a better path to successful leadership as modelled by the Son of God for all mankind. Christian leadership builds greater trust in God. By living with people you learn of their problems; by drawing closer to God, you find solutions to those problems.

3. While living in a world gone adrift on a sea of situational ethics, Christian leaders have integrity because their ethical standard is not self-made but is rooted in unalterable biblical standards that are eternally true and available for public scrutiny. They are also more conscious of their responsibility to God for their actions and words as well as their thoughts as they prepare for their inevitable day of judgement (Romans 14:10-12). For them there is no such thing as doing something in secret for they know that they cannot escape from an all-seeing God and His redemptive love for them. For this reason of accountability, they are to be trusted and should promote confidence. In other words, their yea are yea and their nays are nays (James 5:12).

4. In an era of great self doubt, Christian leaders have a belief and confidence in themselves. Those who live under the shadow of an inferiority complex can never envision accomplishing their dreams. They cannot believe that they can influence events and people. If you do not believe in yourself you cannot expect other to follow your leadership. Taken to the extreme, this becomes arrogance. But in the Christian’s walk, it is humility and reverence in serving a sovereign God. “For the fear and reverence of God are basic to all wisdom, knowing God results in every other kind of understanding” (Proverbs 9:10). When Christians realize that as part of God’s creation they are hopeful, valued, and empowered people through Jesus Christ, they can be confident in their ability to be called to leadership responsibilities (Ephesians 1:18-23). Thus leadership is not rooted in self but in understanding meaning in life and the purpose behind doing things and making a difference in public service.

5. At a time when many leaders are looking inwards, Christian leaders have an awareness of other worlds because they live in a world that God has made. In its diversity, they can find threads of
unity in God’s creation and sovereignty. They are to be in the world but not of it as new creatures in Christ. Christianity calls for action, for reaching out to others, to sharing the gospel to the very ends of the earth. “Go and make disciples of all nations” (Matthew 28:19).

6. When Christians practice servant leadership they have a sense of fulfillment that comes from following Jesus’ admonition and example. Serving also allows you to get outside of yourself, to experience the joy of serving others and seeing them grow as a result of your investment in them. It also brings you in touch with many other Christian leaders whom you might not otherwise meet or have the opportunity to learn from.

7. Instead of relying just on others for their affirmation, Christian leaders have a source of power and inspiration that transcends human wisdom and thinking. Leaders must develop a capacity for handling loneliness when they are out in front. They may be respected, trusted, and followed but they are not always loved by their followers. For this reason, they are often lonely in human terms. But in Christ they have eternal fellowship and through Him access to God himself. In the Bible we have models for prayerful reflection, meditating, and seeking God’s wisdom. Drawing apart is a natural part of the Christians’ renewal process as modelled by Jesus, Moses, Paul, etc. Because of fellowship with God and other believers, loneliness is not a Christian trait.

If we as professors in Christian colleges and universities truly believe that we have a part to play as God’s servants in influencing our culture, then we must pay more attention to leadership development in our students. By so doing we will be preparing them to be Christ’s ambassadors to the world. We cannot do this by osmosis but by developing a deliberate plan for student leadership development in our Christian colleges and universities. It begins by asking the question that should drive the design of all of our curriculum: “What kind of graduates do we want to develop in a Christian institution?” The servant leader will take their students to a level that they would never reach on their own in serving God and people.
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