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Abstract: This paper references research done on Servant Leadership theories across a span of some 45 years since Greenleaf’s first work on the subject. It catalogs 15 Servant Leadership theories based on Scripture. In doing so, it identifies a perceived gap in these theories using theological and hermeneutical arguments. It also is a reference point for further research to consider where the redemptive work of Christ fits into leadership models that draw upon His life and work as their source.

INTRODUCTION

It’s become a popular metaphor among faith oriented leaders who want to “lead like Jesus” that they adapt a style of “Servant Leadership” to model the Lord’s work on earth. The Servant Leadership approach to leading like Jesus has spawned 37 different models of what Servant Leadership should look like in practice (see the link to a webpage in the Appendix that charts out these theories). It may be, however, that even with the many available Servant Leader models, particularly those built on two key Scripture verses (Matthew 20:28; Mark 10:45), that a theological and hermeneutical argument can be made that authors have omitted a key dimension.

This paper was written to question the absence in scripturally-based Servant Leadership theories of any dimensions related to any aspect of ransoming, restoration, or redemption with theories built specifically as referenced on two key Scripture verses (Matthew 20:28; Mark 10:45); and to give rationale for why this omission should be studied further as it pertains to the attributes of the theories themselves.

LOOKING AT THE LIFE OF JESUS FOR CLUES ON LEADERSHIP

Huizing (2011) cites Beeley and Britton (2009), describing the surge of interest in leadership theory as a recognition of the absence of real leadership in both the church and in society. Even in Scripture, the Lord of Heaven searches for someone with the heart to lead His people (1 Samuel 13:14). In the church in particular, each generation produces new problems and with them opportunities where a fresh understanding of leadership is needed (Beeley and Britton, 2009).

Hanna (2006) wrote that while spiritual models of leadership are being more recognized in leadership literature, more study in spiritual leadership models was needed. In recent history faith-based authors, following under the authority of Jesus Christ as the spiritual head of the Church, and by extension the academic institutions representing His philosophy (Colossians 1:18, Ephesians 5:23), have strongly identified with the leadership style of their Teacher and Lord, Jesus Christ (John 13:13). This has meant for many codifying the leadership model of Jesus (Blanchard and Hodges, 2003). These authors, among many others, have suggested that learning to “lead like Jesus” might help to narrow this gap between the theoretical and the practical aspects of leadership (Blanchard and Hodges, 2003).

What exactly might the leadership style of Jesus look like? Some contemporary descriptions of the leadership style of Jesus have included the following:

- Jesus the Selfless Leader (Kimball, 1979)
- Jesus, CEO (Jones, 1996)
- Jesus the Strategic Leader (Martin, 2000)
- Jesus: Shepherd Model of Leadership (Starling, 2009; Foster, 2010)

Some other faith-based authors have expressed that the leadership style of Jesus is more akin to Spiritual
Leadership (Sanders, 2007), or even Loving Leadership (Hettinga, 1996). One of the more popular suggestions of a leadership style based on the life and ministry of Jesus is that of Servant Leadership (Blanchard and Hodges, 2003; Harris, 2010; Grail, 2011, among many others).

Sanders (1994) in referencing the usage of Servant Leadership as a Biblical model noted that in the King James Bible, the term “leader” is used only six times; much more frequently the term “servant” is used for persons in the leadership role. For example, the Lord refers to Moses as “Moses My servant” (Joshua 1:2), Joshua who followed Moses is called “Joshua the servant of the Lord” (Joshua 24:29), and David the King is called “My servant David” (1 Kings 11:32; 2 Kings 19:34). Regarding these “servants of the Lord,” the Scriptures do note that Moses was known to have a humble spirit in service (Numbers 12:3) and Joshua served by example (Joshua 24:15). Northouse (2013) noted that although the origins of Servant Leadership theory are found in the writings of Greenleaf (1970), there were some three decades following Greenleaf’s original writings in which Servant Leadership existed as loosely defined characteristics. Greenleaf’s concepts have more recently been embraced and amplified both by academic authors and faith-based authors who perceived this strong connection between Servant Leadership practices and the life and ministry of Jesus Christ (Blanchard and Hodges, 2003; Russell, 2003).

