8-1986

The Christian as Leader: A Study of Technical, Human and Spiritual Behaviors in Leadership Theory

Nicholas Velthuis Kroeze IV

Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation


http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/2283

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.
THE CHRISTIAN AS LEADER: A STUDY OF TECHNICAL, HUMAN AND SPIRITUAL BEHAVIORS IN LEADERSHIP THEORY

by

Nicholas Velthuis Kroeze IV

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of The Graduate College in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education Department of Educational Leadership

Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, Michigan August 1986
The purpose of this study was to formulate a theory of leadership that would be appropriate in the context of Christian organizations. The basic premise of the theory was that in order for Christian organizations to attain higher degrees of excellence they need to account for and work with three principal variables: technical orientation, human orientation and spiritual orientation. The review of literature and expert opinion gathered in the study further substantiated the advisability of organizations in general taking into account the influence of spirituality and performance on the job. The purpose of the theory was to provide the foundation for the development of a conceptual model that could be used in the training and development of leaders in Christian organizations.

The theory of Christian leadership was reviewed by a number of experts in the field and account was taken of their comments and recommendations. A test instrument, the Christian Leadership Discernment Questionnaire, was developed to accompany the theory. There was a twofold purpose to the questionnaire: first, to determine the possibility of quantifying the three orientations and, second, to determine if the theory could discriminate between these orientations.
The expert review resulted in positive support for the concept and development of the theory which was said to show sound and supportable reasoning, conceptual creativity, utility and potential benefit to both Christian and non-Christian organizations. The statistical analysis performed on the data gathered by the questionnaire indicated that the instrument was reliable and valid in discerning spiritual behavior but less reliable in discerning technical and human-related behavior. Under the conditions of the test the conclusion was made that the results provided sufficient evidence to support the overall viability of the theory as a conceptual, instructional and evaluative tool.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

Introduction

Through the course of history leaders have come and leaders have gone. Some have been considered successful while others have been considered failures. Some have left a lasting mark upon society while others have been virtually forgotten. The variety of skills, knowledge, personal characteristics, behavior, training, and purpose that these people represent is extensive. Though some may have sought the same or similar goals, no two have possessed or demonstrated the same "make-up" that would lead one to say "So, this is why this person is a leader." Yet, in the 20th century the lives, behaviors, and circumstances of those who are recognized as leaders have been studied to identify common themes, factors or elements that might be used to isolate, define, reproduce and develop leadership. The issue which has challenged minds is "What is the essence of leadership?" 

There are few generalizations or universalities that may be ascribed to leaders. Like the character of the artist, the inventor or the explorer, leadership, too, is a highly individual matter. What one leader does or is to be effective may well result in failure in the life of another. The more general the description of effective leadership becomes, the closer it comes to specifying the
essence of leadership while the greater the specificity, the greater the chance of missing the essence of leadership. Argyris (1976) declared that:

It is paradoxical, but true, that the same theories of action designed to achieve order also produce disorder, and since these theories are not very effective in dealing with disorder, they also produce slow, but inevitable, disintegration in the relationships among human beings. Moreover, they also produce group dynamics and organizational problem solving that are counterproductive. Once in existence, the group and organizational factors take on a life of their own, for three reasons. First, they become so complex and so interdependent that they appear beyond the reach of planned change. Second, the people who would have to change them do not have the appropriate theories of action for such change. Third, the people, by and large, are unaware of their responsibility in this problem, and they tend to blame the nonchangeability of organizations upon the organizations themselves. (p. 3)

In this study three issues are addressed. First, a model is presented (defined and explained in the third chapter) that makes the variables of Christian leadership easier to conceptualize. Second, the model is used as the framework for a theory around which strategies for change may be formulated. Third, the teachings in Christianity which place the ultimate responsibility for a person's actions upon the person are emphasized and a highlighting of the resources available to the Christian in recognizing and accepting his or her responsibility in the Christian organization are made.

The Problem: A Summary Statement

Through the process of literature review and expert opinion an awareness has developed that in both the Christian and secular worlds there is no theory of leadership that takes into account the
simultaneity of technical, human, and spiritual variables as they relate to leadership behavior and organizational structure and character. Without this theoretical framework the training and evaluation of leaders in Christian organizations or the evaluation of the organizations themselves may occur in a haphazard manner that could lead to an overall reduction of effectiveness in the organization. Christian organizations must be aware of and willing to implement organizational theory as presented in the secular world. Also, as recorded in the review of literature, secular organizational theory should be aware of and willing to account for the variable of "ideology" as it exists in some leaders and some organizations. An understanding of the attributes and dangers that accompany the three variables (to be defined later as "technical, human and spiritual orientations") is needed to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the individual and the organization.

Definition of Terms and Concepts

The term "secular" is used as an adjective conveying the meaning that belief in God is not a motivational or descriptive factor in the behavior or attitude of individuals. "Secular" is a neutral term carrying no favorable or unfavorable connotations. Some of the authors quoted use the terms "worldly" and "earthly" in the same vein of thought as "secular." These former two words are pejorative in nature as they connote (at least to the Christian) "hedonism" (i.e., a seeking after pleasure for its own sake and as the principal goal of life). These words are avoided in order to
maintain a spirit of objectivity.

The substance of the term "Christian" is formed by three components: (1) faith (in Jesus Christ as Son of God), (2) hope (in the realization of God's spiritual rule becoming his visible rule over all things) and (3) love (toward the being and word of God, and to the physical, psychological, and spiritual well-being of others) (cf. I Corinthians 13).

"Sovereignty" and "Lordship" are used synonymously to convey the concept that God and Jesus Christ have complete power over and right to govern every aspect of things physical, psychological, and spiritual. Note also that the pronouns "he," "him," and "his" when used in reference to God or Christ may or may not be capitalized consistently throughout the quotes in this study. This is due to the personal preference of the various authors when referring to figures of deity and should not be regarded as typographical errors.

The terms "Bible" and "scripture(s)" refer to the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament and the twenty-seven books of the New Testament as presented in any of the Bible versions listed in the bibliography. The Bible is a book containing historical accounts, guidelines and insights for living, prophecies, and words of advice, counsel, comfort, and encouragement. Though written by people, the Bible is accepted by Christians as having been inspired by God. The Bible is used in this study since its heavy influence in the behavior of the Christian individual makes understanding the Christian's motivation impossible without it.

Biblical quotes have been accepted at face value, i.e., whether
they are seen by the reader as fact or fiction, they do exert an influence that moves a Christian to act in one way or another. Since the purpose of this study is to provide insight as to which concepts motivate a Christian, the veracity of the Bible is a question that is considered extraneous to this study. All biblical quotes are taken from the Revised Standard Version (RSV) of the Bible (e.g., Harper study Bible, 1971) unless otherwise noted, e.g., King James Version (KJV), New International Version (NIV).

"Church" is used to denote items about Christian organizations or leaders. Though the use of the term by the quoted authors is meant to convey the concept of a formal church structure composed of individuals coming together for the purpose of worship and the propagation of their beliefs, the liberty has been taken to define and use the term "church" synonymously with "Christian organization." The same ideals, beliefs, and value systems are operative in both the formal church and Christian organizations which exist to support the church's goals.

The concept of "Christian organization" refers to a non-profit organization which is based on the Christian philosophy. The primary functions of this type of organization are to educate, provide physical assistance and development, provide psychological counseling, present the claims of the Bible where established churches do not exist, and provide support services to those carrying out the aforementioned activities. The Christian organization may specialize in just one of these activities or it may cover more than one.
Christian Organizations and Leadership: Some Basic Understandings

The paradox discussed in the introduction suggested that specificity in describing leadership may lead to inappropriate circumscription of the essence of leadership. An appropriate action may be, then, that within the confines of religious organizations a specific model for Christian leadership should be avoided for fear of imposing a form that may not be universally appropriate, warranted, or acceptable across the scope of individual and denominational expressions of Christianity. Yet, the purpose of such a model is not to dictate and prescribe the operationalization of leadership in Christian organizations but to provide a framework around which specific individuals and organizations at specific points in their history can conceptualize and analyze the basic elements and relationships of a God-human-world view.

In addition to the above, secular theories of leadership and organization are insufficient in the Christian realm because of the one element that makes the Christian organization a unique relative of the secular organization: "God." The word "relative" is used with specific intent because Christian leadership does not exist in dynamic opposition to secular leadership principles but, rather, contains many elements in common with secular theories. Secular theories do contain sound and laudable precepts that the Christian leader would be irresponsible to neglect (cf., p. 15). In a debate with Larry Richards, Getz (Richards and Getz, 1981) warned about making the Christian organization so unique from other organizations
that it precluded any possibility of efficient and effective operation. There is a common heritage of organizational and leadership principles which must be accepted and developed rather than ignored merely because the secular half of society uses them.

A fundamental guideline which is advocated in both the secular world (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1979) and the Christian world is the principle that "form must follow function."

There are principles in the New Testament that can be applied to church structure. The reason we don't have the structure itself in the New Testament is that structure and form are cultural. If we tried to copy New Testament church structure, we would lock ourselves into the cultural forms of the first century. Therefore, God has given us functions so we can develop forms that will be relevant to any given culture at any time. (Richards and Getz, 1981, p. 70)

This distinction of form and function is critical to an understanding of a Christian leadership model. In the Christian as well as in the secular world the form-following-function principle is to be accepted as an underlying principle since the work of any organization or leader is one of "process" where change influences the means (which fluctuate) to the end (which is constant).

The goal of any Christian organization or leader (to claim the world for Christ) is fixed and so a definitive statement of purpose is acceptable. Within the context of the Christian organization where its history, longevity, and geographical diversity give evidence of a multitude of approaches to the end, the form of leadership can never be universalized. Getz (Richards and Getz, 1981) stated that he would never want to see himself presenting a definitive statement for the church on leadership. To specify the
form a leader or organization must abide by would be to act presumptuously and inappropriately. The suggestion of a framework around which the individual forms may be built is appropriate in order to help engender thoroughness and adherence to all facets of the function given the leader and organization.

Research Goals

In this study a model is proposed which provides a conceptual framework for analyzing the Christian leader and organization. The material is intended to be a solitary step in developing a more profound and expansive work which would delineate not only a theory of Christian leadership and organization but also the manner in which the theory could be operationalized. The final chapter includes suggestions for further research in this area.

Limitations of the Study

No study of the extent to which any one of the three elements (technical, human, spiritual) of the model effected either of the remaining two was made (e.g., if a high spiritual orientation automatically results in a high human orientation or, if a high spiritual orientation automatically negates the possibility of a high technical orientation). Though the role of spirituality, specifically, in relation to the other two may be of great interest, it best constitutes a study in itself. The study did not gauge the spirituality of the leader or organization in order to place either on a scaled location in the model proposed. This is considered to
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be companion research but of a type best left until the validity of the model itself is established to reasonable satisfaction. This research is restricted to Christian leadership in Christian organizations. No attempt was made to establish subordinate satisfaction or dissatisfaction with leader or organizational characteristics. Further, no combinations of Christian vs. secular leaders in Christian vs. secular organizations were studied.

Methodology

A summary of the conceptual model and its purpose along with illustrations of the model were provided to people in leadership positions in Christian and secular organizations. An analysis guide was provided for them in order to help facilitate and format their responses in three ways: (1) the particular strengths and weaknesses of the theory and its accompanying model, (2) their recommendations for changes or adaptations in the theory and model, and (3) their perception of the utility of the theory and model in providing a framework for training and evaluation. Once the formal findings were made from the data gathered in the study, post-dissertation work on the theoretical model is suggested which is directed toward the substantiation and refinement of the theory.

The people chosen to respond to the theory and model included leadership theorists and practitioners. The sample sources were books listing organizations and their leaders, bibliographies of books on leadership, seminary and college faculty lists, and personal recommendations from contacts made during the preparation
of this study. The respondents were chosen by stratified sampling methods in order to promote a broad representation across denominational and organizational types.

Summary

The needs for accounting for the variable of "ideology" in leadership theory and for providing a theory and conceptual framework for leadership as it is carried out in Christian organizations have not been adequately addressed in publications or practice to date. If the Christian organization and leader are to be effective, they should take into account what has been learned by secular organizations and leaders as far as working with people and meeting the goals of the organization in an efficient and effective manner are concerned. Secular theory, for its part, should be of sufficient scope to account for ideology's influence in any organization and especially that influence in the Christian organization where this variable is of paramount importance (cf., p. 15). A theoretical and conceptual framework capable of integrating and accounting for technical, human and spiritual elements in leaders and organizations is recommended. A review of the selected literature and an explanation of the theory and its model follow in the next chapter.
CHAPTER II

A RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

Introduction

Two classes of theories present in both the Christian and secular worlds give rise to questions of inconsistency or lack of thoroughness in the treatment and explanation of the principles they contain. The two classes are "leadership" and "motivation." The difficulty encountered in these two realms can be summarized in three points. First, in the Christian world the extent of research and writing contributing to an understanding and establishment of a Christian theory of organizational structure and leadership is limited. Walter C. Wright, Jr., director of the Institute for Christian Organizational Development located at Fuller Theological Seminary, stated in a letter (February 19, 1985) regarding material on Christian leadership theory, "I cannot enthusiastically point to much Christian literature on the subject." Literature available from or pertaining to secular theory is abundant, but, as Wright states, little is available which accounts for or explains the unique elements in or concepts of Christian leadership theory. In a search through four Christian journals pertaining to Christian leadership and organizations, dated from 1980 to the present, only a handful of articles detailing theories of leadership could be found: the majority pertained to the practical, "nuts and bolts" issues of
running a modern organization.

Inadequacy of Secular Theories

But, does it matter that there is little in the way of Christian theory? Why wouldn't secular theory be acceptable in a Christian organization? Is leadership any different just because it is a Christian doing it? Eims (1975) states that "The leader must remember that truth is found in Jesus Christ. Secular management books or textbooks on leadership are helpful, but our basic resource is God" (p. 56). The issue is more substantive than recognizing it simply as a situation where the leader happens to be or happens not to be Christian. The perspective as well as the mores concerning life take on a different character and meaning between the secular and Christian worlds. Sanders (1967) in a discussion of two biblical characters, James and John, concluded, "worldly conceptions of greatness and leadership cannot be carried over into His spiritual kingdom. In that kingdom there is a complete reversal of earth's values" (p. 13). The secular world, because of its neutrality, can accept leadership from anyone without regard to his or her personal ideology: the Christian world, because of its unique belief and value system, can accept leadership only from an individual who espouses a philosophy harmonious with Christian goals.

The reason people must accept that there are two different approaches to leadership is that one of the two realms, either secular or Christian, may perceive such a difference. Engstrom
(1976) states that "For centuries the church, beginning with the rise of monasticism, has drawn a sharp distinction between what is sacred and what is secular" (p. 52). This distinction arises from the church. The church is not saying, however, that its style of leadership or organization is more effective, it is only saying that Christian leadership contains an element that distinguishes it from its secular counterpart. The church acknowledges its need for improvement.

A Theology of Non-Competency?

The concern in this area is leader and organizational competency. For all the perception that the Christian world has concerning prior claim to the motivational and leadership principles now found in secular theory, for all its altruism, for all its rationalizations, the Christian organization tends to be less effective and efficient than its own standards would suggest or when seen in comparison with its secular counterparts. Robert Worley, of McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago, as quoted by Lindgren and Shawchuck (1977), stated, "It is, however, strongly characteristic of Protestantism that the prophetic-preaching and the sacramental-pastoral roles have been emphasized while the kingly (organizational), governance or wise-rule (management) activity has been largely neglected" (p. 17). Lindgren and Shawchuck (1977) go on to say that there is grave concern about the welfare of Christian organizations "because many church leaders carry out their organizational responsibilities more or less intuitively" (p. 20).
The lack of governing and goal orientation may be due, in part, to the tendency of Christian organizations or leaders to see not only purposes or goals as static, but also that the means fail to keep pace with the processes, means, and tools of modern society. Leadership and organizational operations are no longer what they were one thousand, one hundred or even ten years ago.

It is important to note that none of the traditional ways of looking at the church deals with its nature as an organization. Very few take note of organizational arrangements at all. Most do not even suggest, except indirectly, that the church is an organization. The traditional interest of Christians in the church has simply been of another kind. Their theological emphasis has been on the transcendent source of the church and its relationship with God through Christ, rather than on the organized ways in which Christians have gone about the church's business. (Hutcheson, 1979, p. 23)

Though Hutcheson is speaking of the organized church, the mentality seen in the above carries over into the Christian organization since its people move about in both realms with equal dedication and ardour.

A paradox is created when the very principles and values the Christian organization or leader prizes become the greatest impediments or detractors in the Christian organization. This is seen in situations where such mandates as "love one another" (John 15:12) and "judge not, that you be not judged" (Matthew 7:1) become reasons, mistakenly, for not carrying out serious performance evaluation; where respect for the individual's responsibility to God becomes a reason, mistakenly, for others not analyzing his or her motivations; where trust in the sovereignty of God becomes a reason, mistakenly, for not planning; and where homogeneity in the body of
believers becomes, mistakenly, an excuse for tolerating counterproductive individual quirks. Engstrom (1976) holds that "there is a tacit assumption that in Christian groups everyone shares in common the belief that we all understand each other as to the Lord's will. We therefore dislike challenging another Christian's motives or actions: we don't want to rock the boat" (p. 158). Such behavior is inappropriate as noted in the Bible where the very Word of God exemplifies and calls us to an attitude and action of excellence (e.g., Philippians 1:10 "that you may approve things that are excellent," Romans 2:18 "know his will and approve what is excellent").