Northouse has also identified some limitations of this stream of research; the most notable being the lack of consensus on a definition or theoretical framework (Northouse, 2013). This is one of the important points to be explored in this paper. Yet Servant Leadership research has advanced to a level of sophistication where scales have been developed to assess the various behaviors with an ever improved level of validity (Dennis and Bocarnea, 2005; Van Dierendonck and Nuijten, 2011).

**SERVANT LEADERSHIP VARIABLES FOUND IN THE LITERATURE**

Early research by faith-based authors qualified the prevailing literature on Servant Leadership by identifying the following consistent dimensions or variables in the servant leader-follower transformational model (Farling, Stone and Winston, 1999):


2. Influence (Festinger, 1954; Rokeach, 1973; Johnson & Eagly, 1989; Bass, 1990)


5. Service (Greenleaf, 1977; Gaston, 1987; Akuchie, 1993; Snodgrass, 1993)

Fourteen years later in his dissertation research Rohm (2013) identified twenty different Servant Leadership models and assembled a consolidated list of dimensions of Servant Leadership. Later Peltz (2013) in his dissertation work documented the existence of 32 Servant Leadership models with a total of 345 identifiable dimensions or factors. Based on the research of Rohm (2013), Peltz (2013) and current business trade publications not included in the academic research of either author (Bucci, 2014a), a total of 37 distinct Servant Leadership models were identified containing 381 dimensions of Servant Leadership theory (Bucci, 2014a). Of this total, 15 of these theories identified could be classified as originating from faith-based authors.

The key Scripture verses referenced in the paper’s introduction (Matthew 20:28 and Mark 10:45) in context are foundational in many of the more contemporary examinations of Servant Leadership by faith-based authors (Purdy, 1989; Akuchie, 1993; Wilkes, 1998; Blanchard, Hybels, and Hodges, 1999; Russell, 2003; Taylor, 2004; Krejcir, 2005; Maxwell, 2007; Leyhee, 2013). Nine of the 15 Scripture-based works contain these key Scripture verses to which Jesus refers in describing His own mission of service and redemption (Matthew 20:28 or Mark 10:45 or both). See Appendix 1 for a delineation of each of the 15 theories drawn from faith-based authors.

In all of the research linking Servant Leadership theories to these key verses (Matthew 20:28 and/or
Mark 10:45) it appeared that one of the following three approaches had been taken with regards to the use of these specific verses as foundational in Servant Leadership theory: either the Servant Leadership theory had no connection at all to the specific Scripture verses, the Servant Leadership theory cited only the first part of the verse or related verses only, or the theory stated as a part of its theoretical foundation the entire verse(s). Examples of these three approaches follows:

Christ-referenced or Christ-influenced models (references to Jesus but not to Matthew 20:28 or Mark 10:45)

- Sendjaya, Sarros and Santora (2008): Under the dimension, Voluntary Subordination, “This emphasis [for servant leaders] on ‘being’ is seen, for example, in Jesus when he described himself to his followers: ‘I am among you as one who serves’ (NIV Bible, Luke 22:27).”
- Foster (1989): Described Jesus’ actions as a form of voluntary subordination which is seen as a revolutionary act of will to voluntarily abandon oneself to others (p. 406).

Used first half or part of the key verses and omitted the ransom/redemption piece:

- Miller (1995): “Jesus was a man whose Servant Leadership powerfully declared itself. As a servant, He had submitted His life to God. In a similar way, we set free the real power of God’s leadership in our lives by surrendering our weakness to His power” (p. 8). (Matthew 20:27).
- Blanchard and Hodges (2003) discuss the following: “And once a leader’s vision is clear, once the final exam is set up, then a leader initiates day-to-day coaching. You prepare people to be able to pass the final exam, to live according to the vision. Jesus said, ‘The Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve’ (Matthew 20:28). And what did He come to serve? He came to serve the vision that He had been given by His Father” (p. 56). Again we have an example of the authors only citing first half of the verse.