A Gap in Secular Theory

The third reason for attempting to establish a Christian model of leadership results from examining certain popular secular theories and finding them lacking in accounting for the influence of ideology in the life of the individual and organization. Waitley (1985) sees this as an area which demands closer study:

I see a painful metamorphosis taking place in society that is every bit as dramatic as the magic transformation of the caterpillar into the butterfly. The very nature of winning is in transition. Our former basis for defining winning, according to external standards set by a hedonistic, egocentric, highly impressionable society, is being transformed. The new view of winning is based on internal standards which, while differing for each individual, are consistent in that they take into account moral and spiritual values and principles that affect all of humankind and the natural world. (p. 30)

There are fundamental differences between how secular and Christian people view themselves. Sanders (1967) offers the
following basic comparisons between secular (i.e., "natural") and Christian (i.e., "spiritual") views:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURAL</th>
<th>SPIRITUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-confident</td>
<td>Confident in God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows men</td>
<td>Also knows God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes own decisions</td>
<td>Seeks to find God's will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Self-effacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originates own methods</td>
<td>Finds and follows God's methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys commanding others</td>
<td>Delights to obey God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated by personal</td>
<td>Motivated by love for God and man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>God-dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The critical difference in perspective is that secular people view themselves as the "end-point" of all activity—the flow of all activity being seen as focusing on the person. Christians, on the other hand, see themselves as the "mediating point"—the focus of all activity being directed or channeled through them.

To Christians the pinnacle of success is seen as that point where their being intersects with God's being (see Figure 1). By regarding themselves in this fashion Christians open themselves up to an entirely new dimension of existence where they acquire the responsibilities and resources of a spiritual world. Those with a secular philosophy see themselves as the endpoint of existence and so may restrict themselves to the one, physical dimension of life.

The relationship shown in Figure 1 does not result in the Christian becoming a passive being in the hands of God nor does (or should) the spiritual dynamic become an excuse for one's activity or non-activity in the physical world. Rather, the relationship spurs the Christian on to an even higher level of performance from an even deeper source of motivation. Entailed in this is a continual
struggle in which the Christian must temper his or her personal and physical desires with those principles of life and living that are established in the Scriptures. Engstrom (1976) characterizes this as "the tension always evident in leadership action" (p. 21). The study and comparison of the theories which follow further illucidate the contrast in perspective between the secular and Christian worlds.

(a) As secular people mature and come to greater control over their environment and over others they conceive of themselves as being self-sufficient, self-assured, and self-controlled. They operate in a purely physical realm.

(b) As people begin to become spiritually sensitive they acknowledge the existence of the spiritual realm but not its influence in their lives.

(c) As people begin to mature spiritually they become more God-centered, finding sufficiency, satisfaction, and meaning as coming more from God than from the physical world.

Figure 1. The Physical-Spiritual Relationship

Maslow

If satisfaction is to be reached for any upper level need, the
need immediately below it must have been satisfied (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1979). This concept is represented in Figure 2.

![Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs](image)

Figure 2. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

One's motivation lies in satisfying the immediate need one has and in striving to satisfy the next higher need. Crucial to Maslow's theory is the understanding of the all-pervasive character of any one need. If a need is felt in one area of the organism it affects all other aspects of the organism (Maslow, 1970). In spite of the strength and foundational status Maslow (1970) ascribes to the overwhelming influence of any need (especially of the lower ones), he is willing to qualify its influence in his motivational theory.

In the finding that living at the higher need level can sometimes become relatively independent of lower need gratification (and even of higher need gratification in a pinch), we may have a solution to an age-old dilemma of the theologians. They have always found it necessary to attempt to reconcile the flesh and the spirit, the angel and the devil—the higher and the lower in the human organism, but no one has ever found a satisfactory solution. Functional autonomy of the higher need life seems to be part of the answer. The higher develops only on the basis of the lower, but eventually, when well established, may become relatively independent of the lower. (p. 103)
Maslow's theory contains a framework for understanding human behavior but does not account for some critical variables that would have a dramatic effect upon his hierarchical theory of human needs and motivation. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979) state of Maslow's theory that it "differs from other motivational formulations in that it does not consider an individual's motivation on a one-to-one basis or as a series of independent drives" (p. 153).

Maslow (1970) does recognize that the original hierarchy of needs should be expanded into a more comprehensive accounting of factors regarding people's motivation. He developed the term "metamotivation" to explain that people who have found basic needs gratification are motivated in certain "higher ways." Characteristic of this motivation is that it does not automatically come upon gratification of basic needs:

One must speak also of the additional variable of "defenses against metamotivation" (Maslow, 1967). This implies that, for the strategy of communication and of theory-building, it may turn out to be useful to add to the definition of the self-actualizing person, not only (a) that he be sufficiently free of illness, (b) that he be sufficiently gratified in his basic needs, and (c) that he be positively using his capacities, but also (d) that he be motivated by some values which he strives for or gropes for and to which he is loyal. (p. 29)

Important insights as to how Christian leadership differs from secular leadership are gained through the citation above. Maslow (1970) recognizes the impact of an individual's ideology on motivation—even recognizing that "the spiritual life is part of the human essence" (p. 39)—yet holds back from recognizing that its impact is not dependent on a person's having reached the apex of need fulfillment.
The essence of Christian ideology lies in the acceptance of God as "sovereign." Sovereignty means that God is all-powerful, in control of and knowledgable about every event in human history and every aspect of human existence and development. This concept of God entails the possibility of the individual subjugating any need when allegiance to the demands of the ideology dictate doing so. In stark contrast to Maslow's view of people's drives, Elliot (1982) says:

The (Christian) is not on his own, left to seek self-actualization, which is a new word for old-fashioned selfishness. He is not "doing his thing" to find his own life or liberty or happiness. He gives himself to a Master and in so doing leaves self behind. (p. 25)

By avoiding and emphasis on "self" Christianity gives the individual a perspective on life which may free her or him to grow to fullest potential as a human being without being constrained by concerns over "prior needs." One of Christianity's foremost concepts is that its belief system is operational at any time in a person's development and at any level of development. Indeed, Jesus Christ taught that need fulfillment did not primarily result from physiological or psychological gratification but from spiritual affinity with the principles God established for humankind. Of humanity's basic needs Christ said:

Therefore I tell you, do not be anxious about your life, what you shall eat or what you shall drink, nor about your body, what you shall put on. Is not life more than food, and the body more than clothing? Look at the birds of the air: they neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not of more value than they? And which of you by being anxious can add one cubit to his span of life? And why are you anxious about clothing? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they neither toil nor spin; yet I tell you,
even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God so clothes the grass of the field, which today is alive and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, will he not much more clothe you, O men of little faith? Therefore do not be anxious, saying, "What shall we eat?" or "What shall we drink?" or "What shall we wear?" For the Gentiles seek all these things; and your heavenly Father knows that you need them all. But seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things shall be yours as well. (Matthew 6:25-33)

Christ (and, hence, Christianity) declared that this principle not only supercedes all other needs but guarantees total and complete satisfaction: "I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly." (John 10:10) The net result is that the individual finds that self-fulfillment is only truly found in self-subjection to the lordship of Christ. Nothing has been lost of the individual's freedom or personhood since, as Christianity recognizes, the essential privilege of humans to freely choose is not violated by God's "design": people have a free will. Maslow may argue that the Christian is really only finding self-fulfillment in the form of religion as a choice among many plausible options but the argument would ignore one important fact: in the Christian approach to life one does not have to be first self-actualized before he or she can grow in other areas; this ideology may at any time supercede and even negate the physical and psychological demands of any strata in the heirarchy of needs. This concept, illustrated in Figure 3, shows that as the individual matures ideologically (in this case in Christian spirituality) the greater the influence of the ideology over the person's needs and nature. The influence of ideology can be, in itself, in a state of flux. This characteristic is shown by the wavy line.
Figure 3. The Impact of Ideology on the Heirarchy of Needs

The importance of the above concept as a distinctive element in Christian leadership theory is that it signals the organization as to what it may expect from each individual in the organization in the way of cooperation, performance, attitude, and devotion to the task (which are expected, in the Christian world, to be highly positive). The Christian organization contains evidence of a built-in training and evaluation system for working with employees which has been and is, by its own nature, an integral part of the individual's make-up from as early as that person's birth. The challenge to the organization is to take planned and purposeful advantage of this circumstance, making it an objective as well as a subjective element in the human resource area of the organization.

The above has been an area where Christian organizations have been lax. Engstrom and Dayton (1984) lament: "Why is it that Christian organizations are so often characterized as long on spirituality and short on competence?" (p. 43). They suggested an answer when they commented in a previous chapter that "Management
theory is extremely useful in carrying out any enterprise. Those involved in the leadership of Christian organizations ignore it to the peril of the enterprise for which we may be responsible" (p. 20). On the basis of this thought a new perspective is needed—one which goes beyond the human dimension as seen by Maslow and yet provides an objective and utilitarian understanding of the dimension of ideology and which provides substance to the training and evaluation of Christian leaders as they strive for corporate competence and excellence.

Caution needs to be exercised in connection with the realization of the Christian individual's openness to working with and around demanding situations with a positive and accepting attitude. The emphasis in Christianity of the individual Christian finding satisfaction and contentment in the physical and psychological realms of life on the basis of mature spirituality does open the door for organizations and leaders to take advantage of the Christian's tolerance for marginal working conditions and demands. This point will be developed and explored further in the third chapter.

Herzberg

The motivation-hygiene theory is similar to Maslow in that it emphasizes that a certain level of satisfaction must be reached by the individual at the lower level of needs if the person is to move to a higher level of motivation with regard to his or her work. Hygienic factors are those psychological or physiological elements
which the individual requires in order to do the basic job given the person. Without them, the individual will not perform or will only do so in a limited fashion. The motivational factors, on the other hand, are those which cause one to exceed expectations and perform in a more superior fashion. Hygenic factors are extrinsic in nature while motivational factors are intrinsic.

In contrast to Maslow, Herzberg (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959) recognizes the influence of ideology in providing meaning and motivation to life. The beliefs that people hold call them to want to do their job in a conscientious manner and allow them to do it with joy. He states, "It is probably also true that the close relationship between work and aesthetics, religion, and social relations . . . increases the motivation to work" (p. 121). Herzberg relegates this observation, i.e., the one pertaining to religion, to primitive society and does not see it as influential in a modern society. In spite of this he does acknowledge that "The concept of self-actualization, or self-realization, as a man's ultimate goal has been focal to the thought of many personality theorists.... Man tends to actualize himself in every area of his life" (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 114). Actualization of people in every area of their lives directly involves the ideology they espouse. Herzberg (1966) appears to have recognized this fact and goes to great lengths to account for its influence, although one notes a less appreciative view of Christian ideology as his terminology for the concept switches from "religion" (Herzberg et al., 1959) to "myth" (1966).
Regardless of the terminology or characterization of Christian ideology he uses, Herzberg does allow for the existence of its influence. If this ideology is influential in motivation and the formation of leaders then it should, at some point, be accounted for. With this thought in mind, then, the contrast in interpretation between Christianity and Herzberg follows.

![Herzberg Model](image-url)

**Herzberg**

- Level of minimal tolerance. The person must be satisfied with everything below this line before passage to the higher, motivational level can be achieved.

**Christianity**

- The wavy line is a point of balance. The motivational factors are present and exert influence at every level. Circumstances and spiritual maturity cause the point of balance to fluctuate.

**Figure 4. A Christian View of Herzberg**

Christianity rotates Herzberg's model ninety degrees (see Figure 4). There is a simultaneity of extrinsic and intrinsic factors which is balanced by the individual's spiritual maturity. The concept is similar to Getzels & Guba's transactional management theory (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1979) in which the manager must decide in favor of the institution (nomethetic) when necessary and in favor of the individual (ideographic) when appropriate. Extrapolating this to Christianity one would say that the individual
must balance her or his wants and needs (ideographic) against the desires of God (nometthic).

The Bible requires that people not be bound by earthly desires and inducements. With Herzberg as well as with Maslow a sharp distinction in perspective exists. Christ admonishes in Matthew 6:31, "So do not worry, saying, 'What shall we eat?' or 'What shall we drink?' or 'What shall we wear?" and so addresses the hygiene issue: it is not to be preeminent. In the thirty-third verse of the same chapter Christ states "But seek first his (God's) kingdom and his righteousness" and so establishes the motivating factor: it is spiritual. The verse continues, "and all these things will be given to you as well," and so rotates the Herzberg model further in perspective to a full 180 degrees: Christian motivation must first be intrinsic and secondly extrinsic. As the ideology textbook for the Christian, the Bible is replete with statements, illustrations, and examples substantiating the texts given above. These texts can be summarized in St. Paul's declaration:

For I have learned, in whatever state I am, to be content. I know how to be abased, and I know how to abound; in any and all circumstances I have learned the secret of facing plenty and hunger, abundance and want. I can do all things in him who strengthens me. (Philippians 4:11-13)

When Christians look at motivation and leadership they should bear in mind that the intrinsic, the motivator, does not require that extrinsic factors be satisfied first. Both the positive and the negative implications of this point are shown later in the study.

According to Herzberg (1959) people exceed the standard requirements placed upon them only when their "level of minimal
"tolerance" is passed and they become free to perform at a superior level in a superior fashion. In contrast, Christianity emphasizes one's striving for excellence no matter what the internal or external conditions may be. When God is held as sovereign and Christ as the model, anything less than a striving toward excellence in doing and being would be unacceptable. Engstrom (1982) states that striving for excellence is a Christian's duty (p. 22) and that "The Christian leader never equates mediocrity with the things of God, but is always committed to the pursuit of excellence" (p. 199).

The Christian's willingness to work toward a level of excellence and the attitude held in this process is not carried out from purely altruistic motivation. More than acting the way they do or being what they are "because it is right to do or be so," Christians too, like their secular counterparts, anticipate a reward for a job well done. McKenna (1984) touches on this when he says, "Until all creation is redeemed (i.e., until it acknowledges the lordship of Christ), we must learn to work diligently, patiently, and faithfully on long-term tasks for which the gratification is often deferred. Once we see our work in this perspective, joy will attend our daily task" (p. 49). Though there is a difference of reward that secular people would not find acceptable, Christians view the reward they strive for so highly that it can serve as motivation for a lifetime. With such a strong influence to motivate that Christian ideology has, the Christian world would be wise to promote a theory of leadership that is at the same time sensitive to spiritual elements and to leadership principles that have proven
successful in the secular world.

Vroom

Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory of motivation is similar to Herzberg in that it holds that a person acts in order to reach some level of satisfaction: "it assumes that performance is a means to satisfaction" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1979, p. 171). Ideology notwithstanding, the reward sought by a person may be of such high value that the more elemental desires of an individual may be sublimated as one strives toward that reward. Vroom (1964) says "...we are suggesting that means acquire valence as a consequence of their expected relationship to ends" (p. 16). In effect, the greater the perceived worth of the reward the more one is willing to tolerate and able to appreciate the means and the manner employed or experienced in moving toward the goal with its accompanying reward.

This principle is in accord with Christian theology in that Christianity espouses a belief that the means, whether they entail personal adversity or favor, are overwhelmingly acceptable in light of the reward the Christian anticipates. The scriptures give examples of this concept: of Christ the Bible says in Hebrews 12:2, "For the joy that was set before him (he) endured the cross" and in the words of St. Paul, whom many Christians hold as the greatest New Testament theologian, "I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed to us" (Romans 8:18).

Does this mean that the Christian is motivated differently than
is the secular individual? Yes, for the means to the end and the circumstances encountered on the way are not seen negatively—one does not have to "have" before action will be taken. According to the following quotation, even the most adverse conditions may be seen in a positive light and so result in an even deeper motivation to strive toward the goal:

Count it all joy, my brethren, when you meet various trials, for you know that the testing of your faith produces steadfastness. And let steadfastness have its full effect, that you may be perfect and complete, lacking in nothing. (James 1:2-4)

The Bible agrees with Vroom's principle: the valence of the means, whether it be seen as painful or pleasurable, is related to the established goal or end. In the Christian interpretation this is a highly normative and altruistic principle. This principle may also leave itself open in two dangerous ways: (1) the goals and expected behavior may be so lofty that people may reject them completely as being unobtainable and (2) those who do attempt to abide by them may be taken advantage of in Christian as well as in secular contexts. This second point will be addressed in the third chapter but of the first it should simply be stated that without high goals one may never be challenged to strive toward one's full potential or development. The Christian world sees the meeting of its goals as humanly impossible. The expectation is that one will attempt to go as far as possible in meeting them as one can. St. Paul was a person of extraordinary background, intellect, character, and service. Though he recognized this in himself to the point where he could advise others to imitate him, he realized that human
life and development was a continuing process: "Not that I have already obtained this or am already perfect; but I press on to make it my own, because Christ Jesus has made me his own" (Philippians 4:12). The Christian is taught to never rest on past or present achievements, no matter how notable they may be. The reward is seen as so superior to any humanly possible achievement that one must continually work at pursuing greater and more influential involvement in all areas of life.

Vroom (1964) does acknowledge that, at some point, the Christian ideological system had a tremendous impact on motivation. Referring to Weber's 1930 study, he comments on how the Calvinistic Protestants of the 16th and 17th centuries "believed that continuous bodily or mental labor increased the glory of God" (p. 35). Vroom acknowledges that a change of values— from the spiritual to the material— has occurred in American culture and, while acknowledging the effect this "Protestant Ethic" has had on lending attractiveness to work, wonders whether there is serious "question whether the social conditions exist at the present time for developing in large numbers persons who positively value hard productive labor" (p. 36).

Unfortunately, Vroom does not entertain the thought that as the perception toward the reason for working changed over the centuries and became more material in nature, so, too, the Christian perspective may have changed (as it has, to become more spiritual). Growth in awareness and understanding is a common trait of the Christian as well as of the secular world. Byrne (1961) demonstrates this as he traces the development of Christian thought.
through the centuries and highlights the relationship it shares with secular thought. McKenna (1984), speaking on current religious thought, expresses a person's responsibility in this way: "Work, according to the biblical ethic, is morally accountable.... In our work we are responsible for the task we are given to do, the character we bring to the task, and the attitude with which we work" (p. 49). According to McKenna, the Christian concept of work involves a more intimate, internal process between the individual and God. A concept present in this thought is that the organization or leader is not responsible to give primary satisfaction (though either may support it) to the individual. Satisfaction is seen ultimately as innate and spiritual in nature.