Specifically Christ-centric Servant Leadership theories: (use full reference to Matthew 20:28 and/or Mark 10:45)

- Van Tassel (2006): In discussing his research on the servant-leadership model at a Franciscan-sponsored university, bifurcated the verse, saying, “Christ Himself came to serve rather than be served.” Used this reference three times only citing first half of the verse (pgs. 1, 15, 32).
- Ebener and O’Connell (2010): [Servant Leadership] has been prescribed by many as the way to “lead like Jesus” (p. 317) (Mark 10:43-44; Matthew 20:27).

But in a review of all of the 381 dimensions of Servant Leadership (Peltz, 2013; and Bucci, 2014a) there does not appear to be any mention of, or relationship to, any aspect of ransoming, restoration or redemption as referenced in these two highlighted key Scripture verses (Matthew 20:28; Mark 10:45). This perceived absence or omission may not be significant based on Servant Leadership theories emanating from the disciples of Robert Greenleaf or others who looked at Servant Leadership as a general leadership theory (Spears, 1995). The omission may be significant when considering those Scripture-based theories which cite the aforementioned specific reference verses (Matthew 20:28; Mark 10:45) and yet in some instances focus the attention on only the first part of the verse. There is not a clear understanding as to why this approach was
taken. The authors will argue below that this is an inappropriate, out-of-context omission for several reasons.

HERMENEUTICAL AND THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENTS FOR LINKAGE

As noted above, there are many of the Servant Leadership models utilizing the specific Scripture references (Matthew 20:28; Mark 10:45) in part, if not completely. Jesus states in Matthew 20:28 (NASB) “...just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many,” Similarly Mark 10:45 (NASB) states, “For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many.” Although there is a slight difference in the Greek between the two verses (reflected in the NASB), the structure of both verses clearly ties the “to serve” to the “to give his life as a ransom for many.” The καὶ (kai) makes the two phrases inseparable (Blass, Debrunner, and Funk, 1961). Not only this, while some may argue that this kai is copulative or connective (and; e.g., NLT), many now see this kai as epexegetical (Hagner 1995; Davies and Allison 1997; Osborne 2010), which means that it should be translated “to serve, that is, namely, to give his life as a ransom for many.” It is not only the situation where it is seen that Jesus came to both serve and be a ransom, it is also that the act of giving himself as a ransom is Jesus’ ultimate demonstration of service (France, 2002). The “ransom” section not only highlights the purpose of Jesus death (France, 2002; France, 2007; Witherington, 2006; Marcus 2009), it also clearly shows the substitutionary atonement of Jesus’ vicarious death for others (Lewis and Demarest 1990; Mounce 1991; Stein, 2008; Osborne 2010). Philippians 2:5-11 likewise highlights this demonstration of service while noting that it is not just service, but also obedience that leads to the laying down of His life (see Oden, 1989).

However, the term “ransom” (ἀντίλυτρον) needs to be understood. Whereas it is only found in this form in these two corresponding gospel accounts, its cognate (ἀντιλύτρων) is found in Pauline literature (Procksch and Büchsel, 1967; Lewis and Demarest 1990; France, 2007). While it does retain the historical understanding of payment, it can be translated as “redeem” (e.g., GNT) since the “term focuses upon the act of setting free, not upon the payment of a ransom” (Newman and Stine, 1988). The focus of this phrase in both Matthew and Mark is redemptive as tied to service. The allusions in these verses to Daniel 7 as “son of man” (see Evans, 2001; Kärkkäinen, 2003; Marcus, 2009), Isaiah 52-53 as “the suffering servant” (see France, 2002; Nolland, 2005; Witherington, 2006; France, 2007; Marcus, 2009), as the “righteous sufferer” in Psalms 22, 69 (see Kärkkäinen, 2003) and possibly Isaiah 43 “as a ransom” (cf. Noland, 2005; Osborne, 2010), highlights the strong Old Testament connection and theological precedence of suffering-Servant Leadership. Jesus is the model for servanthood (see John 13:1-17), a model to be followed by His disciples in service and self-sacrifice.