Does the Christian organization or leader have an advantage over organizations that emphasize Vroom's concepts? Yes and no. As stated earlier, there is tremendous potential for misuse of the biblical operational standards that the Christian holds. The Christian organization does have an advantage in employing people who are basically satisfied with themselves and with life, but the trap that must be constantly guarded against is the possibility of acting in such a way that reflects the thought that because satisfaction is only a matter between the individual him or herself and God, the organization does not have to concern itself, particularly, with making one satisfied. Again, this potential problem area is deferred to Chapter Three for fuller discussion and treatment.

Vroom (1964) summarizes the concepts treated in this section
when he states that "The extent to which a worker strives to perform effectively in a job is not solely a function of his personality or of the nature of his work role but is a complex resultant of both types of variables" (p. 262). Secular theory ignores a vital aspect of a human's personality—her or his ideology. Something of the depth and scope of the influence of ideology (as held by the Christian) has been shown and it begs for consideration as a variable in the study of motivation, leadership and organizational behavior. Further, Christian theory is negligent of the concepts surrounding a person's "work role." These elements should be brought together in a conceptual framework that would facilitate their study, understanding and application in both the secular and Christian worlds of leadership theory.

Argyris

Argyris (1976) reports that many organizations, including religious organizations, are in a state of deterioration because of inefficient structure and management. "It is no surprise," states Argyris, "to learn that, for the first time in decades, people are doubting and mistrusting the efficacy of organizations" (p. ix). A lack of consolidation of skills exists in different areas that are needed for the competent running of an organization. Too often, Argyris believes, organizations and leaders demonstrate high quality skills in one or two areas and because of this (limited) competency tend to neglect the need or fail to see the need for expanding skills into other or all areas pertinent to human and organizational
welfare. This situation is evidenced in Christian organizations where there is a strong emphasis on human and spiritual values but not so much on organizational competency.

Argyris (1976), in describing different patterns of behavior, approximates a substantiation of the concept considered under Vroom (1964) in which McKenna (1984) sees motivation to work as the individual's responsibility: all the factors are inherent in people to be self-motivating (Sergiovanni & Starratt, p. 102). Argyris believes that most people (the "workers") are not self-directed or motivated and prefer to be told what to do while the others, who tend to be the managers and leaders, are more highly self-directed and motivated.

Evidence of Argyris's distinction between people's motivation is present in Christian organizations as well as in secular organizations. There is universal acceptance that people develop and mature at rates differing from one person to the next. But, simple recognition of this difference must not serve one as an excuse for not performing. To the Christian, in the final analysis, it is not who you are or what you do that counts but, rather, what you do with what you have. Briscoe (1982) states, "It's not how a man starts his Christian life that matters, you see. It's how he finishes it; just as it's really not how a man starts a race that counts, but how he ends it" (p. 190). In the Christian world, people receive constant admonishment toward responsible action which, in effect, results in positive motivation or, in the very least, a striving toward the realization of a deeper motivation in
one's life.

As Argyris describes the school as being responsible to move "youngsters from infancy to maturity, intellectually, socially, and emotionally" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, p. 107), so also the Christian church describes its responsibility. In this sense the individual receives instruction and practice in growth toward maturity not only from the school (and home) but also from the church. Graves (1976) says, "A church does not have an educational program, it is an educational program" (p. 107). He goes on to substantiate that this has been a practice of and major emphasis in the church since its inception. Graves specifically states that the church is engaged in "intensive instructional programs designed to help believers grow in spiritual maturity and to equip them for their ministries as Christians in the world" (p. 107). Note the dualistic nature of instruction: for "spiritual maturity" and "ministry (work) in the world." The former is related to the latter and its influence carries over into it. Spiritual motivation augments (and is capable of supplanting) physical and psychological motivation. Hence, as one internalizes the Christian principles one acquires, motivation becomes more than a physical or mental exercise: it becomes the heart and soul of one's being.

A final conclusion can be drawn from this discussion of Argyris as was drawn from that of Vroom: secular theory does not suffice to explain motivation in universally acceptable terms. When one considers the Christian worker, the Christian leader and the Christian organization, the force and influence of its ideology must
be considered as a major variable in the study of or theory relevant to its practiced behavior. Elliot (1982) captures the essence of the unique mentality of the Christian laborer which, in a word, is characterised by a willingness to work:

The Christian attitude toward work is truly revolutionary. Think what it would do to the economy and the entire fabric of life if the question were asked daily, in the kitchen, in the office, the schoolroom, the plant: "Who is your Master?" and the answer was given: "Christ is my Master, whose slave I am." It would transform in a stroke not only the worker's attitude toward the boss, but his attitude toward those who work with him. No longer would he be scheming ways to outdo them, cheat them, gain preference over them in the employer's eyes. He would not be seeking ways to evade work that he doesn't like and letting George do it. It would change his attitude toward the work itself because he would do it not for show, not for promotion or bonuses or compliments or the free trip to Las Vegas, but with single-mindedness, for Christ. It would change the quality of the work, for he has a master who sees what no other overseer could spot: not only every detail of the work done, but the intentions of the heart. The workman would know that the work, no matter how demeaning it might otherwise be, how routine, how humble, really does matter. It will be noticed. (p. 132)

As stated elsewhere in this study, the above mode of thinking, though it is highly positive in the basic attitude it portrays, runs the risk of vulnerability, of being taken advantage of. The demands of modern organizations include not only a work force that is highly dedicated to the task but critically sensitive to pertinent communications coming from the work force itself that may help ensure the long-term survival of the organization. Appropriate action for the individual is to react against injustices and to confront perceived inadequacies or shortcomings that affect him or her on the basis of non-selfish principles since the individual, in the Christian belief system, has the responsibility to "redeem"
society. The accepting yet "call-to-account" character of the Christian is seen in Christ's command to his followers, "Be wise as serpents and innocent as doves" (Matthew 10:16) and in Christ's personal examples of challenging the organization where it was acting improperly (cf. John 2:13-22, Luke 11:37-54, Luke 13:10-17, Luke 14:1-6, Mark 7:1-23). Christianity espouses a unique and all-encompassing motivation the influence of which is sufficiently strong and pervasive to demand its consideration in leadership theory.

The Study

The need for (1) conceptualizing and consolidating a theory of Christian leadership, (2) developing a training and evaluation model for Christian leadership, and (3) incorporating a third, spiritual dimension into secular theory leads to the third chapter of this dissertation. A three dimensional model is posited that serves as a conceptualization of the three factors listed above.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF A THEORY OF CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP

General Description of the Theory

Why a theory of Christian leadership? Is such a theory truly and specifically needed for the Christian leader or the Christian organization? The answer to these questions is best seen in the following statement from Reddin (1970):

A sound theory shows clearly how things are related and how and when the relationship changes. Sound management theories are intended to clarify, not to mystify. They are designed to make sense out of what may appear to be a confusing situation. They show relationships not previously identified and hence lead to actions that would not otherwise be considered. They provide positive, direct guides to action. (p. viii)

Tannenbaum, Margulies, Massarik and Associates (1985) take this concept a step further by including the concept of "model" as a more tangible structure to guide organizations and their leaders:

We have noticed definite trends in the mismanagement of organizations due to postures inadvertently taken by managers who lack models for comprehending how personal and organizational realities are formed. (p. 139)

These two perspectives of theory and model form to provide a foundation upon which organizations and leaders may base and form legitimate action with regard to the particular goals of the particular organization. What makes this concept uniquely applicable to Christian organizations was explained in Chapter Two but is further borne out by Tannenbaum et al. in a subsequent observation they made concerning the limited understanding of some
organizational managers:

What they need, however, are models that restructure their thinking to see that subjectivity and self-interested participation are part and parcel of every organizational action and perception, models that allow them to include this factor in their everyday organizational thinking. (p. 141)

This factor of "subjectivity" is being advocated under the concept of "Christianity" as a dimension needed in organizational and leadership theory and model construction in this study. A clarification of relationships between dimensions recognized in the world of Christian leadership is made yet in such a manner that has not been attempted thus far.

The awareness of "dimensions" in the world of labor is not new with humankind's entrance into the 20th century. From ancient times there was a cognizance of the dynamic tension between people's needs, labor's demands, forces in nature, and the desires of the gods. Then, as now, the individual who could take and discern and meld the dimensions of the world was the one whose life reflected success. Rather than be subject to or complacent concerning the elements of the environment, this person was one who strove to understand and utilize the dynamic interaction of the dimensions.

An example of this understanding is seen in the life of Nehemiah (425 B.C.), one of history's most noted administrators and leaders. Barber (1976) says of him that he functioned "both as a task specialist and a social-emotional expert" (p. 57). Against enormous odds Nehemiah took a reluctant people to carry out a laboriously demanding task in a life-threatening environment where only he would stand as the difference between the people's ultimate
success or failure. The whole of his story can be read in the Old Testament section of the Bible, but the point of the matter is this: the concept of looking at organizations and leadership as composed of different and discernable dimensions has been a well-established concept in humankind's history from the dawn of civilization.

If what we conceive of Christian leadership is no different from what was conceived over two thousand years ago, then why is a new theory necessary? What, essentially, is new? The answer: the packaging. What was true yesterday is true today; only the way it is presented has changed. Yet, the content remains constantly and consistently important: the person, the organization, who or which strives for success attempts to understand and act in balanced movement with all the dimensions pertinent to accomplishing work through people. The packaging changes because different people from different times look at identical facts from different perspectives, different circumstances. And this is what is presented here—the established facts brought together and conceptualized in a manner appropriate for Christian leaders in Christian organizations in modern times. The basic goal undertaken by this study is to reconcile the facts of old with the needs of modern Christian organizations and leaders.

The theory of Christian leadership as presented in this chapter states that as individuals and organizations increase in their technical, human, and spiritual orientations the more effective they become. The theory assumes that as people mature as individuals the greater their ability to understand, act in, and appreciate the
value of each of the three dimensions separately and as an interactive unit. Also assumed in the theory is that each dimension has an optimal manifestation and high and low extremes which are least effective manifestations.

Below, each dimension is considered individually and citations supporting the inclusion of each dimension in the theory are provided. Following this is a presentation of concepts integral to the theory which illucidate the strengths and potential weak areas one might anticipate as the theory is implemented.

The Individual Components of the Theory

Technical Dimension

The existence of a technical dimension is supported by a number of recorded observations and studies (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; Reddin, 1970; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1979; Vroom, 1964). This dimension stresses the objective, the technical, and the scientific. Empirical studies based on quantifiable data are the evaluative standards of this dimension as technical process is seen as relatively predictable. The degree of effectiveness with which the work is accomplished and the efficiency with which it is done are characteristic of the technical dimension.

With regard to this study, the technical dimension is seen as simultaneously showing two potentially, though not necessarily, divergent sets of goals—those of the organization as a system and those of Christianity as a belief (hereafter referred to as "Kingdom goals"). Since both sets of goals place very specific performance
requirements on the individual, it is appropriate to look at each of the sets apart from the other and then in combination.

**Organizational Goals**

Without goals no meaningful work can be consistently accomplished in an organization. Goals give direction and are used to measure progress and profit-making. They help define the type of work that the organization wishes to accomplish and the type of personnel needed to carry it out. Yet, in an organization, especially a service organization (which most Christian organizations tend to be), goals may not be clearly defined or emphasized. Whether characteristic of the leader as an individual or the organization as a whole, the technical orientation demonstrated influences the effectiveness and efficiency with which the final product or service is delivered. As Figure 5 shows, technical orientation may be conceived of as being "high" or "low."

A high technical orientation means that the individual or organization considers goal setting, organization of labor and process evaluation as being of paramount importance in supplying products or services to the public. Low technical orientation is seen as a "laissez-faire" attitude toward specific goal setting and programming of work to meet the goals. Rather than seeking to control events to produce favorable results, the low oriented individual or organization is content to let events occur in a happenstance manner. Between the high and low ends of the technical dimension lie an infinite variety of degrees of technical
orientation. The degree of technical orientation demonstrated may be influenced by attitude, ability, knowledge, the perceived goal, and the needs of the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laissez-faire behavior</th>
<th>Aggressive control behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Technical Dimension

**Kingdom Goals**

Concern for the goals of the organization (technical orientation) has been previously shown to have Christian roots going back at least as far as 425 B.C. Even more interesting to note is that the first command given to humankind by God, as recorded in the Bible, involves the same high-level technical orientation that was described above, i.e., effort deliberately expended to actively control, manipulate, and organize elements according to a purposeful plan. Note this citation from Genesis 1:28 (New International Version, NIV): "God blessed them (Adam and Eve) and said to them, 'Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it.'" The word "subdue" means to bring something under control and dominate over it. Humanity is herein given a charge not to withdraw from the life and activity of the world (low technical orientation) but to seek to bring it under human control (high technical orientation). The goal has been God-set but people are responsible to organize the means to reach the goal. There is no instruction in scriptures to ignore the technical side of society or to disparage what humankind has learned about running organizations apart from
Christian influence.

**Human Dimension**

The inclusion of a "human dimension" as a principal element of organizational and leadership theory is supported by the same individuals cited under the section introducing the technical dimension of the model. The importance of taking into consideration the various aspects of the human dimension is seen in the need for organizations to provide a counterbalance to strict goal-seeking and profit-making in the organization without regard to the human cost involved. Brown (1973) describes the concept in this fashion:

An unfortunate by-product of the development of the large-scale organizations needed to implement the advances in science and technology is the increasing tendency to extend the impersonal approach of science and technology to organizations which, regardless of size, remain essentially human institutions. Science and technology have provided new knowledge and devices for human organizations to use. But they have also created great strains and stresses within the ever larger human organizations needed to put new discoveries to work. Science and technology have not altered the persistent and controlling attribute of human organization--namely, whatever the organization's size or form, it continues to be subject to the complex and unpredictable initiatives and responses of the individual human beings who make it up. This is the human nature of organizations. (p. 1)

The organization can be nothing more than the people it serves and the people who service it. That the needs of people need to be cared for in order for an organization to be successful is without argument. Yet, needs are not the final word: from the Christian perspective doing enough to provide for humankind's living in relative contentment is not enough. For the Christian leader there is a call to actively cause people to grow, to bring all people to
"full maturity." These two perspectives are considered individually in the text that follows.

**Sensitivity to Human Needs**

Research carried out over the last few decades (Argyris, 1957, 1964; Blake & Mouton, 1964; Brown, 1973; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; McGregor, 1966; Vroom, 1964) indicates that in their work role people do not maintain long-term satisfaction, productivity, and motivation with work environments that treat workers as nothing more than a collection of brain cells and muscles which can be "bought off." Even in highly unique and exceptionally privileged work environments and opportunities people resist the degradation or subjugation of their "personhood." A prime example of this was seen aboard the Apollo Skylab I mission of 1973 where the first space "mutiny" occurred. The astronauts refused to follow NASA's work orders for a day because, over the course of the long mission, they had been given no chance to follow a "personal schedule" as they experienced the intricacies of space phenomena. NASA's high goal orientation for the mission failed to take into account the psychological needs and intuitive capabilities of the human cargo. The exceptionally high motivation and reward to the astronauts of traveling in space was insufficient to keep the personnel on board performing effectively and consistently throughout the flight.

A sensitivity to human needs means to make an effort not only to supply an equitable reward for labor rendered but to also provide a working environment that is physically and psychologically
comfortable while also providing opportunities for individual expression, innovation, input, and development on and off the job. Whether this concept is approached from a human relations perspective as held by Argyris (1957), Likert (1967), and McGregor (1960), or from a human resources perspective as defined by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1979), the importance of the human element to the welfare of the organization is crucial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis on</th>
<th>Ambivalence to human needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Human Dimension

Figure 6 shows that, in a fashion similar to the technical dimension, there is a range of degrees to which sensitivity to human needs can be manifested. The low end of the continuum represents complete ambivalence to the psychological and physiological welfare of the individual. The person is seen as existing only to serve the needs of the organization and its leader. The person or organization who or which is at the low end of the human dimension is a psychological, if not a physical, hermit, i.e., he, she or it removes the self from all interaction with humanity except, perhaps, where survival demands interaction.

At the high end of the human dimension is the manifestation of behavior and character where an emphasis on the well-being of the individual is seen. Friendships and human relationships are encouraged by the organization and leader while an open and comfortable atmosphere is sought by all involved. The attitudes and
opinions of the workers are an important influence in the day-to-day and long-term operation of the organization. Rather than ignoring the workers or driving them to perform by means of a negative reward system, the organization strives to motivate the individuals so that they personally desire to carry out their duties rather than be forced to do so.

**Responsibility to "Build Up"**

Commensurate with a sensitivity to the needs of human beings and the desire to facilitate and accommodate individual as well as group desires is the responsibility for leaders to challenge and move people to reach upper levels of human potential, awareness and understanding. A sensitivity to human needs in and of itself runs the danger of creating a complacent people, a people whose view of the world is myopic. This circumstance results from individuals being taught or conditioned that they have no personal accountability in their own personal welfare. These people grow with the sense that the environment must adapt itself to them rather than they to the environment. This is where "building up" enters as a more objective, one-step-removed approach to working with people. Building up is a process of encouraging people, forcing them, while supporting them, to come to terms and work with new or uncomfortable elements in the environment. This process always comes with challenge, sometimes with pain.

Building up can only be achieved in the proper environment. Ideally, where the workers and organization share a similar
philosophical background and value system the stage can be set for the "building" process. In this way an authority outside the immediate organization is accepted as having established principles that are to be adhered to for reasons beyond and prevenient to the goals, systems or desires of the organization or its leader. In the case of Christianity such an authority is accepted in the being of God as he is revealed in the Bible. In contrasting areas of concern between Christian and non-Christian organizations, Engstrom (1976) states:

Christians have added problems and concerns because Christian organizations are different—or at least should be. They are different because they have a higher allegiance than the basic purpose of the organization. They operate on the assumption that they are doing something, are part of something, that has eternal value. They are different because the individuals in the organization share in the common allegiance to a "God who is there." Because they have this higher and common purpose, they assume a moral and ethical level which should always transcend their short-range goals. (p. v)

By approaching the matter in this way all people involved have some assurance that the attitude and activity of the organization directed toward the workers is not self-serving manipulation but honest effort being exerted for the workers' ultimate benefit.