The broader context also notes the model of typing servanthood to redemption. In both the Matthew and Mark passages just preceding the noted verses, there are two additional sections (Matthew 20:17-28; Mark 10:32-45). Osborne has highlighted that these three sections—Passion prediction, Request for a place of honor, and Jesus’ teaching on greatness (where the above noted verses belong)—are, in fact, a unified unit (2010). First, Jesus foretells His death, and like the previous two times (Mark 8:31, 9:31), the disciples fail to understand His teaching (Samuel, 2007; Stein, 2008). In these respective contexts (Matthew 20:28; Mark 10:45), the disciples debate “who will be greatest in the Kingdom?” Generally speaking, the passages reflect the same basic concern. The disciples, James and John, the sons of Zebedee, (or their mother in Matthew) were asking for the right and left hand position of Jesus when He comes into His kingdom. He states that they must “drink the cup that I drink” (Mark 10:38). They are not to “lord it” as the Gentiles, but are to be a servant, following His example. This discussion is prefaced in Matthew (20:17-19) and Mark (10:32-34) by Jesus predicting the death that he was going to die (thus “the cup” that He was to drink). Jesus demonstrates the great reversal, whereas others “lord it” or are ambitious, angling for power and prestige. He highlights being a servant leader for its own sake (Samuel, 2007). In this passage, combined themes of suffering, service and Jesus’ redemptive sacrifice are emphasized (Osborne, 2010).

The understanding of Christ in a theological sense is fundamentally important here. One question that we can ask ourselves is, “How did Jesus the Christ live as a servant in a redemptive fashion?” Two biblical examples will do here. First, Jesus and the woman
caught in adultery (John 8:1-11) demonstrates clearly the redemptive servanthood of Jesus. Second, when the man with leprosy came to Jesus for healing (Matt. 8:2-4), “Jesus stretched out His hand and touched him, saying, ‘I am willing; be cleansed!’” (vs. 3, NASB). The touching of one considered unclean (as well as many of the other Gospels’ healing accounts like the women with an issue of blood (Lk 8: 43-48)) clearly demonstrated a redemptive element of Jesus’ life. Jesus’ death on the Cross was for the redemption of all of humanity, yet Jesus ministered redemptively for at least three years in addition to the Passion Week.

As Robert Coleman (1964) emphasized, while it took Jesus only three days to establish salvation, it took Him three-plus years with the disciples to establish the church and to set the pattern for life—including being redemptive Servant Leaders. The Gospel narratives are filled with the life of Jesus as serving and redemptive living. Further, the unity of Christ two natures—God and Human—sets the understanding that Jesus was a unified complete whole (see Oden, 1989; Lewis and Demarest 1990; Erickson, 2013), in much the same way that Jesus’ death on the Cross took both our shame (of which much of the majority world would be most concerned) and our guilt (which is more common in Western cultures) (Kärkkäinen, 2003). This unity likewise means that His service is inseparable from His redemptive life, which is also inseparable from His relationship with the Father, and His relationship with others. The unified life that Jesus led implies a unified life for His followers—service, sacrifice, and redemptive living. Or in other words, to separate Jesus’ Servant Leadership from His redemptive life and work is to have a truncated Jesus, and a distorted model of Servant Leadership (and redemption).