An example of putting the principles of sensitivity to human needs and the responsibility to build up together is seen in the concept of "tough love." Tough love was born out of a situation where parents' relationships with their children had deteriorated to the point of being negatively existant or non-existant. The parents had "gone the extra mile" to accommodate their children's behavior and desires but found that this resulted in "spoiled" children and
degeneration of respect in the parent-child relationship. To say "no" to one's children and demand accountability and responsibility on their part was determined to be appropriate as long as an attitude of love toward the children was present in the situation. Christianity is similar in perspective: every conceivable effort will be made to accommodate, support and aid the individual as the individual maintains an openness to input and influence which are intended to build up, to cause to mature.

**Spiritual Dimension**

This third element of the Christian theory and model of leadership is what distinguishes the Christian theory from all other theories espoused in the secular world of management, leadership and organizations. This is not to say that people working in secular organizations lack "spirituality." Indeed, men and women of deep spiritual conviction have held prominent positions of leadership outside of Christian organizations. What, in actuality, distinguishes the two types of theories is that in secular theory the spiritual element is considered to be a demographic variable (e.g., church affiliation, amount of time spent per year in church functions, number of dollars given per year to church-sponsored activities and programs, etc.) whereas in the Christian theory the spiritual element is perceived as an integral dimension to successful leadership and organizational development. Engstrom and Dayton (1984) state the need for accepting current secular theory and expanding upon it in an effort to more fully explain Christian
leadership: "From an organizational standpoint, there are fundamentally two kinds of work: management work and technical work. The Christian organization, however, adds a third dimension to these which, for lack of another definition, we will call spiritual competence" (p. 44).

Though Engstrom and Dayton do not pursue the topic to great extent or depth, their mention of a third, spiritual element hints at a "coming of age" for the role of Christian philosophy and values as an integral part of leadership and organizational theory. Barrs (1983), Eims (1975), Hutcheson (1979), Richards and Hoeldtke (1980), Sanders (1967), and Waitley (1985) also call for some attempt to integrate spirituality into modern leadership and organizational theory and practice. In an article published in the Kalamazoo Gazette (May 18, 1985), syndicated columnist Michael J. McManus reported on a newly formed organization, Fellowship of Companies for Christ, which is attempting to promote the benefits of running companies, Christian or secular, according to principles found in the Christian faith. The purpose of the text which follows is to take a step toward providing the theoretical base and framework for the spiritual dimension which is in the birth-stage of recognition in leadership theory.

The Dimension Described

As with the technical dimension and human dimension, the spiritual dimension is recognized as having high and low manifestations or orientations (see Figure 7). The spiritual
dimension is composed of a belief system—a conviction that beyond the physically recognizable universe there lies another realm of existence which is capable of being perceived by humanity and which acts in and influences the physical realm. The Christian is encouraged and challenged in life to develop an interactive relationship with and appreciation for what it recognizes as the creator of all things physical and spiritual, namely, God. John Calvin, a principal leader of the Protestant Reformation, wrote in a major treatise, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, in 1535:

Moreover, although our mind cannot apprehend God without rendering some honor to him, it will not suffice simply to hold that there is One whom all ought to honor and adore, unless we are also persuaded that he is the fountain of every good, and that we must seek nothing elsewhere than in him. This I take to mean that not only does he sustain this universe (as he once founded it) by his boundless might, regulate it by his wisdom, preserve it by his goodness, and especially rule mankind by his righteousness and judgment, bear with it in his mercy, watch over it by his protection; but also that no drop will be found either of wisdom and light, or of righteousness or power or rectitude, or of genuine truth, which does not flow from him, and of which he is not the cause. (McNeill, 1960, p. 40)

Calvin's statement gives the rationale for pursuing the development of a spiritual orientation: if one holds the conviction or is inclined toward believing that God exists as the supreme being then it is certainly to one's advantage to be open and draw close to that source of all knowledge, wisdom, and might and so bring her or his life into accord with that being. People with a high spiritual orientation espouse this belief and its entailing responsibilities without equivocation. This does not mean that they are a perfect or superior people: it means that they dedicate themselves to striving
for the realization of the principles of the Christian faith in their lives.

On the low end of the spiritual dimension are those whom we describe with the term "agnostic." Webster describes "agnostic" as "of or relating to the belief that the existence of an ultimate reality (as God) is unknown and probably unknowable" (p. 18). To people of this conviction the ultimate authority of humankind is humankind. People are responsible to the culturally defined values and mores of their society and those codes of ethics which are self-imposed.

![Figure 7. Spiritual Dimension](image)

Under this Christian theory of leadership the assumption is made that the spiritual orientation one demonstrates, regardless of degree, is focused on how God is understood in the Christian faith. Leadership in this context takes on a selfless, altruistic character which is evidenced by the leader's behavior as well as his or her faith and philosophy. Sanders (1967) writes concerning this topic: "The true spiritual leader is concerned infinitely more with the service he can render God and his fellowmen than with the benefits and pleasures he can extract from life. He aims to put more into life than he takes out of it" (p. 13). This leads to the deliberation of the concept which marks the Christian approach to leadership as a unique and beneficially promising contribution to
the world of organizational and leadership theory: the leader as servant.

Servanthood: the Servant-Leader

The "servant-leader" concept is the culmination of all the factors discussed in the three dimensions of the theory: technical, human and spiritual. On the surface it appears to be a contradiction of terms. How can the functions of "servant" and "leader" be reconciled into a single concept that would form the backbone of Christian leadership theory? Yet, this concept challenges all leaders, Christian and non-Christian, to optimal action, behavior, attitude and effectiveness.

The roots of servant-leadership lie in the person and ministry of Jesus Christ. By looking at his approach to leadership one can gain a significant understanding of what it means to lead in the truly Christian intent of the word. The first thought held regarding Christ is his claim to being the "Son of God." Whether one as a Christian holds this to be true or as a non-Christian doubts its veracity, an attempt to validate the claim is irrelevant to the point being made, which is this: in spite of the father-son relationship Christ said he shared with God, he never claimed or demanded "executive privilege." Paul expresses it this way:

Have this mind among yourselves, which is yours in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross. (Philippians 2:5-8)
Not only in his life-style did Christ demonstrate servanthood as a form of leadership, he actively taught and trained his followers to emulate him. The New Testament book of Mark records an incident where some of Jesus' followers, the twelve disciples, were discussing which of them might be considered "the greatest." Perceiving their thoughts, Jesus responded in this way: "And he sat down and called the twelve; and he said to them, 'If any one would be first, he must be last of all and servant of all'" (9:35). This points out one of the foremost principles of Christian leadership: your attitude, who you are rather than what you do, determines your ultimate success as a leader. Yet the mentality in which this teaching is couched seems to be a great contradiction. Our concept of noted leaders is that they demonstrate aggressive personalities, not servant-mindedness. Discussing the utter subordination Jesus took upon himself, Foster (1978) notes that the seeming contradictions of Christian teachings with the wisdom of the world are nothing more than a switch from self-servitude to true servanthood. He states:

It is impossible to overstate the revolutionary character of Jesus' life and teaching at this point. It did away with all the claims to privileged position and status. It called into being a whole new order of leadership. The cross-life of Jesus undermined all social orders based on power and self-interest. (p. 101)

What made Christ so revolutionary is not so much that he brought a new perspective to leadership but that it worked. One only has to exist in the world to recognize the far-reaching impact of Christ upon humanity. Why did Jesus' system work? Part of the answer, at least, lies in the fact that he never stopped leading.
This statement is best understood in light of the active and passive elements present in leadership. Jesus Christ exerted great influence when he taught, commanding people's attention and action with the result that "the crowds were astonished at his teaching, for he taught them as one who had authority, and not as their scribes" (Matthew 7:28 & 29). That a leader is effective in planned, public occasions where special effort is taken to perform appropriately and so influence others is only to be expected. But Christ influenced others with equal, if not surpassing, impact at all times and under all circumstances, even while asleep in a storm-tossed boat and in agonizing pain as he hung on a cross (c.f., Mark 4:35-41, John 19). To Christ leadership was not a static, uni-situational activity. For Christ, to be a leader meant to lead, by teaching or by example, in all areas of life; to so embody organization, knowledge, wisdom, conceptual skills, positive direction for action and positive motivation in his own being, that in him leadership might be personified.

The other part of the answer for the success of Christ's leadership lies in the fact that all the personal effort he took and pain he endured was not directed toward his own personal reward or glory. Eims (1975) says, "Jesus came and reversed the direction of service without giving up His leadership" (p. 41). Take special note of the words "the direction of service." Leadership itself was not that which changed but the view of the beneficiary of the service rendered—it was never to be oneself but always another (which ultimately glorifies God; cf., Berkhof, 1939, p. 541:
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"Whatever their (i.e., man's works) proximate aim may be, their final aim is not the welfare of man, but the glory of God, which is the highest conceivable aim to man's life, I Corinthians 10:31; Romans 12:1; Colossians 3:17,23.").

An interesting aspect of this concept is that not all—only a very few—have the apparent ability to lead but yet the essence of Christian leadership is service and in this sense everyone can be a leader for all can serve. Though a person's background, qualifications, desires or fears may vary greatly in depth, scope or variety, the individual may still serve and serve well. By approaching leadership with this frame of mind those who have an aversion to standing in a formal leadership position may find their unfounded qualms dissipated as they begin to exert more positive influence in their organization and in the lives of those around them. Perhaps the only difference, then, between the designated leader and the designated follower is the extent to which one organizes or supervises the work of others.

Responsibility to God

Because of the Christian belief that all of life is meaningful and purposeful and that one's occupation is as much appointed by God as achieved through human endeavor, the responsibility assumed in leading is accompanied by a responsibility to lead. This dual nature of leadership holds the individual accountable not only to carry out the leadership task in an effective manner but to become involved whenever and wherever the individual's influence could be a
factor in the positive development of people, tasks and organizations.

The belief that such behavior is expected and can be operationalized at this point in history is influenced through the scriptures where, from its opening to its closing pages, accounts are recorded of ordinary people who were given extraordinary gifts (i.e., abilities and opportunities) so that the will of God in history might be accomplished (e.g.: Noah, Genesis 6-9; Moses, Exodus 1-Deuteronomy 34; Deborah, Judges 4-5; Esther, Esther 1-10; David, I Samuel 15-I Kings 2; Peter, Acts 2-12; Paul, Acts 13-28). The Christian, who sees God as never changing in character or purpose (cf., Hebrews 13:8, James 1:17) and the scriptures as true and applicable for all time (cf., II Timothy 3:16) accepts God's call for responsible leadership as commensurate with the purposes of one's life in the world today.

Engstrom (1983) defines leadership as an extension of stewardship:

As an individual, I have the responsibility of stewardship for all that God has given me—my life, my family, my potential. If I squander them away either by dissipation or disregard, I can hardly expect God's approving words, "Well done, good and faithful servant" (Matt. 25:21). Therefore, I choose to seek the visions, the plans, the revelations of God's opportunities. (p. 147)

Engstrom describes leaders as individuals who do not merely content themselves to receive what they consider "God's blessings" but who also actively seek to apply and integrate these into their lives and work. Responsibility to God entails a great drive and desire to utilize one's abilities in taking advantage of any situation to
provide positive influence and growth in oneself and others.

An inhibition to effective leadership—fear of failure—is eliminated by approaching leadership as, primarily, responsibility to God. Engstrom (1982) summarizes various biblical teachings when he states that "God does not expect perfection: He expects obedience. And through obedience He can turn failures into triumphs" (p. 45).

For Christian leadership to be truly Christian a knowledge about God must be accompanied by a relationship with God. This is the essence of the spiritual dimension. Proceeding from the low end to the high end of this dimension is not solely an intellectual process: the psyche and spirit are involved as well. Not only is this essential in order to establish a true spiritual relationship or character, it is essential if one is to receive the full benefit that accompanies this relationship. Eims (1975) describes the relationship in this manner: "God Himself is our source of power, but fellowship with God is that which 'throws the switch,' and makes that power operative and effective in our lives" (p. 16).

One's ability to "throw the switch" is directly related to one's spiritual maturity. In fact, this theory holds that progress toward the optimal levels of each of the three dimensions is directly related to the maturation of the individual (cf., Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). The section which follows integrates the three dimensions and shows their characteristics and relationships in the light of the concept of maturity.
A Three-Dimensional Perspective

The previous sections provided an explanation of the three components of the Christian leadership theory individually and gave the rationale for including each in the theory. Each dimension was noted as having optimal manifestations as well as high and low extremes. The presentation which follows describes first the composite nature of the dimensions and their interrelationships with each other and with the concept of maturity, and then proceeds, secondly, to a presentation of the nature and consequences of the low and high extremes of each dimension and the results of optimal behavior in each dimension.

The Composite Components

The model chosen to represent the components of the theory is designed as a cube (see Figure 8). Each dimension of the cube represents one of the major components: the length of the cube is the technical aspect, the width is the human relations aspect, and the height is the spiritual aspect. In the illustration what has heretofore been termed a "dimension" is called an "orientation." This change in nomenclature indicates that the theory as well as the cube illustration may identify and measure individual and organizational orientations and predispositions to act in a certain characteristic fashion. Transversing the cube from the front, lower left corner to the back, upper right corner is a broken line representing growth in maturity.

The "low" corner of the cube is the common juncture of all
three dimensions. This point represents a complete absence of any orientation to internalize and act along the lines of any of the three dimensions. The numerical equivalent of this point is "0-0-0" (numerical equivalents correspond to each dimension in this order: the first is Technical, the second is Human, and the third is Spiritual). The optimal manifestation of each orientation is shown at the end of each line extending out from the common corner and labeled as the "high" point. The numerical equivalent of this point is "10."

![Three-Dimensional Model Diagram](image)

Figure 8. The Three-Dimensional Model

The combination of high technical, high human, low spiritual (10-10-0) results in the "Optimal Secular" combination. In the secular setting the degree of spiritual orientation of an individual
may be as high as ten but be recorded as zero since this dimension is discounted as being a key variable in the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization. If the leader of a secular organization demonstrates any degree of spiritual orientation it would be understood as influencing the degree of task and human orientation rather than standing as a separate entity in its own right.

The person or organization measuring 10-10-0 places strong emphasis on meeting the organization's goals while at the same time emphasizing the needs and desires of the human work force and product recipients. The emphasis in each dimension is matched by the capability to perform optimally in each area. When the demands of one dimension take precedence over the other a temporary imbalance between the two may exist. The imbalance does provide for the ultimate good of both the human and technical elements and is brought back into proper balance as soon as it is feasible to do so.

The significant departure from secular theory, which focuses on the technical and human dimensions, occurs when emphasis is placed on the spiritual orientation of an individual or organization. This variable may not be critical to leadership in the secular sense but it is vital to leadership in the context of Christian individuals and organizations. For this reason a measure of 10-10-10 is considered optimal and is subtitled "servant-leader" to more fully describe its significance. Assigning a numerical scale to the spiritual dimension directly conveys the impression that spirituality is quantifiable. This is not strictly the case. The
Bible teaches that no person truly knows the spirituality of another person, that only God is capable of this understanding (cf., I Corinthians 2:11, I Samuel 16:7). What the scale reflects, rather, is the relatively consistent behavior and attitude of people with regard to expected behavior and attitude as outlined in the scriptures. This approach is analogous to scientists determining the existence of sub-atomic particles on the basis of their "tracks," i.e., the traces of where they have traveled, because the particles themselves cannot be seen or isolated. A direct biblical parallel with this approach is seen in Matthew 7:20 where Jesus Christ described the process of spiritual evaluation in the context of discerning between true and false prophets: "Thus you will know them by their fruits (i.e., the results of their actions)." The approach taken to measure a person's spiritual orientation appears in Chapter Four.

Using the 3-D Model

The purpose of the theory and model is to promote the synthesis of existing knowledge in a certain manner in order to encourage the conceptualization and application of elements essential to the training of Christian leaders and the running of Christian organizations. The normative nature of the theory influences this purpose to the extent that the possibility is precluded that some organizations or leaders may require, as a rule, only a certain degree of any given dimension or dimensions (e.g., 7-7-7) in order to achieve optimal performance for the task at hand or in the
situation encountered. This point is, however, a moot one since the emphasis in the theory is on thinking, feeling and acting in the highest manner possible so that lesser levels of orientation (though they be sufficient for immediate and forseen needs) are always held in perspective by the higher. In this way contentment with the status quo and inability to respond at higher levels when necessary are held in abeyance.

Synchronicity and Motivation: The Epoxy Cement

Held in deference to this point in the development of the theory is the consideration of extreme manifestations of the technical, human and spiritual orientations. In the context of this theory extreme behavior is directly equated with maturity: the more extreme the orientation or behavior the less mature the individual or organization is considered to be. Greater degrees of maturity lead to a greater probability of optimal results.

The latter placement of this topic is not to be construed as giving diminished importance to what is to follow for an understanding of the negative impact of extreme orientations in organizations is critical to optimal achievement. Accompanying the concept is another which helps form a bonding agent which holds the dimensions of the theory together. This concept, synchronicity, will be explained shortly. First, consider the outcome of extreme orientations and behaviors.

Figure 9 illustrates the three dimensions and labels their extreme points. Each dimension is represented by a single "wave"
with the wave peak being the optimal point of orientation (labeled "high" in Figure 8). The left-hand "trough" is considered the "low extreme" manifestation (labeled "low" in Figure 8) and the right-hand trough is considered "high extreme" (not represented in the cube illustration).

The low extremes tend to be directed inward toward the individual or organization. They connote inability, lack of desire or calculated avoidance with regard to thinking or acting along the lines of any particular dimension.

The nomenclature and the definitions given in the text which follows are unique to the presentation of the concepts of synchronicity. The terms do not necessarily reflect the same meanings as readers might understand in the popular usage of the words.

The low extreme of the technical dimension is labeled "laissez-faire" and represents withdrawal from goal setting, organization and goal achievement. The attitude held is one of letting things happen as they will with little regard for the results.