**SUPPORT FOR REDEMPTION AS A MANAGERIAL SKILL**

Our knowledge of redemption is contextualized in the redemptive work of Christ on the Cross, and the expression of this transformed life seems more familiar to congregational life in a church setting, or through a personal interaction when seeking restoration among individuals. In the Bible, redemption is considered from the perspective of the process and how it transforms persons who allow the process to work in them (Rightmire, 1996). Yet the call for transformation made by Jesus was conducted not only in religious settings, but more often in the marketplace among tradespersons. After all, much of the New Testament was written by marketplace leaders like the doctor Luke, the tax official Matthew, the tentmaker Paul and the owners of a fishing business (Peter, James and John). “Finding its context in the social, legal, and religious customs of the ancient world, the metaphor of redemption includes the ideas of loosing from a bond, setting free from captivity or slavery, buying back something lost or sold, exchanging something in one’s possession for something possessed by another, and ransoming” (Rightmire, 1996, p. 664).

It is a natural extension of this practice that a valid and valuable effort be made by faith-based leaders both within and outside of the church to follow the pattern of Jesus by forgiving and serving individuals with weaknesses, by seeking to restore them to useful contributions to the work of the kingdom of God and to future success in life. This task admits that weaknesses are real, and by acknowledging the need for assistance in overcoming weaknesses individuals will receive the help and the training they need to again add value to the world around them and likewise continue the process themselves with other such individuals. This approach would seem to align with at least one trait noted in several Servant Leadership models that describe a Servant Leader as committed to developing others (Rinehart, 1998; Laub, 1999; Blanchard, Hybels, & Hodges, 1999).

In the workplace, studies suggest that as many as 75% of employees have engaged in some form of theft, fraud, embezzlement, vandalism, sabotage and unexcused absenteeism or otherwise harmed their employer (Harper, 1990; Hayes, 2008). Since the earliest days of management practice in organizations, managers have traditionally experimented with a variety of forms of employee discipline in dealing with aberrant terminal workplace behavior, to correct behavior and to redeem the investment made in this employee. Conventional approaches for handling terminal employee behavior recommend that managers talk to their subordinates about the problem behavior first (Yukl, 2002). If this approach is not initially effective, the manager generally follows three recommended paths: pursue progressive discipline with the employee up to and including termination should the behavior not be redirected, reassign the employee, or dismiss the employee outright if they are an “at-will” employee (Termination
Procedures, 2005). Redemptive second chances opportunities when offered, whether through a Last Chance Agreement as result of a negotiated settlement to reinstate a terminated employee (Peterson, 1997), or as a remedy in a discharge case when invoked by an employer or by an arbitrator (Bamberger and Donahue, 1999) or following an employee’s participation in a treatment program where the employee’s terminal behavior was linked to substance abuse or the employee’s response to circumstances outside of the workplace (Atkinson, 2001) can give managers and employees the opportunity to consider that perhaps a gracious bigger picture is at work, and these may cause employees to reflect thankfully on the opportunity to start fresh or undo some hurtful actions previously undertaken.

Managers and organizations must realize that all people are fallible, not perfect, and need training and nurturing to be successful. There is a significant disconnect in thinking that hiring involves drawing from a normal distribution curve (Blanchard, Zigarmi and Zigarmi, 1985). Viewing it from purely economic terms: the cost to recruit, train and fully staff a position in a typical business is often at least one and one-half times the employee’s salary (Lucas, 2013). According to Banks and Stevens (1997), the manager’s role is perceived to be one with a “sacred responsibility” towards their employee to competently manage and train their people for success. It is the manager’s role and greatest challenge to achieve optimum performance from all his/her people, and challenging their employees towards a higher level of performance is a critical part of a manager’s job (Furnham, 2002). Servant Leadership as a theoretical leadership theory considers leadership from the point of view of the leader and his or her behaviors (Northouse, 2013). In order to achieve this optimum level of employee performance, a manager may choose to act by applying one or more of the varying Servant Leadership approaches. But when employees fail and fall short, they may also need to act redemptively - or start over.

DISCUSSION

Russell writes that “the person who aspires to genuine Servant Leadership seeks to follow the footsteps of Christ” (Russell, 2003). If the focus of the theory is in the development of leadership practices based on Christ’s servant attitude alone, then there is much synergy with non faith-based models of Servant Leadership. Tim Keller writes that Jesus was the most morally upright person who ever lived (Keller, 2008, p.82), and so He would have been a great role model for serving. But we needed a Redeemer to free us from our prison of sin. This fact is not necessarily acknowledged by many faith-based authors, with some having developed independent theories on Servant Leadership without mentioning Jesus Christ (including Patterson, 2003; Barbuto and Wheeler, 2006; van Dierendonck and Nuijten, 2011); although a careful review of the source research for these articles and surveys seems to suggest some strong support by faith-based researchers.

The linkage to the redemption and ransom work of Christ harkens back to His mission, stated in the key reference verses (Matthew 20:28; Mark 10:45) as well as in Paul’s writing, where the Apostle writes that Jesus, “gave Himself for us to redeem us from every lawless deed, and to purify for Himself a people for His own possession, zealous for good deeds” (Titus 2:13). This focus returns Christians to the core of their faith, the substitutionary atoning work of Christ (2 Corinthians 5:14-15; 1 John 2:2). This perhaps becomes more difficult for application in a general management setting and might then put limitations on utilizing the Servant Leadership theory based not only on the servant life of Christ, but also on His substitutionary atoning work on behalf of those He led. It is unknown as to whether policies or practices within the organization limited the manager’s ability to pursue more redemptive approaches such as the previously highlighted process of reinstatement.

The texts of Matthew 20:28 and Mark 10:45 clearly link servanthood with redemption, while New Testament theology (e.g., John 13:1-13, Philippians 2:5-11) likewise highlight this connection. Further, the narrative of Jesus as found in the gospel accounts demonstrates the redemptive service of Jesus that was to be emulated by His disciples. As Stein (2008) suggests, Mark 10:45 is arguably “the clearest example of imitation Christi found in Mark.” Jesus unified life, likewise, is to be followed by his disciples. While it is clear that only Jesus could fulfill the redemptive event of the Cross, all of his disciples were to live redemptively as servants and leaders of the fledgling church. How then should this inform our management philosophy?


CONCLUSION

Huizing (2011) stated that Christians cannot rely only on general leadership theory in discerning leadership that is Christ-like. This emphasis is reinforced by Hanna (2006), who writes that Biblically-directed Servant Leadership is Christ-centered. Huizing (2011) admonishes that this is the point of integration: it is here that faith expressed under the governance of God will impact one’s leadership point of view (Blanchard and Hodges, 2003).

The growth and impact of Servant Leadership research has helped substantiate that this stream of research has many unique attributes and contains a level of sophistication in scale development which has helped to validate this approach (Northouse, 2013). Living with our unique value system and seeking to serve our gracious Savior, Christians are drawn towards emulating Jesus Christ by applying to their lives and work a leadership model based on His unique behaviors (Blanchard and Hodges, 2003); not merely listening to His words but doing as he has said (James 1:22). It is a comfort to know that modeling Servant Leadership is perhaps modeling the very traits exhibited by Christ when He walked here on earth.

Yet as emphasized here, Christ’s focus was not simply serving His disciples but also dying to redeem them and us. The challenge for future research would be to build on the body of past research as summarized here to examine more closely the traits ascribed to Servant Leadership or other faith-based leadership models to assess how and where these expressions of Christ’s servant heart and redemptive activity are being fully defined and modeled, as clearly represented by our two key Scripture verses (Matthew 20:28 and Mark 10:45). We as researchers and as redeemed children of God are also challenged to advocate for further research and management action based on the mission of Christ (Matthew 20:28), who came to serve and restore individuals created in the image of God to positions of fulfilling their calling (Plantinga, 2002); to supporting an organization’s mission, to economic contribution and to providing for their own and their family’s needs. For those of us “redeemed of the Lord” (Psalm 107:2) let our research say so!
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APPENDIX 1: SCRIPTURE-BASED SERVANT LEADERSHIP MODELS – BY PUBLICATION DATE

Additional data support and tables can be found online at:
http://www.slideshare.net/josephjbucci/cbfa-2014-paper-for-submission-sl4-c-51176360.