The low extreme of the human dimension, labeled "hermit," conveys the sense that there is no inclination toward the cultivation of relationships with human beings nor toward their welfare. The individual or organization in this position views the self as all-important and self-preservation and growth more a matter of avoiding or contending against human beings than in working with them.
In the spiritual dimension the low extreme is known as "agnostic." In this position the individual places no emphasis upon nor recognizes any value in seeking out the existence of a supernatural being—God—nor in establishing a relationship with this being. Jesus Christ is recognized as a historical figure without a divine nature whose teachings have some moral value but no bearing on "eternity".

The intervals leading from the low extreme to the point of optimal orientation represent increasing awareness of and ability with the elements pertinent to the particular dimension. Leading down the wave from the optimal to the high extreme point are intervals which signify an increasing tendency to be aware of and
emphasize skills in only one particular dimension. This behavior is termed "single-plane orientation" and is characterized by an emphasis on one orientation to the exclusion of all else. While it is possible for an entity to register numerical equivalents of "0" in each of the orientations on the low end of the scale, it is impossible to do so at the high extreme end.

In the technical dimension the high extreme behavior tends toward bureaucracy. The organization with its systems, means and goals is valued above all else. The principal danger of this extreme lies in its philosophy that the end justifies the means. The value system it espouses precludes consideration of the worker's individual cultural, moral, social and religious background unless such can be used by the organization for its own purposes.

The high extreme of the human dimension is "humanism." In this instance awareness of and concern for people gains an added emphasis on accommodating the physical and psychological needs and desires of individuals while holding little regard for structural implications or spiritual guidelines. The danger of this extreme lies in its negation of absolutes. Principles and rules of behavior and procedure are deemed appropriate in only a general sense and must give way to any unique demands made by human beings as individuals or as a group. Organizational and societal structure must accommodate itself to people rather than people to the structure.

In the spiritual dimension the extreme danger lies in "monasticism." In this case the individual places absolute emphasis on his or her relationship with God. Life in and interaction with
society is disparaged as the individual isolates him or herself from everything in the physical world except that which is absolutely necessary to sustain human life. The negative impact of this orientation lies in creating people that are "so heavenly minded that they are no earthly good." No deliberate leadership is provided by people in this extreme so it does, in effect, cease to be a factor contributing toward leadership.

Occasional "extreme" behavior is not considered negative in that the number and depth of occurrences, be they limited, do not reflect an extreme orientation. Indeed, acting in the extreme may be the most propitious step to take in a given situation. A leader of a Christian organization, for example, may be well advised to withdraw from the demands of the technical and human aspects of work in order to "get back in tune" spiritually. Such a foray into the realm of monasticism is acceptable if its end is not in itself but in seeking to enhance one's perspective and abilities in all three dimensions. The same is true for the technical and human dimensions as well.

The numerical scale as applied to the extreme orientations is shown in Figure 10. The scale may be superimposed horizontally or vertically and differs from the cube scale only in that the numbers continue, in diminishing order, to the right of the point of optimal orientation. To distinguish the low extreme numbers from the high extreme a letter is placed before the number: "L" for low extreme and "H" for high extreme. Thus, by way of example, a person scoring "L0" in the human dimension would be considered to have a "hermit"
orientation.
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Figure 10. Extreme Manifestations

The relationship between extreme behavior and maturity in this theory works on the declaration that people who can maintain a balanced approach to life are better equipped to perceive and act because they take into consideration all the variables of life. This concept is advanced by Katz (1955) who determined that effectual leaders have conceptual skills. By this Katz means the ability to distinguish the important variables in a situation and to be able to work with them in concert in order to arrive at the desired end. In the theory of Christian leadership the most mature individual is the one who is labeled "servant-leader." A lesser emphasis in any of the dimensions would mean the individual is not as mature as she or he might be. A stronger emphasis—that is, toward the high extreme—means that the individual has matured further in a certain dimension but only at the cost of diminished effectiveness in the others.

Synchronicity

Synchronicity is a term used to reinforce the concept that the
greater the extent to which the simultaneous application of all three dimensions is evidenced the greater the likelihood the effort expended will occur in an effective and efficient manner. This is not to say that all three dimensions must be equally employed but that the total implication of each dimension must be considered prior to and during any activity. Indeed, effectiveness results from choosing the appropriate response to a given situation: it would not be in order, for example, to address a technical problem solely through spiritual means.

The illustration in Figure 11 shows that a combination of greater synchronicity with least extreme orientation results in the highest level of effectiveness, efficiency and appropriateness for the organization and leader.

(smaller gap = greater effectiveness)

Figure 11. Synchronicity

Potential Weaknesses

The theory as it has been presented is strictly normative. An ideal was set forth which the theory holds to be the most superior characterization that could be attributed to a person or organization. Yet, there are certain pitfalls which, though they may be present in any setting, are particularly prone to exist in
Christian environments. The following introduction of these pitfalls concerns those which occur in the organization as a whole as well as with those which pertain more to the individual leader. By understanding these potential areas of danger the effective leader will be able to anticipate their occurrence and plan appropriately to resolve them.

A Delicate Advantage

The high motivation with which Christians enter into their work (as discussed earlier) and the mind-set of the Christian organization can create an environment which can be surpassed by none. This apparent advantage can be offset by the very principles that make this environment possible: the worker in this setting may be expected to labor more while receiving less compensation than would be acceptable in the secular world. Christian employees enter into their occupations with this expectation in mind (a result of the "spiritual calling" they perceive) but the uncertainty of a person's level of tolerance or maturity make the leader's human relations abilities a delicate issue. On the one hand the leader might expect more from the workers and receive favorable responses from them but on the other hand the leader may unwittingly push them too far without realizing a subtle resistance building up in the workers until some aspect of the system breaks down.

Two circumstances lead to unequal expectations. First, leaders become leaders in an organization for many reasons but primary among them is their zeal to do the work they believe God called them to
do. In their hearts, minds and spirits they view no other task as more challenging, rewarding and meaningful in the long run than that in which they are engaged. To call their particular occupations "work" would be meaningless for the tasks which they enter into surpass that connotation. They look upon what they do with joyful passion and eager anticipation. Difficulty with this frame of mind is encountered when the leader takes for granted that the subordinates share the same zeal as their leader to accomplish particular organizational goals. That they might not should not be a critical reflection on the subordinates. Their priorities may be legitimately directed toward any number of different aspects of the organization or in their private lives.

Levels and direction of zeal can differ greatly between superiors and subordinates. Leaders should temper demands for extra service with opportunities for extra service. By so doing, leaders can lessen the occasions for resentment and increase opportunities for subordinates to take pride in extra service when they see this service coming from their own self-motivation rather than as imposed upon them from the outside. Leaders are more apt to see subordinates catch and emulate the leader's zeal as they begin to sense the psychological and spiritual rewards inherent in "going beyond the call of duty."

The second contributing factor leading to neutralizing any advantage in the Christian system lies in the tendency of the workers, because of their Christian ideology, to allow their personal rights to be compromised to a certain degree. The advice
given in such biblical texts as James 1:19—"Let every man be quick to hear, slow to speak, slow to anger"—and Philippians 2:14—"Do all things without grumbling or questioning"—(see also Romans 12:9-21 and Matthew 5) are taken by Christians as guidance to avoid conflict and bear "suffering" for the sake of their ultimate allegiance, God, if not for the sake of the organization and its leader(s) themselves. The leader may come to see the extra expectations placed upon the subordinates as the new norm while the subordinates continue to view their favorable response as exceeding the norm. The greater the disparity between these two views the greater the potential for sudden and unexpected conflict. If and when this happens the leader may interpret the subordinates' behavior as insubordinate and even unChristian while the subordinates themselves view their actions as nothing more than reestablishing the original norm. The effective leader will circumvent such occurrences by keeping the lines of communication open so as to be aware of and sensitive to the subordinates as a group and as individuals. Rather than allow frustration to be the motivation for subordinates' communication the leader can purposely create an atmosphere where the sharing of feelings and ideas is an acceptable as well as expected activity.

Dreams and Details

Directly related to the above is the possibility of Christian leaders enjoying their work to the extent that they get so caught up in their vision for the organization that they neglect the
day-to-day operational details of the organization. The possibility may also exist that the leader be a "detail person" by nature and tend to neglect the larger picture of the general goals and challenges of the organization. Though people do have pet projects at times, leaders should keep a balanced approach in running the organization. The Bible considers both to be of great value. Proverbs 29:18 shows the worth of long-range goals when it states "Where there is no vision, the people perish" (KJV) and a parable of Christ recorded in Matthew 25 shows the importance of caring over smaller matters: "His master said to him, 'Well done, good and faithful servant; you have been faithful over a little, I will set you over much" (verse 21). Leaders constantly evaluate the balance in their work lives and, if they find themselves consistently neglecting to perform in a certain area, correct the imbalance in their own person or bring in people who can compliment their weak area.

Judgments

Leaders in Christian organizations may be reluctant to confront inappropriate work, behavior or attitudes on the part of their subordinates because of the negative value the Bible seems to give to such practice (e.g., Matthew 7:1, "Judge not that you be not judged."). As a result nonproductive effort on the part of the workers is tolerated as the leader strives to avoid judging a fellow-Christian. Mediocre work and sub-achievement become the norm in such situations. In these cases leaders should remember that
there is a significant difference between judging a person's character or spirituality and judging that person's work. Also, the manner in which the critique takes place is important: the goal of the criticism should not be self-serving and the means through which it takes place should instill respect and confidence in the individual being critiqued.

The biblical perspective is on positive guidance: if one sees a person not performing in the manner desired, rather than criticize the person's (in)competence, show the person better ways of carrying the work out. There is no injunction in the scriptures to avoid encouraging others to excellence in performance. The exact opposite is true. The passage in Hebrews 10:24—"consider how to stir up one another to love and good works"—is exemplary of the approach Christians are to take in their interrelationships at work as well as at home. Effective leaders will be seen as encouragers rather than as judges.

Competition

Christian leaders may be reticent in allowing competition to exist in the organization out of fear that "one-upmanship" may infringe upon the company philosophy of mutual respect and cooperation. The perspective that competition is an unhealthy attribute in Christian organizations results from a one-sided view as to the origin and consequences of competitive behavior.

Competition is viewed as a negative attribute when it is seen as an effort by people to secure a limited resource or reward for
themselves and that in order to do so other people must be displaced or made to appear inferior. But competition did not become a characteristic of western civilization on this basis. Indeed, competition may degenerate into a cut-throat affair where unfair advantage is sought but its primary characteristic is that it motivates people to superior performance and productivity. In this sense competition is biblically acceptable. Romans 12:10 speaks of outdoing others in showing honor and so sets a positive direction for competition. II Timothy 4:7 records St. Paul's words, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith," and shows that a "spirit of competition" may mark a person's inner struggles (competitions) as well as those the person experiences with others.

If competition is kept in biblical perspective the feared negative outcome based on fighting for scarce resources and rewards is a moot point. The Bible states that God's resources and rewards, in both the physical and spiritual realms, are limitless and freely given (cf., James 1:5, Luke 22:35, Ephesians 3:20). No matter how many people are in the "competition," they will all receive more than their expectations. The effective Christian leader will seek ways to promote the positive impact of competition rather than ignore or despise it.

Summary

In this chapter the importance of perceiving leadership as a tri-dimensional process composed of technical, human and spiritual
elements was explained. A rationale for including each of the three elements as necessary aspects of Christian leadership theory was given. The benefits as well as the potential drawbacks of the theory were described and direction for implementing the theory was suggested. Chapter Four delineates the method by which the theory was tested.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to set forth a theoretical framework that would serve as a step toward a fuller understanding of Christian leaders and organizations. This framework could function as a guide for the training and evaluation of Christian leaders and the evaluation of Christian organizations. Since the theory presents a new combination of Christian and secular principles, an evaluation was directed at assuring its greatest possible representativeness of and utility to Christian leaders and organizations of differing objectives and denominational memberships. The specific approach which was used in accomplishing the above is delineated below.

Overview of Methodology

The study was two-fold. The first effort was the gathering of expert opinion on the theological soundness of the theory and the utility it might have in the world of Christian organizations. This review was carried out by individuals noted for their expertise in the field of Christian leadership and by those involved in formulating leadership and management theory (see "Population").

The second and ancillary part of the study analyzed the extent to which the model could discriminate between the manifestations of
technical, human and spiritual behavior as outlined in Chapter Three. To address this purpose a survey was conducted in four different types of organizations (see Figure 12). They were categorized according to their "excellence" and their being Christian or secular organizations. A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized for analyzing the data generated in this study. The organizations in Quadrant I (Q.I) represent above-average secular organizations (see "Population" for the method used to choose these organizations and those that follow in the other quadrants), those in Quadrant II (Q.II) represent average secular organizations, those in Quadrant III (Q.III) represent above-average Christian organizations, and those in Quadrant IV (Q.IV) represent average Christian organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secular</td>
<td>Q.I</td>
<td>Q.II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Q.III</td>
<td>Q.IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Sample Groups

The survey given in the four categories of organizations (see "Instrumentation") was directed toward ascertaining the theory's ability to discriminate the technical, human and spiritual orientations of each organization's chief executive officer (CEO).
The survey instrument was distributed to subordinates who rated their CEO's on the degree to which he or she was perceived as embodying the characteristics ascribed in the instrument to each of the three orientations. The data thus generated were used to refine the theory and its instrumentation.

Population

Organizations

For the process of expert review it was not necessary to select organizations but in the companion research aimed at determining a CEO's technical, human and spiritual orientations individual organizations provided the appropriate setting for the survey that took place. The effort directed toward the appropriate selection of organizations concentrated on the formation of four groups: top-rated secular organizations, top-rated Christian organizations, less favorably rated secular organizations and less favorably rated Christian organizations. The purpose of these categories was to provide contrast between secular and Christian organizations and between more effective and less effective organizations as defined on the following pages.

The terminology applied in identifying the non-excellent organizations is being used nominally, not pejoratively. "Non-excellent" organizations are not to be interpreted as "inferior." Their selection and identifying nomenclature served only to provide a sample population which was somehow distinct from those organizations which were selected as outstanding by the
publications mentioned below. Deliberation of the criteria used in the selection of these and the other organizations follows.

In the selection of the "excellent" organizations choosing the "best" organizations was not critical but only that those chosen be reasonably in the society of the top-rated. The study was not concerned with determining which organizations were most excellent. The organizations served only as a testing medium for the theory herein presented and not as the focal or end point of the study.

**Excellent Secular**

To choose the organizations in the study the multistage cluster sampling method was used. The initial group from which the top secular organizations (Q.I) were drawn were those listed in *The 100 Best Companies to Work for in America* (Levering, Moskowitz & Katz, 1985). This source of organizations was chosen because it lists the top-rated companies on criteria other than earnings—a basic tenet of being that excellence in leadership involves more than the ability to establish positive economic growth. Twenty organizations were drawn using a random numbers table.

**Excellent Christian**

The criterion used for determining the top-rated Christian organizations (Q.III) was the extent to which their work and ministry was recognized by Christians in North America. This method was settled on because there were no lists known to the author that ranked Christian organizations according to their effectiveness or
excellence in leadership. The rationale by which the method chosen was instituted was based on the assumption that in order to gain the status of a nationally recognized organization the leadership of that organization must possess a high degree of "excellence" in order to attract and manage the resources necessary to carry out the national or global ministry of the organization. A clear limitation of this study was that organizations which were excellent but more obscure in their public profile were excluded from the study.

To choose twenty top-rated Christian organizations a list of nationally recognized Christian organizations was compiled through consultation with leaders of Christian organizations in the geographic area in which this dissertation was written. The possibility that the list might have been myopic or prejudicial as a result of it being created by people residing in the same area was considered to be of inconsequential importance to this study. The homogeneity and fraternity of people involved in Christian organizations allow for their awareness and understanding of Christian organizations headquartered in the United States and Canada which minister on a national and international basis.

Contact was made with the Christian leaders in this group by means of letter, telephone conversation and personal interview. Each was requested to name at least ten organizations (they were encouraged to name more) which he or she viewed as excellent according to his or her own personal criteria. Suggestions for organizations were made generally by type (e.g., hospital, mission agency, publishing house) and specifically by name. The responses
were compiled and the twenty most frequently named organizations provided part of the sample group for the study.

**Average Secular**

The twenty original organizations chosen for Quadrant II came from a random selection of organizations listed in the Fortune 500 group. This source was appropriate for this study because the primary criterion for Fortune 500 selection is economic stature. Since the variables under study went beyond profit-making the Fortune 500 represented a group distinct from the concept of excellence as presented in this dissertation. Organizations from the selection population for Quadrant I which also appeared in the population for Quadrant II were withdrawn from the latter population so as to keep the groups distinct.

Only one organization in this group responded favorably to completing the questionnaire. Follow-up phone calls to every nonresponding organization provided no favorable results. For this reason the selection criteria for the organizations composing the sample set for Q.II were reformulated in order to obtain a sample set more receptive to participating in the study.

The first criterion for the new sample set was that the organizations be divisions of Fortune 500 organizations or that they operate on a national level as organizations in their own right. The basis for this decision was that organizations of this stature would have well-established lines of authority and communications operating in a setting where a multiplicity of personality types and
task differentiation would make them a sufficiently close parallel to the original organizations that were selected.

The second criterion was that the organizations must be located in the general geographic area where the researcher held residence. This criterion was chosen to enable the researcher to use personal contact to help persuade people to join the study. The organizations were chosen by random selection from a list of organizations which fit the criteria listed above. These organizations were contacted first by either personal appearance or telephone in order to ascertain their willingness to participate in the study. Of the ten organizations contacted eight responded positively. The sample size was left at eight since it was within the parameters of the study criteria.

Average Christian

The second list of Christian organizations in the study (Q.IV) was drawn from U.S. Nonprofit Organizations in Development Assistance Abroad (Boynes, 1983) and from Mission Handbook: North American Protestant Ministries Overseas (Dayton, 1976) by means of a random numbers table. Any organization selected in this manner which also appeared in the population for Q.III was replaced by drawing a substitute at random from the same directory. Twenty organizations were so selected.
Respondents

Expert Reviewers

Twenty people were requested to carry out the review and critique of the theory summary. Representation of Christian and secular leadership theorists and practitioners was sought for this group though an exact balance of such representation was not considered critical to the task being performed. The respondents were selected from names suggested by people contacted during the course of this dissertation and from the bibliography herein contained.

The individuals who critiqued the theory summary were not given anonymity because their work centered on evaluating an original theory in which they held no stake. Also, recognition of these individuals served to add validity and authority to the comments made and recorded in the study.

Questionnaire Recipients

The principal individual chosen to respond to the questionnaire in the second study was the Director of Personnel (or equivalent) of each organization. This person was also requested to distribute a copy of the questionnaire to a peer in another department and to a general office secretary. This approach was taken with the expectation that if the Director of Personnel was interested in and supported the study then his or her personal authority and influence might help guarantee a response from the others. Each respondent
was provided with a self-addressed, stamped envelope (SASE) to help guarantee the privacy of each one's response.

Though a response from each of the three individuals was desired, a partial return of two out of three from each organization was originally established as the minimum. This was done on the basis that a single return might become its own standard. Having at least one other perspective on the same individual could give either greater corroboration or a more exact balance to the actual behavior in which the CEO engaged. Because of the ability of the statistical package used (SPSS) to accept partial data and construct reliability coefficients from limited input, to accept a single return from any organization was practical and beneficial to the study. For a full explanation of the procedure used please refer to the SPSS (Nie, 1975) manual, "Missing Values Card," pages 57-59.

Since each questionnaire recipient rated another individual's behavior as she or he perceived it, anonymity of response was required for this sample group. The individual questionnaires carried a code number as the only means of identifying source. The surveyor alone kept an identification code key. On the questionnaire a space for specifying the respondent's position in the organization was provided. This item served as verification of proper distribution of the instrument in the organization by the director of personnel and as the means of indentifying individuals who requested feedback on the results of the survey.
Instrumentation

There were two objectives in analyzing the theory of Christian leadership. The first was to determine the theoretical adequacy of the material herein presented. The second was to determine if the theory and model could indeed discriminate between secular and Christian leadership and between excellent and less than excellent (hereafter referred to as "average") leadership.

Theory Summary

For the first objective a summary of the theory and a presentation of the model (see Appendix A) were distributed to a select group of people (see "Population"). This summary was eight pages in length and emphasized the theory itself over the background and problem statement leading up to the theory. In addition to the summary a set of guide questions generated by the surveyor was included to lead the respondents into the main areas of concern regarding the theory. The questions related to the principal criteria for theory acceptability: that the theory be practical, researchable and able to make a positive contribution to the worlds of theory and practice. Specific questions were added which were directed toward the theological soundness of the theory.

Opportunity was given the respondents to openly comment upon and edit the theory in areas they deemed pertinent. They were encouraged to write comments on the summary itself as well as on the questionnaire form. As an incentive and token of appreciation five dollars in the form of a check was included with the summary and its
related material.

**Questionnaire**

The second objective, concerning the discriminatory power of the theory, was carried out in the context of both Christian and secular organizations (see "Population"). The question "Is there a difference between good leadership and good Christian leadership?" was addressed in an effort to distinguish between secular and Christian leadership and average and excellent leadership. The instrument used in this context (see Appendix E) was constructed by the surveyor to determine the levels of technical, human and spiritual orientations the individual leader was perceived as demonstrating.

**Questionnaire Packet**

The contents of the packet of materials sent to each Director of Personnel included one cover letter, three questionnaires, three SASE's and three amateur balloon sculpture kits which were used to attract attention and as a token of gratitude for responding to the questionnaire.

**Questionnaire Construction Technique**

The procedure used to construct the instrument followed the approach suggested by Carmines and Zeller (1979) and Kerlinger (1964) concerning the content validity of tests. Their recommended review of the literature resulted in finding several significant
behaviors as manifestations of technical, human and spiritual orientations. The literature references and their associated behaviors are listed in Appendix F. While the domain of behaviors associated with technical, human and spiritual orientations was quite extensive only a limited number of items was sought for each orientation in order to construct a test that could be completed in a short amount of time. Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1972) cautioned that a shortened test would adversely influence the reliability of the instrument. On the other hand, Carmines and Zeller state that adding additional items reaches a point of diminishing returns and may have little influence upon the alpha level used in the correlation procedures regarding test reliability. Ary et al. and Carmines and Zeller do agree that the issue is reduced to a judgement call by the developer of the instrument. Their advice that content validity procedures be supplemented by construct validity procedures as a more accurate test of reliability was followed. This material appears later in the chapter.

From the items derived out of the review of literature a sample test was constructed (see Appendix G). The sample was distributed for critical review by twelve experts in the field of organizational leadership. Three of these people were from Western Michigan University's Department of Management, three were from Western Michigan University's Department of Educational Leadership, and six were practitioners (upper-level managers or presidents) in major, local organizations or institutions. Eleven of the twelve people responded to the request for the critical review.
From the expert critique of the test content a new instrument was constructed (see Appendix H) and pre-tested. Four sample groups of ten people each were assigned roles: Group 1 as members of an excellent Christian organization, Group 2 as members of an average Christian organization, Group 3 as members of an excellent secular organization, and Group 4 as members of an average secular organization. The role descriptions for each group are located in Appendix H. The responses from the sample groups were tabulated. The mean scores were calculated for each item for each test group, for each orientation (technical, human and spiritual) for each test group, and for each test group across all three orientations.

To determine if the test instrument was able to discriminate between the four test groups, subscale means were calculated and then compared with the expected mean scores. The result of this pre-test and the ability to determine its effectiveness on the basis of means comparison may have been the result of the diversity of the role descriptions. Ary et al. (1972) point out that "reliability is in part a function of group heterogeneity." (p. 209) In any case, the relevant factors were weighed by the researcher and the judgement to proceed was made.

The final form of the test instrument (Appendix E) was constructed by randomly ordering the test items and rephrasing six of them (two from each orientation) so that they would describe a negative presence of a particular behavior. A space was provided in front of each item on the questionnaire where the respondent could mark with a number (one through five) the degree to which he
or she perceived the chief executive officer as demonstrating the behavior. The following is a sample item from the test:

6. Evaluates organizational goals. Assesses goals to determine if the goals are still valid.

Thirty behaviors were listed on the instrument: twelve technical related, ten human related and eight spiritual related. Each respondent was offered a copy of summary results from the study plus the surveyor's availability to them by letter, phone or personal meeting should any so desire.

Data Collection

Theory Summary Critique

The analysis carried out by those studying the theory summary was returned to the surveyor in a self-addressed, stamped envelope provided by the surveyor. The respondents were instructed to include all materials upon which they had listed comments. Follow-up letters (see Appendix C) were sent to those whose comments had not been received within the specified time frame (see below) in order to encourage them to comply with the request for their input.

The amount of time allotted for this process was four weeks from the date of the mailing to the respondents to the date of the receipt of their critiques. The follow-up letter was mailed where needed at the end of the third week. Responses were accepted up until the time of the final computation and analysis of the data though no extra effort was made to secure these responses.

Of the twenty people contacted seven (35%) responded with a
critique of the theory, seven (35%) declined the request and six (30%) did not respond in any manner to the original mailing or to the follow-up letter sent to them. The individuals not giving a critique either returned the five dollar check given them or left it uncashed. Of the seven who did respond five represented Christian organizations and two represented secular universities. Some of these individuals returned the check with their response. A list of the participating individuals appears in Chapter Five and in Appendix B.

**Questionnaires**

The questionnaire used in the companion research was mailed with a SASE to each of the individuals selected for this phase of the study. Follow-up to each nonresponding organization in sample groups where less than 20% of the organizations responded occurred by phone call three weeks after the questionnaires were mailed. Eighteen calls were made but none yielded further responses to the questionnaire. Table 1 shows the breakdown of responses by organizational type and Table 2 shows the breakdown of responses within each organizational type.
Table 1
Response Rates from Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Number of Organizations Participating</th>
<th>Number of Organizations Declining Participation</th>
<th>Number of Organizations Not Responding</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Secular</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Secular</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Christian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Christian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures exclude the sample group that was dropped due to lack of response. The figures for this group would be 2, 3, 15 & 20, respectively.

Data Analysis

Analysis of Expert Review Material

The treatment of the responses on the theory summary was carried out by means of qualitative analysis on the content of the comments. The comments were summarized and recorded under the name of the individual who made them (see Appendix B) and then categorized according to the subject area of their content and presented in succinct form (see Chapter Five, "Qualitative Analysis"). This input was used in two ways: first, to help establish the soundness, practicality and theological acceptability of the theory and, second, to suggest areas for refinement of and
further research for the theory as a follow-up study to this study.

Table 2
Response Distribution within Each Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Number</th>
<th>Excellent Secular</th>
<th>Average Secular</th>
<th>Excellent Christian</th>
<th>Average Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DR*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NR**</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses

*DR = Declined Responding
**NR = No Response
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Analysis of Theory's Discriminatory Power

The principal information gathered from this analysis was used to support the practical application of the Theory of Christian Leadership to the extent that it is feasible to discern and measure an individual's orientation in technical, human and spiritual areas.

Reliability

The reliability of the test instrument was ascertained by means of item analysis. The mean scores of each category of organization for each item were recorded and used to give an overall view of the results of the survey. From a general analysis of the means some items were recognizable as possibly unreliable. To follow-up on this, the interitem correlation coefficients for the technical, human and spiritual elements were calculated and then used to identify items with low correlations to the other items in the same group. Next, an analysis of the reliability coefficients was carried out using the Internal Consistency Method and Cronbach's alpha (Carmines and Zeller, 1979). The items which consistently appeared as unreliable across these three analyses were recognized. Possible explanations for their low scores on reliability were given.

Consideration was given to the fact that reliability coefficients derived from a single organizational type would be lower since it is more difficult for a measuring instrument to detect differences among individuals in a homogeneous group than to detect differences among individuals in a heterogeneous group.
Validity

A test of content validity was carried out in the construction of the test (see "Instrumentation") which was followed by a second analysis to determine whether the instrument could discriminate between types (Christian and secular) and qualities (excellent and average) of organizations. This was done by calculating three two-way analyses of variance: one ANOVA being calculated for each of the technical, human and spiritual variables for each type of organization. The purpose of the ANOVA was to discover how much variance in one attribute was independent of another. The null hypotheses tested appear below:

Hypothesis 1: There is no difference in a CEO's technical behavior (skills) between Christian and secular organizations.

Hypothesis 2: There is no difference in a CEO's technical behavior (skills) between excellent and average organizations.

Hypothesis 3: There is no difference in a CEO's human behavior (skills) between Christian and secular organizations.

Hypothesis 4: There is no difference in a CEO's human behavior (skills) between excellent and average organizations.

Hypothesis 5: There is no difference in a CEO's spiritual behavior (skills) between Christian and secular organizations.

Hypothesis 6: There is no difference in a CEO's spiritual behavior (skills) between excellent and average organizations.

The results of the ANOVA on the hypotheses were evaluated at the .05 level of significance.
Summary

The methodology shown in this chapter was designed to evaluate the theory on a qualitative basis and the test instrument on a statistical basis. This dual approach was adopted to address the need for and workability of a unique theory of Christian leadership and to ascertain the extent to which a reliable and valid instrument could be developed to discern and quantify the orientations addressed in this study. The results of these analyses are presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

Introduction

The findings the study was designed to obtain fell into two categories: qualitative and statistical. The qualitative effort verified the utility of the model to the extent that it could help train and evaluate of leaders in Christian organizations. The theological soundness of combining "spirituality" with the dimensions of technical and human skills was ascertained through the critique. The statistical effort was directed at determining if the model could discern the degree to which an individual's behavior demonstrated technical, human and spiritual skills and so document the model's discriminatory power. The text which follows details the findings made in these two areas.

Qualitative Analysis: Was the Theory Sound?

Distribution and Return

An eight-page summary of the theory (see Appendix A) which included a set of guide questions was distributed to twenty nationally recognized theorists in organizational leadership. Of the twenty people contacted seven (35%) responded with a critique of the theory, seven (35%) declined the invitation to critique and six (30%) did not respond in any manner to the original mailing nor to
the follow-up letter sent to them. Out of the seven who responded five represented Christian organizations and two represented secular universities.

The scope and depth of the individual responses varied but all of the respondents provided insights and suggestions that gave definite direction to and support for the further development of the theory. A list of those who responded follows:

Dr. Chris Argyris from the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Dr. Harold N. Englund (on behalf of Dr. Robert Schuller), Executive Director, Church Relations, Robert Schuller Ministries.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, President, University of Notre Dame.


Mr. Gordon D. Loux (on behalf of Mr. Charles Colson), president, Prison Fellowship.

Dr. Thomas J. Sergiovanni, Lillian Radford Professor of Education, Trinity University.

Dr. Walter C. Wright, Jr., director, Institute for Christian Organizational Development, Fuller Theological Seminary.

A summary of each respondent's comments is shown in Appendix B. In the following pages the comments have been grouped together according to theme. Following each grouping is a reaction concerning the effect and influence the comments have on the leadership theory.
Comments and Suggestions

Meanings of Terminology

Some respondents did not perceive the definition of some terms as sufficiently clear in the context of the summary. Specifically, "human" was seen as being open to interpretation as "secular humanism." If such were the case, the possibility of a secular humanist with a strong value system meeting the criteria of spiritual behavior would be high.

Concomitant with the above was the desire to give greater clarity on what was meant by the term "Christian." The use of this word was seen as too general in definition and application to be of use in focusing the theory into a specific realm. Outside of these two comments the respondents stated that the terminology used was clearly defined and understood.

Reaction. The concern that "secular humanism" could be equated with Christian spirituality is not unfounded. The Bible itself lists characteristics, traits, manifestations, behaviors, evidences and proofs of true, spiritual Christianity which could equally describe an individual who would be a secular humanist with a high value system. Galatians 5:22, for example, lists the fruit (i.e., the actions and attitudes an individual may manifest) of the Spirit as "love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control." The key, discriminatory element which must be considered is that these are not behaviors which, in the performing of them, make a person spiritual or Christian (though
they may make a person a secular humanist with a high value system). These characteristics are, rather, the direct result of a developing understanding of and relationship with God through Jesus Christ, not the means for achieving such a relationship. The instrument which was designed as a part of this study reflected the above concern: the behavioral descriptors for "spiritual" were specifically researched and written to discriminate between spirituality and secular humanism. The success of this effort is documented later in this chapter. For additional input on the differences between secular and Christian value systems, behaviors and "spirit," please refer to Chapter Two, "A Gap in Secular Theory," p. 17.

Further deliberation of the term "Christian" in order to narrow its scope may be useful for application in specific organizations which would desire not only a measure of spiritual behavior but of doctrinal purity (as that organization would define such). An effort was made in this study, however, to avoid sectarianism and denominationalism so that the theory could be developed and tested as a general theory of Christian leadership. Given its validity and utility in a more universal setting, the theory could then be further delimited to meet the needs and philosophies of specific organizations.

That these two terms raised some question may have been the result of individual perspective rather than lack of clarity in the theory. Had the reviewers had an opportunity to study the theory presentation in its entirety the questions may not have arisen. In any case, that these two were the only items brought into question
lends evidence to the intelligibility of the terminology used in the theory.

**Use of Spiritual Dimension**

The addition of a spiritual dimension was seen as a unique, valuable and appropriate contribution to leadership theory. One reviewer in particular described spirituality as a highly critical item to the extent that it was seen as bringing every aspect of life under the lordship of Jesus Christ. Another respondent saw the spiritual element as appropriate only where human values incorporated the concept of "power to serve" over "power to rule." The possibility that "spiritual" could be seen as synonymous with "values" and that "cultural leadership" and "organizational culture" should be studied in connection with this dimension were pointed out. The confusion that could result from these terms lies in the fact that they are all individually internalized standards of behavior which hold many preferred behaviors in common. "Spiritual" would have to be defined in a truly unique way in order to provide contrast with other behavioral standards.

**Reaction.** The support received by these comments is critical in establishing that the spiritual element is not a unique entity apart from the technical and human elements (though it can be observed separately) but that spirituality is an element which permeates all other elements. For the above reason this study has emphasized spirituality as critical to any study of leadership and especially to that in a Christian organization.
The comment regarding "power to serve" versus "power to rule" is one of the foundational points of the theory (see Chapter Three, p. 56, "Servanthood: the Servant-Leader"). Though the theory agrees with this basic concept it does not in any way support the conjecture that the spiritual element is contingent upon human values such as seems to be intimated by the preface to the above comment, "the spiritual element as appropriate only where human values incorporated the concept." As stated earlier, "spiritual" involves more than a well-developed, highly moral value system. If, however, the commentator meant by his statement that the theory of Christian leadership is only appropriate in the context of Christian organizations, then his point may be well taken. The study did not attempt to answer the question of the impact of Christian leadership in secular organizations. The possible influence of such an impact would be appropriate for follow-up research.

The possibility that "spiritual" could be synonymous with "values" and "culture" is a real one. The theory did not preclude that such could be the case. The study, it should be borne in mind, is not focusing upon spirituality as a moral system but as a relationship between humanity and God. The values result from this relationship, not lead to it (see Chapter Three, p. 52, "Spiritual Dimension").

The Trilogy

The simultaneous presence of technical, human and spiritual elements in leadership was widely supported. The distinctions drawn
between these aspects were also supported though there was some caution expressed on viewing these distinctions as matters of degree, not as absolutes. The interrelationships between the three were seen as being in a state of flux since one aspect might be pursued at the expense of the others. Greater deliberation was recommended concerning the impact of the spiritual dimension upon the other two aspects.

Reaction. The theory does provide for utilizing the distinctions between the technical, human and spiritual aspects in the form of degree rather than as absolutes (see Chapter Three, "The Composite Components," p. 63 and "Synchronicity," p. 67). Had this information been included in the theory summary the question may not have arisen. The one respondent's comment does, in any case, support research carried out by other theorists (e.g., Reddin, 1970; Vroom, 1964) that leadership style (the appropriate "mix" of technical, human and spiritual elements as this theory would express it) is subject to the conditions in the environment at any given time. This "contingency" or "situational" approach to leadership is acceptable in the framework of this study, though it is not a major consideration in the development of the theory.

The impact of the spiritual dimension upon the technical and human dimensions is certainly one of great interest and need. Such a study would be appropriate as a step in elaborating upon the theory.