Model: 10 Keys to Servant Leadership (Miller, 1995).
Scripture References: Matthew 20:27, 11:29, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, Psalms. The book uses many Scriptures however its main threaded theme is 2 Samuel. The word “restoration” used for the in Key 10 for the Restoration of Praise.
Characteristics / Attributes:
1. Key 1: Fostering an Honest Servant Image
2. Key 2: Seeing Yourself as a Leader: Learning the Art of Self-Perception
3. Key 3: Networking and the Special Friends of a Leader
4. Key 4: Vision: Gathering It Up and Giving It Out
5. Key 5: Decision: The Key to Leadership
6. Key 6: Defining, Structuring, and Motivating
7. Key 7: The Politics of Grace and the Abuse of Power
8. Key 8: Leadership: Coping with Difficult People
10. Key 10: Surviving a Visible Mistake (seeking forgiveness for one’s own mistakes)

Scripture References: Ecclesiastes
Characteristics / Attributes:
1. Committed
2. Listen and learn
3. Givers not takers
4. Want to serve
5. Promote diversity
6. Provide a learning/growing environment
7. Value-driven and performance-oriented

Model: Principles of Servant Leadership (Sims, 1997).
Scripture References: Psalms, Matthew 5-7, Mark 10:35-45, 2 Corinthians 5, others
Characteristics / Attributes:
1. A learner who promotes sharing of vision
2. A person who uses power to solve the thing that is necessary for others
3. A person who promotes cooperation with the community
4. A person who accepts other’s opinions
5. A person who communicates with others honestly
6. A person who encourages others.

Scripture References: Matthew 20:28, Mark 10:42-45 and others.
Characteristics / Attributes:
Wilkes distills Jesus’ approach to leadership into seven principles (p. 25-27):
1. Humble your heart: Servant leaders humble themselves and wait for God to exalt them.
2. First be a follower: Servant leaders follow Jesus rather than seek a position.
3. Find greatness in service: Servant leaders give up personal rights to find greatness in service to others. Scripture reference for the comparison: Mark 10: 42-45 (cross-listed with Matthew 20:28) page 25 and page 87.
4. Take risks: Servant leaders can risk serving others because they trust that God is in control of their lives.
5. Take up the towel: Servant leaders take up the towel of servanthood in order to meet the needs of others.
6. Share responsibility and authority: Servant leaders share their responsibility and authority with others to meet the needs of the flock.
7. Build a team: Servant leaders multiply the impact of their leadership by empowering others to lead.
**Model: The 4 Values of Servant Leadership (Rinehart, 1998).**

Scripture References: Gospel of John, Matthew 20:28, Mark 10:43-44, Colossians, 2 Corinthians, 1 Peter, 1 Timothy, others

**Characteristics / Attributes:**

1. Diversity of the body: freedom to vary methods, styles, forms, and visions,
2. Equip and develop people,
3. Directs people to the Scriptures
4. Authenticity.

Rinehart also distinguishes between “power leaders” and “servant leaders.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Leaders</th>
<th>Servant Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feed on the spotlight;</td>
<td>Share the spotlight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a high turnover;</td>
<td>Nurture loyal colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the focus on themselves and</td>
<td>Affirm kingdom agendas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their agenda;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to their title frequently;</td>
<td>Use their title rarely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use images, offices, and perks to</td>
<td>Abhor power images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reveal their status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model: 6 Discrete Elements of Servant Leadership (Laub, 1999).**


**Characteristics / Attributes:**

1. Values people
2. Develops people
3. Builds community
4. Displays authenticity
5. Provides leadership
6. Shares leadership

**Model: 9 Critical Factors of Servant Leadership (Moon, 1999).**


**Characteristics / Attributes:**

1. God’s calling
2. Relationship
3. Obedience
4. Prayer
5. Humility
6. Accountability
7. Vision
8. Mentoring
9. Love

**Model: Leadership by the Book - Summary of Servant Leadership Principles (Blanchard, Hybels, and Hodges, 1999).**

Scripture References: Matthew 20:28, Mark 10:42-45 and others.