The observations noted in this section all support the existence of "something" which impacts upon leadership which
technical and human dimensions do not and cannot account for.
Different authorities from different backgrounds (e.g., Maslow, 1970; Vroom, 1964; Waitley, 1985) also support the possibility of a critical element which has yet to be fully accounted for and integrated into leadership theory. The present study has taken a step in that direction.

Optimal Manifestations

This aspect of the model generated wider reaction than any other. "Optimal" could be open to question and challenge since effectiveness, as one respondent perceived it, was contingent upon a number of variables outside the realms of the three principal elements under study. In any case, there was support that optimal levels probably did exist and, at the very least, would be a concept worth pursuing. A more thorough explanation of "optimal" was desired in order to give it greater contextual validity.

Reaction. Though outside variables were mentioned as affecting leadership none were given as examples. Perhaps the respondent was referring to such items as social class of employees, the physical location of the organization, size of community in which the organization is located, the current events of the local area, nation and world, etc. Supposing this to be the case, note should be taken that the theory does not purport to account for the multiplicity of variables at work in every conceivable situation. Rather, the aim of the theory is to provide a framework composed of three principal elements (technical, human and spiritual skills)
which characterize the critical skills and perspectives needed to
discern, utilize and capitalize upon the immediate, subsequential
and extenuating variables present in any given situation. Granted,
the theory could deliberate upon this matter to greater extent but
it is still in a developmental stage where its basic tenets must
first be corroborated before expanding into related matters.

The need to provide a fuller explanation of "optimal" could be
fulfilled by a reading of the dissertation itself rather than the
summary. There appears to be, however, enough interest in and
concern about the concepts of synchronicity and optimal
manifestations to warrant a study specifically in this area.

**Extreme Manifestations**

The descriptions of the extreme technical, human and spiritual
behaviors were considered appropriate and adequate though one
respondent did comment that they may be understatements.

**Reaction.** When considering the reaction of the respondents to
the "optimal" concept, to find total agreement on the extreme
manifestations may come with some surprise. If there is a
willingness to set parameters, then why not a mid-point? In light
of the material under "Optimal Manifestations," the answer may be
that a range of behaviors is needed to set boundaries on how one may
react in any particular situation but that defining one (supposedly)
universal form of behavior may be impossible. The degree of
question concerning "optimal" and the degree of support concerning
"extremes" show consistency in thought. The study will have to
undergo future research to redirect and refine the area of optimal manifestations.

**Synchronicity**

The concept of synchronicity was found to be interesting though the suggestion was made that the hypothesis of a "smaller gap" equaling "greater effectiveness" may be incorrect since the relationship could be curvilinear in nature.

**Reaction.** This comment suggests that there may be a point of diminishing returns in the integrated use of technical, human and spiritual skills. The theory provides for this to the extent that it incorporates the concept of "high extreme behavior" (see Chapter Four, "Synchronicity and Motivation: The Epoxy Cement," p. 67). Beyond this no specific study of the possible curvilinear nature of synchronicity took place. A study in this area would be useful in the development of the theory since the construction of an appropriate test would be needed which could acquire additional data for supporting or modifying the theory. Such will be noted as an area for further research.

**Contradictions**

No contradictions in terms and concepts were observed in either theoretical or theological areas.

**Reaction.** This corroborates the findings stated under "Meanings of Terminology," above. The difference between these two
is that the former concerns the significance of individual terms while the latter concerns the significance of concepts. Yet, in both areas the text provided sufficient information to convey the intended meanings and avoided the misuse of the terms and concepts.

**Utility**

There was a high level of support regarding the development and use of the theory and model. The lack of management training in Christian organizations was seen as a problem so that certain aspects of the model would be very helpful as organizational training philosophy is updated. The theory's use as a training and evaluation tool was supported since a "biblical approach" to management was recognized as highly sound and important to Christian organizations. The respondents commented on the theory in general as being important, a good idea, worth pursuing, and greatly needed in the Christian world.

**Reaction.** The comments here supported the findings of the review of literature delineated in Chapter Two. The challenge now is to disseminate this information and support it with such research findings as might come from this and other studies carried out in this area. This emphasis is gaining momentum in the leadership of Christian organizations. In an interview with Gordon MacDonald, president of Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, Kachur (1986) quotes MacDonald as saying:

Today we are in a dramatically changing world that requires new kinds of leadership. The next ten years are going to be unlike any in the history of the world— or the
church. It is going to be a fight for survival, and only those organizations that are defining leadership, priorities, and visions are going to make it. (p. 22)

This study is directed toward answering this need and the step that it has taken in that direction is supported by those who recognize the "gap" in current leadership theory as it is understood and practiced in the Christian world.

One question remains unanswered. The focus of the comments was on the need for this type of research in Christian organizations. Is this concept needed in the secular world as well? Perhaps only when research such as contained in this study begins to take a decisive and influential role and is proved to increase the performance of Christian organizations will the secular world become interested in it.

Comments and Suggestions

Some additional comments were received from the respondents which would affect the depth and scope of the theory. The suggestion was made that the more simple and universal the theory could be kept the greater would be its application. A statement on the identity and position of humankind vis-a-vis God was thought to be helpful. Further reaction came in the highlighting of principles which apply to leadership in general: a strong sense of vision, the ability to choose between options, and a willingness to pay a high price to make one's dream come to pass.

Reaction. The comment that the theory should be kept universal so that it might have greater application is logical, but is it
desirable? The answer to this depends upon the area into which a wider scope would be opened. Should it be universal in the sense of "cross-denominational?" Or universal with regard to secular and Christian organizations? The theory is already open to a cross-denominational stance in that it has avoided dogmatic doctrinal standards of any one denomination. As for a combined secular and Christian application of the theory, that issue has already been addressed above. The desirability for a theory of sweeping application across all possible areas of interest is great. Yet, the focus for the present is to refine and consolidate the theory as a foundation that would be strong enough to support any possible expansion of new concepts and applications. The relationship of humankind with regard to God is explained to a much fuller extent in the body of the study (see Chapter Two, "A Gap in Secular Theory," p. 17).

The final statements concerning the principles of leadership could be summarized as "drive, intelligence and attitude." As such these are not uniquely Christian but the point which ensues is that they must also be Christian and have a part in Christian leadership. One of the faults the study pointed out is that Christian leaders may shy away from terms or concepts simply because they do not "sound" Christian. Further in his interview with MacDonald, Kachur (1986) inquired if there was a relevant model of leadership for today. MacDonald responded:

I suspect it is a business model. I constantly resort to business terminology, while my father used battlefield terminology. We have learned a lot from marketing, sales, and administrative techniques. As long as we don't reduce
the gospel and kingdom to that, we won't be in trouble.

(p. 23)

This is the challenge that Christian organizations must come to terms with. They must be willing to learn from and utilize the "success formulas" of the business world while maintaining their own unique identity. The Christian leadership theory is based on the belief that this challenge can be met with success and benefit to Christian organizations.

Summary of Expert Review Items

The responses of those who critiqued the theory summary varied in emphasis and perspective but were supportive of the theory and its viability as a tool in the training and evaluation of leaders in Christian organizations. There were no significant faults found in the theory as the comments were directed more at seeking clarification on certain points and adjusting the scope of the theory. Many of the issues raised by the respondents could have been resolved had they had the opportunity to study the theory in its entirety.

Statistical Analysis: Did the Instrument Find Differences?

Overview

Though this analysis was considered ancillary to the qualitative analysis of the theory every effort was made to provide data and statistics that were accurate, pertinent and sufficiently informative. The importance of this analysis was in the
contribution it made toward establishing the ability of the theory to discern and measure technical, human and spiritual orientations. To this end a test instrument was developed and administered. The instrument was then evaluated statistically to ascertain its reliability and validity. These procedures are documented below.

Reliability

The purpose of a test of reliability is to establish whether the instrument in question consistently measures what it intends to measure. The data and statistics addressed for this purpose were:
(a) the mean score of each organization on each item of the test,
(b) the interitem correlation coefficients for the technical, human and spiritual variables, (c) the reliability coefficients (alpha) of each test item, and (d) the interrater reliability coefficients.

Mean Scores

Table 3 lists the mean score of each organization for each item on the test. This information was used to give a precursory analysis of the relative differences between groups.

The information in this table was approached with the assumption that individual organizations should score above or below the item mean depending on their organizational type. Accordingly, "Excellent Christian" would score above the item mean on the technical, human and spiritual variables; "Average Christian" would score above on the spiritual variable; "Excellent Secular" would score above on the technical and human variables; and "Average
"Secular" would not score above the mean on any of the three variables. This analysis indicated that the test instrument was discriminating overall but that a problem with items 7, 17, 19, 20, 21, 24 and 30 might exist. The empirical analyses which follow determined the reliability and validity of the test with greater accuracy.

Table 3

Mean Score of Each Organization for Each Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.*</th>
<th>Mean Across Organizations</th>
<th>Excellent Christian</th>
<th>Average Christian</th>
<th>Excellent Secular</th>
<th>Average Secular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>3.7407</td>
<td>4.8542</td>
<td>4.6429</td>
<td>3.0833</td>
<td>2.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 2</td>
<td>4.3210</td>
<td>4.8333</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>4.7500</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 3</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>4.6667</td>
<td>4.4048</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>2.2917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 4</td>
<td>4.0370</td>
<td>4.2500</td>
<td>3.7619</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 5</td>
<td>3.9568</td>
<td>4.3125</td>
<td>3.7143</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>3.7917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 6</td>
<td>4.5617</td>
<td>4.7083</td>
<td>4.3571</td>
<td>4.7500</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 7</td>
<td>3.6358</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>3.7857</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>3.4583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 8</td>
<td>4.3148</td>
<td>4.7083</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>4.5833</td>
<td>4.2083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 9</td>
<td>4.3519</td>
<td>4.9375</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>3.0833</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 10</td>
<td>4.4568</td>
<td>4.7083</td>
<td>4.4286</td>
<td>4.9167</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 11</td>
<td>4.0062</td>
<td>4.1875</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>3.8750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 12</td>
<td>3.8395</td>
<td>4.0833</td>
<td>3.7143</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>3.4583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 13</td>
<td>3.6296</td>
<td>4.7083</td>
<td>4.4286</td>
<td>1.5833</td>
<td>2.8750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 14</td>
<td>3.5309</td>
<td>4.5208</td>
<td>4.6905</td>
<td>2.1667</td>
<td>2.2083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.*</th>
<th>Mean Across Organizations</th>
<th>Excellent Christian</th>
<th>Average Christian</th>
<th>Excellent Secular</th>
<th>Average Secular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 15</td>
<td>2.9259</td>
<td>3.9583</td>
<td>4.5238</td>
<td>1.3333</td>
<td>1.2917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 16</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>4.5417</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.8333</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 17</td>
<td>3.9012</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>4.0952</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>3.9167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 18</td>
<td>3.7593</td>
<td>4.7917</td>
<td>4.6905</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.5417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 19</td>
<td>4.5123</td>
<td>4.7708</td>
<td>4.4762</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
<td>4.4583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 20</td>
<td>4.3580</td>
<td>4.7500</td>
<td>4.0476</td>
<td>4.5833</td>
<td>4.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 21</td>
<td>4.3395</td>
<td>4.4583</td>
<td>4.1190</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>4.4167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 22</td>
<td>4.1790</td>
<td>4.4375</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>4.5833</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 23</td>
<td>3.9012</td>
<td>4.1458</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>4.4167</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 24</td>
<td>4.0988</td>
<td>4.1250</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>4.5833</td>
<td>4.2917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 26</td>
<td>4.3148</td>
<td>4.8125</td>
<td>3.6190</td>
<td>4.7500</td>
<td>4.2083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 27</td>
<td>4.4136</td>
<td>4.7500</td>
<td>3.9286</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>4.2083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 28</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>4.8542</td>
<td>3.7381</td>
<td>4.6667</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 29</td>
<td>4.3889</td>
<td>4.9583</td>
<td>4.0714</td>
<td>4.5833</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 30</td>
<td>3.9630</td>
<td>4.4583</td>
<td>3.9048</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The letter preceding the item number indicates whether the behavior described in the item is related to the technical (T), human (H) or spiritual (S) orientation.

Interitem Correlation Coefficients

Items on the test which showed a low correlation with items from the same group (technical, human and spiritual) were identified.
from this data. This was carried out as an identification procedure only. The identified items were not analyzed further to determine why low interitem correlation coefficients existed. This procedure will be only one of the significant areas suggested for further study for the future refinement of the theory. That the test and, hence, the theory show potential to discriminate across orientations and organization types was sufficient for the present study.

Table 4 shows the table used by Hinkle, Wiersma and Jurs (1979, p. 85) for interpreting the size of the correlation coefficient. The results from the reliability analysis are then shown in Table 5. Table 6 lists items from each category (technical, human and spiritual) and categorizes them according to the size of their correlation coefficients as interpreted through the Hinkle table.

Table 4

Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.90 to 1.0 (-.90 to -1.0)</td>
<td>Very high positive (negative) correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70 to .90 (-.70 to -.90)</td>
<td>High positive (negative) correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .70 (-.50 to -.70)</td>
<td>Moderate positive (negative) correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .50 (-.30 to -.50)</td>
<td>Low positive (negative) correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00 to .30 (.00 to -.30)</td>
<td>Little if any correlation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the questionable items picked up from the analysis of means five of them (7, 17, 19, 20 & 24) rate as Low or Little on the significance of their correlations, two of the items (21 & 30) are
considered moderate, and an additional three items (10, 27 & 12) were picked up as Low by the analysis of correlation.

Table 5
Correlation of Items Within Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.74024</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.73208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.86083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.71638</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.66282</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.92768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.48905</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.74580</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.74684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.70025</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.34289</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.78641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.42392</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.56936</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.89759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.70798</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.46432</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.85732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.05441</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.78892</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.89535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.21987</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.88390</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.18511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.65165</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.83286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.67504</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.66576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.64360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.33808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of items in the Moderate, Low and Little rankings may be the result of one of four factors: (1) the test items under question may not be reliable, (2) the items may be reliable but
suffer the negative effects of homogeneity (most significantly, low deviation or variance from the norm being interpreted as no significant effect being present in the item), (3) the technique used for its estimation may be inappropriate or, (4) any combination of the above. To draw conclusions on any of these four without further testing of the data would be impossible so analysis of the reliability coefficients (alpha) of the items was calculated.

Table 6
Number and Rank of Items According to Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Spiritual</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>5, 6, 8, 16</td>
<td>2, 11, 26, 28, 29</td>
<td>1, 9, 13, 14, 15, 18</td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>21, 23, 25</td>
<td>4, 22, 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>7, 10, 27</td>
<td>12, 24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17, 19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficients

Of the methods available for assessing reliability the Internal Consistency Method was the most appropriate in the context of this
study. According to Carmines and Zeller (1979, p. 44) Cronbach's alpha is the most popular estimate of reliability with this method. When analyzed overall (i.e., across all items, across all organization types) the data indicated a reliability coefficient of 0.91218. According to Ary et al. (1972, p. 209), reliability coefficients of .90 and above are satisfactory while coefficients lower than .70 are unsatisfactory. On the basis of this information the conclusion can be made that the test instrument, overall, gave sufficiently reliable results for the population under study.

Table 7
Overall Alpha Levels with Deleted Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Deleted</th>
<th>Alpha Level</th>
<th>Item Deleted</th>
<th>Alpha Level</th>
<th>Item Deleted</th>
<th>Alpha Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.90717</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.90865</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.91043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.90875</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.91080</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.91139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.90434</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.90879</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.90997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.91010</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.90604</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.91317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.90789</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.91059</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.90851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.90909</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.90991</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.90821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.91139</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.91647</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.91156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.90737</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.90567</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.90701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.90972</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.91143</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.90530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.91094</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.91471</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.90478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Alpha = 0.91218
Table 8

Alpha Levels with Deleted Items According to Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Deleted</th>
<th>Alpha Level</th>
<th>Item Deleted</th>
<th>Alpha Level</th>
<th>Item Deleted</th>
<th>Alpha Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.79559</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.89032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.92061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.80560</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.89780</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.91455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.81838</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.88987</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.93056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.79976</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.91415</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.92596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.82329</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.90045</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.91714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.80664</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.90669</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.92109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.87674</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.88630</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.91774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.83410</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.88043</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.95744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.80489</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.88413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.80222</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.89519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.80447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.83082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = 0.83091  Alpha = 0.90457  Alpha = 0.93544

On the overall analysis three test items gave evidence of unreliability. If these items (17, 20 & 24) were to be deleted from
the test the alpha level of the instrument would increase (see Table 7). Based on this evidence the decision was made to run the reliability analysis for each behavior type (technical, human and spiritual) and compare the individual alpha levels (see Table 8).

An analysis of Tables 7 and 8 indicates that overall three items (17, 20 & 24) have doubtful reliability and that in the specific categories technical contains two unreliable items (17 & 19), human contains two (12 & 24) and spiritual contains one (20). When a comparison was drawn between the three sets of data (item means, Table 3; interitem correlation coefficients, Table 5; and Cronbach's alpha, Table 8) four items (17, 19, 20 & 24) appeared consistently across all three tests as having unsatisfactory levels of reliability.

The reason(s) lying behind the failure of these items to meet the standards of reliability discussed above can be conjectured on the basis of logic and professional review. A discussion of these items was conducted with statisticians and upper management level personnel. The insights into the items provided by this discussion are given below.

Low Reliability Items

In the text below the items under discussion are reprinted from the test instrument and include a parenthetical term stating the area of orientation to which each pertains. Following each item is a summary of the conjectured reasons for its low reliability score.

**Item 17 (technical):** "Does not base decisions on the organiza-
tion's formal policies. Makes exceptions to rules and when exceptions are made such are not subjected to organizational review."

This item was believed to be too open to diverse interpretation. In some contexts this behavior could be seen as appropriate and appreciated while in other contexts it could be interpreted as too dogmatic and stifling. The intent of the item (to determine if the individual acts on the basis of organizational rather than personal standards) was seen as appropriate but it was recommended for a clearer wording.