**Characteristics / Attributes:**

1. Effective leadership starts on the inside.
2. Real change in behavior requires a real change of the heart.
3. True leadership starts on the inside with a servant heart, then moves outward to serve others.
4. I take on the challenge of leadership when I see it as a way in which I can serve others.
5. My main interest is the development and care for those I lead.
6. I want to be held accountable for my leadership performance.
7. I am willing to listen; and, in actuality, I enjoy receiving feedback to help me improve my leadership.
8. Leaders are not meant to be served, but to serve others.
9. I praise the progress of my people; I look to catch them doing something right.
10. Servant Leadership is not about pleasing everyone, but pleasing God first, developing people second, attaining the Company’s mission, and finally finding satisfaction in achieving all three.
11. Effective leaders have a support/accountability group to keep them on track.
12. Leaders regularly make an inventory of their actions, motives and thoughts, to be sure that they are consistent with the Servant Leadership model.

**Model: The 10 Facets of Servant Leadership (Rardin, 2003).**
Scripture References: Matthew, Mark, and others.
Characteristics / Attributes:

1. Focuses on the individual
2. Empathic
3. Caring
4. Self-sacrificing
5. Nurturing
6. Stoops
7. Submits to gifts of others
8. Saves
9. Full of grace
10. Humbly serves the purpose of God in the lives of others.

**Model: Servant Leadership Traits (Marciarello, 2003).**
Scripture references: Nehemiah; Mark 10:42-45
Characteristics / Attributes:

1. Showing compassion (representing patience and focus on the individual)
2. Demonstrating humility
3. Remaining impartial
4. Living a life of integrity
5. Building trust by being trustworthy
6. Applying knowledge and experience while developing wisdom

Also mentioned: Humanity and Humility.

**Model: Summary of Principles – A servant leader does these things (Sullivan, 2004).**
Scripture References: Matthew 20:28, Mark 10:42-45 and others.
Characteristics / Attributes:

1. A servant leader knows their person [power].
2. A servant leader knows their position [authority].
3. A servant leader knows their purpose [rule].
4. A servant leader knows their provision [headship].
5. A servant leader knows their perception [example].
6. A servant leader knows their profession [servant].
7. A servant leader knows their preference [humility].
Model: 5 Important Qualities of Servant Leadership (Pham, 2005).
Characteristics / Attributes:
1. Honesty and trust
2. Communication
3. Integrity
4. Faith
5. Prayer

Model: 5 Nature and Qualities of Servant Leadership (Prosser, 2007).
Scripture References: Matthew, Numbers, Acts and others.
Characteristics / Attributes:
1. Attitudes
2. Vision
3. Respect
4. Change and counsel
5. Reward.

Model: 5 Best Practices of Servant Leadership (Wong and Davey, 2007)
Scripture References: Mark 10:42-45, Philippians 2:6-8 (Mentions that Jesus took on the nature of a servant to redeem us and minister to us. Does not include redemption or restoration in any of the best practices, although close themes)
Characteristics / Attributes:
1. Right identity – Seeing oneself as a servant: cultivating humility, selflessness, stewardship, sense of calling
2. Right motivation – Serving God by serving others: helping hand, sacrifice one’s self interest, bring our best in others, empowering others
3. Right method – Relating to others in a positive manner: listening with empathy, involve others in decision-making, engage others in team building, affirming others
4. Right impact – Inspiring others to serve a higher purpose: modeling core values, demonstrating love, challenging others to live for higher purpose, challenging others to strive for excellence
5. Right character – Maintaining integrity and authenticity: walking the talk, standing up for what you believe in, courage to confront grim realities, engage in honest evaluation of your progress with others’ help.