**Item 19 (technical):** "Clearly communicates the goals of the organization. Understands the organization's purpose and goals and acts to advocate these goals."

The deliberating sentence under this item may have contained too many distinct elements, causing the respondent to lose focus on the main concept. The suggestion was made to separate "understands" and "acts" and "purpose" and "goals" into two distinct items.

**Item 20 (spiritual):** "Does not use God's name in a profane manner. Avoids using God's name in a context which does not bring respect to God's name."

The point was made that in highly professional organizational settings, secular or Christian, profanity does not normally occur in the structured settings in which subordinates would encounter their CEO. The recommendation was made to drop this item completely from the instrument.

**Item 24 (human):** "Provides leadership in order to assure that
the working climate is safe from physical hazards. Has a high concern for subordinates' safety."

This item reflected ambiguous behavior, i.e., there is little evidence available to determine the CEO's active, personal concern in this area. Mention was made that this item would reflect more how safe the respondent perceives the job than the degree to which the CEO assures that safety. The item should be dropped.

**Interrater Reliability**

The purpose of interrater reliability (IRR) is to establish the extent to which the variation generated by the test instrument is attributable to the variance between the scores of individuals within each organization. The IRR analysis was run on the data from each organization in which two or more people responded to the questionnaire (22 organizations). The results are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Type</th>
<th>IRR Coefficient</th>
<th>Variance Equivalent</th>
<th>Percent Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>6.3224</td>
<td>39.9736</td>
<td>41.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>6.4854</td>
<td>42.0614</td>
<td>52.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>5.0925</td>
<td>25.9342</td>
<td>90.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>5.9667</td>
<td>35.9897</td>
<td>73.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis may be reported in two ways—as a statistical coefficient and as a percent reflecting agreement. As a coefficient it is equivalent to a standard deviation and so yields variance data. Typical variance within an organization is 30, plus or minus 5. "Percent Agreement" indicates the degree of similarity of responses between raters in the same organization.

The interpretation of this data is open to subjectivity. Gay (1981) calls such reliability coefficients "not very good" (p. 122) and Dyer (1979) states that "No definite guidelines exist regarding the minimum level of intercoder agreement" (p. 124). The significance of the IRR coefficient also varies with the content of the survey questionnaire and the methodology used in securing the data. Borg and Gall (1983), who most closely approximates the conditions seen in this research, states that "When the observer must make inferences or evaluation about the behavior he observes, however, 70 to 80 percent agreement is usually considered satisfactory" (p. 479).

According to these guidelines the IRR of the test results were below the satisfactory level in the technical and human aspects and above the satisfactory level in the spiritual aspect. Overall, the IRR coefficient is slightly outside the satisfactory level while the "Percent Agreement" is slightly above its minimum level. The significance of these factors and the above data to the reliability of the test instrument are discussed in Chapter Six.
The Quality of the Test and Item-Behavior Relationships

The main purpose of the questionnaire was to describe behaviors which the theory of Christian leadership held as contributing toward excellence in leader performance. If such behaviors could indeed be defined, discriminated and quantified support for the practicality and utility of the theory could be established from an empirical standpoint (such support has already been derived from the expert review described at the beginning of this chapter).

Table 10
Cell Means for Individual Orientations by Type & Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Spiritual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>52.92</td>
<td>47.95</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4.41</td>
<td>*4.00</td>
<td>*4.50</td>
<td>*3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>52.17</td>
<td>48.54</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4.35</td>
<td>*4.05</td>
<td>*4.46</td>
<td>*4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean X = Christian  S = Secular  E = Excellent  A = Average

Note: The score range differs for each scale. The ranges are:
Technical 12 - 60  Human 10 - 50  Spiritual 8 - 40

The question of how well the test instrument sampled the content areas under study was addressed by the analysis of its...
content validity (see p. 92). In this section additional analyses on the instrument's ability to discriminate between behaviors (technical, human, spiritual) are shown in response to the question of how well the relationship between the test items and their respective behaviors can be explained.

In Table 10 the cell means are shown for each of the three orientations by type (Christian or secular) and quality (excellent or average). The data indicates that the test instrument is scoring the leaders of excellent organizations higher than average organizations in the areas of technical and human behavior. The instrument scored Christian organizations higher than secular organizations in the area of spiritual behavior. In all three behavioral categories "Excellent Christian" scored higher than any other combination of organization type and quality. "Average Christian" was the lowest scoring group with regard to technical and human behaviors.

A Test of the Null Hypotheses

To further analyze the data a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed. The ANOVA was originally run as a full model (i.e., with interaction effects) but no significant effects were found at the .05 alpha level. The ANOVA was then run a second time on the main effects (technical, human and spiritual). This resulted in the rejection of three of the six null hypotheses shown on page 97. The results for each main effect are shown in Tables 11, 12 and 13 and are followed by an interpretation of the results.
The data in Table 11 indicate that the variance generated by the questionnaire as it relates to technical behavior is not significantly affected by type of organization. Null Hypotheses 1 stated that there was no difference concerning the behavior of the chief executive officer (CEO) in the area of technical skills between organizational types. Since no significant difference between Christian and secular organizations with regard to technical skills was found with the instrument, Null Hypothesis 1 was retained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124.256</td>
<td>5.448</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to Null Hypothesis 2 the data in Table 11 indicated that the variance generated in the technical area can be attributed to the behavior of CEO's working in organizations of differing qualities. This being the case, Null Hypothesis 2 can be rejected: there is a significant difference between leaders of excellent organizations and those of average organizations concerning technical behavior.

The ANOVA for the human variable shown in Table 12 led to the
retooling of Null Hypothesis 3. The results of this test indicated that the difference between leaders of Christian and secular organizations with regard to human skills was not significant. On the basis of this data Null Hypothesis 4 should be rejected: the difference in human oriented behavior is significantly different between that of CEO's in excellent organizations and those in average organizations.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.736</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>258.403</td>
<td>10.062</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1603.389</td>
<td>71.087</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null Hypothesis 5 stated that there was no difference in spiritual behavior in CEO's of Christian and secular organizations. The data derived from the ANOVA as shown in Table 13 indicated that there is a significant difference in behavior of this kind between organizational types. This hypothesis should be rejected.

Null Hypothesis 6 stated that there was no difference in spiritual behavior in CEO's of excellent and average organizations. This hypothesis held as no significant difference was found through the analysis of variance.

Summary of Statistical Analysis

The analysis of data resulting in a reliability coefficient indicated that overall (i.e., across all items, across all organizational types) the questionnaire consistently measured the behaviors it was intended to measure. The coefficient which resulted (0.91218) is considered excellent for a reliability score. When broken down into the three distinct behavioral types the reliability coefficient diminished in each area though, due to limited sample size and smaller number of questionnaire items per behavioral type, the smaller coefficients were not unexpected and were manageable within the context of the study.

A review of the mean scores for each organizational type for each item on the questionnaire indicated that seven items on the questionnaire may not be significant discriminators of the behaviors they described. Further analysis using interitem correlation coefficients yielded eight items that were of low or little
reliability in discerning CEO behavior. A study of the alpha levels resulting from the deletion of items with questionable reliability brought out five items from the test. Between these three analyses four items were consistently named. These four were then described and reasons for their low reliability scores were given.

The interrater reliability (IRR) analysis, which resulted in data showing the amount of variance generated by the questionnaire that was attributable to variance within each responding organization, gave inconclusive results. Given the design and purpose of the test the finding was interpreted as supporting the overall reliability of the questionnaire in its ability to discern the three principal behaviors established by the theory.

Six null hypotheses were then tested against the data. This analysis resulted in rejecting three of the hypotheses and retaining three hypotheses. The results indicated that there is a significant difference between the CEO's of excellent organizations and those of average organizations with regard to their technical and human behaviors (there was no significant difference between Christian and secular CEO's in these areas). Concerning spiritual behavior there was no significant difference between CEO's where quality was the determining variable but there was a significant difference with the type of organization (Christian or secular) in which the CEO was employed.

Chapter Summary

The theory critique and the statistical analysis of the test
instrument were presented in this chapter. General and positive support regarding the theory was received and encouragement to pursue the development of the theory was given. The statistical analysis on the test instrument gave mixed results on the preferred outcome of the analysis but sufficient support was received to indicate that the questionnaire was discriminating between the elements set forth in the theory. The conclusions drawn from this information and the areas that should be further studied are delineated in Chapter Six.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to draw attention to the fact that excellence in leadership in Christian organizations depends upon and is characterized by the proper integration of three principal skills or behaviors: technical, human and spiritual. The literature provided information indicating that Christian organizations tend to be weaker than secular organizations in the technical area and that to truly achieve "excellence" training, application and evaluation in this area must take place. On the other hand, that leadership theory in general does not specifically account for the role of "spirituality" as it interacts with technical and human skills and orientations became apparent. According to the literature the omission of "spirituality as a variable was considered detrimental to a thorough understanding of elements influencing leadership. On the basis of this input a theory was developed which took into account the simultaneous influence of technical, human and spiritual variables. Because such a theory, in addition to its general contribution to leadership theory, was seen as useful in the training, development and evaluation of Christian leaders a test instrument was developed to determine the viability of its practical
application. This instrument was used to discern the three variables and quantify the degree to which they were present in any given individual.

Conclusions

Expert Review

For ease of reference the detailed reactions to the reviewers' comments are given starting on page 103 and follow every grouping of comments thereafter. The general conclusions are given below.

That the responses of the reviewers were unanimous in their declaration of the value of pursuing the study of Christian leadership substantiates the reality of the problem of properly combining technical, human and spiritual skills. On the basis of these comments the theory received support for its timeliness and pertinence as well as cause to pursue its further development.

The addition and integration of a spiritual perspective in combination with technical and human concepts was accepted as appropriate and advisable in leadership theory in general and Christian leadership in particular. Neither contradictions nor unsupportable extrapolations were found in the integration of the three elements and the terminology used was evaluated as lucid and pertinent. These comments indicated that the clarity and direction of the theory was of appropriate depth and scope. A radical reworking or complete disposal of the theory was not necessary in order to continue to develop an appropriate philosophical and theoretical framework for Christian leadership.
Interest in and a desire for an empirically founded theory of Christian leadership is growing. Throughout the course of this study awareness was created that in the last five or six years the demand for accountability regarding organizational effectiveness in Christian organizations has greatly increased. Lack of understanding, apathy, complacency, fear of "secular" management theory and practice, and lack of direction have all contributed to the gap in perspective and performance that is now being felt by those involved in Christian organizations. The comments of the reviewers substantiated that the recognized need for movement in this area has not waned.

The theory as it was presented in the study is a viable framework from which a philosophy and theory of Christian organizational leadership may begin to be formed. The final depth and scope may never be established for such a framework as a single theory of Christian leadership: a semi-dichotomous theory may be needed to address the needs of Christian organizations in general and specific denominational differences in particular. In any case, the theory provided positive movement toward addressing and helping resolve these needs.

A principal conclusion which was drawn regarding the theory of Christian leadership and secular theory is that secular organizations which ignore the highly influential role of spirituality on leadership motivation and skill may be doing so to their own detriment. Spirituality was seen as unique in that it provided an anchor point for attitude in addition to the
values-oriented anchor point for behavior (which is human-related). The spiritual element generates a more pervasive and profound level of influence in an individual than technical or human considerations are able to provide by themselves. If this spiritual nature could be discerned and evaluated (as this study showed the possibility of doing) it could be used in secular organizations to better understand the expectations which could be placed on specific individuals.

For its overall concept, practicality and utility the theory of Christian leadership was given solid and diverse support. The viability of constructing a reliable and valid instrument to use with the theory is specified below.

**Analysis of Data**

The purpose of the analysis was to determine the extent to which the theory, using an instrument developed specifically for use with the theory, could discern and measure technical, human and spiritual orientations (see p. 114). The statistical analysis was considered an ancillary study because it was concerned with the developmental stage of the theory rather than with the formulation stage—the principal purpose of the study. Nevertheless, the data gathered through the statistical analysis was useful in substantiating the theory in general and in providing promising areas for further research. The text which follows gives the conclusions drawn from the analysis.

A comparison of the four reliability studies yielded evidence
that the test instrument, for the survey groups chosen, did show some measure of ability to discriminate among technical, human and spiritual behaviors. The overall discriminatory power of the questionnaire was satisfactory though when separated into its three main components (technical, human, spiritual) became less than satisfactory (except with regard to the spiritual element). A review of the testing conditions and procedures led to the conclusion that by themselves the main components did not have a sufficient number of behavior descriptors nor was the number of individual respondents high enough to give statistically significant results.

The impact of these findings upon the theory could be considered inconclusive except for the fact that the principal area of concern, i.e., the possibility of quantifying spiritual behavior, did show statistical significance. The spiritual variable registered as statistically reliable and valid, thus supporting the theory. The potential areas of difficulty in measuring this variable were deliberated upon but it did appear workable and, of major importance, agreed with the expert review opinion.

The "less than satisfactory" ratings of the technical and human aspects requires a degree of subjective judgement which takes into consideration the conditions of the test. The test groups chosen for the study were clearly dichotomous with regard to type (Christian and secular) but only ambiguously so with regard to quality (excellent and average). In other words, there was just enough difference between the organizations chosen as "excellent"
and "average." The rationale used and the difficulty with establishing the selected test groups were explained in Chapter Four (p. 83). Because of the degree of test group homogeneity with regard to quality, that the test instrument indicated at least some (though not statistically significant) difference between the groups is taken as a positive indication of the potential of the test to measure these variables under stronger testing procedures.

The results of the interrater reliability analysis paralleled the other findings: the test generated less error variance in the spiritual variable than in the technical and human variables. This indicates a need for strengthening the test in specific areas:

1. Greater control needs to be exercised in the selection of respondents for the questionnaire.

2. The number of respondents in each organization needs to be increased in order to give less weight to individual (mis)interpretation of the items.

3. The variables of respondent training, access to and interaction with the CEO need to be controlled.

4. A common standard of reference needs to be integrated into the test to provide more objectivity to the individual items.

The test can be considered a success in that it brought out, from the context of "the real world," areas that need to be refined as the theory is developed. The test was intended to be investigative and not conclusive and it met that goal. The findings it holds in common with the qualitative analysis are recorded below.
Summary Conclusions

The results of both the qualitative study and statistical analysis drew attention to the need for and viability of including a spiritual dimension to leadership theory. This data supports the problem statement and review of literature in promulgating that this dimension needs to be accounted for and can be profited from in both Christian and secular organizations. The need for further development of an analysis tool was supported and considered to be obtainable. Possible areas for further refinement of the theory and instrument appear below.

Recommendations for Further Study

Items for further study resulted from opinions expressed by those who critiqued the theory and were involved in the survey and from the statistical analysis of the test instrument. First, a more thorough and intensive reliability study was recommended for the test. Heterogeneous groups should be used with regard to both type and quality of organization. More distinct definitions of what is considered "excellent" and what is considered "average" need to be made and utilized in a future study.

Second, the very low response rate of the original organizations in the "Average Secular" population may carry some significance in relation to the content of the instrument. Were these organizations reluctant to acknowledge the possible influence of spirituality? Could this be a contributing factor to their being less than excellent? A second sampling from this population with
follow-up to determine the reason for nonresponse could provide insights into these questions.

Third, statements (unrecorded) rising from comments made from both Christian and secular executives raised the question "Are Christian managers better equipped to do their job in either Christian or secular organizations?" The study touched on this point but did not focus attention on it. The results of such a study could be highly complementary to the theory.

Fourth, given the unique characteristics that Christians were noted as bringing to the task (cf., Chapter Two), there was interest in seeing if these characteristics contributed in a positive manner at all levels of the organization. Would they be more effective at upper management levels? More so at lower blue collar levels? Universally beneficial? The declaration in this study that secular organizations negate the importance of spirituality to their own detriment should be analyzed in light of these questions.

Fifth, heterogeneity of spiritual values and practice may have a significant effect on performance and organizational climate. Do these elements improve with heterogeneity or with homogeneity? How does one differentiate in a study between the effects of homogeneity and spirituality? Is there a discerning element?

Sixth, the concepts of synchronicity and optimal behavior should be developed to a greater degree. Though only treated tangentially in the dissertation they did generate a high degree of intrigue and promised conceptual utility to the development of the theory.
Seventh, the curvilinear nature of synchronicity should be considered, studied and accounted for (if it proves to be present). Data from such a study would be useful in supporting or rejecting the negative influence of extreme behavior in leadership situations.

A number of other studies could ensue from this study but the above are the more immediate and greater areas of concern. Their inclusion in the theory could contribute to a more influential presentation of the theory of Christian leadership and so build on the foundation which this study has established.

Summary

The conclusions made from the twofold study of expert opinion and empirical analysis indicated that the theory of Christian leadership is a viable and timely tool for addressing the needs of Christian organizations. The theory was shown to provide not only a theoretical basis from which to expand Christian organizational theory but also a means by which the potential and present leaders of Christian organizations could be evaluated and trained to serve better in their positions.

Some refinement of the theory is necessary but the weight of opinion and empirical evidence show such refinement to be achievable. The next significant step is seen as developing and testing the instrument used in conjunction with the theory to further substantiate the discriminatory power of the theory. At the conclusion of such work the theory would then be promoted for general usage in the world of Christian organizations.
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APPENDIX A

Theory Summary Document
Overview

During the course of writing a doctoral dissertation, a review of literature and observations of organizations in both Christian and secular contexts has led to the conclusion that significant elements affecting the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization are being overlooked. While the problem as confronted in the dissertation is two-fold, encompassing both secular and Christian organizations, the principal objective of the study is to suggest a theoretical framework that would serve as a step toward a fuller understanding of Christian leaders and organizations. This framework would function as a guide for the training and evaluation of Christian leaders and as a form for analysis of Christian organizations. The theory presents a new combination of Christian and secular thought which reflects a unique way of conceptualizing Christian leadership.

The text which follows is designed to give a brief overview of the theory. Since you are being asked to react to the theory's viability in the areas of theological affinity, comprehensiveness, practicality and utility, the data and testing supporting the theory formation have not been included. The issues of validity and reliability are being tested separately with other groups. The input needed from you concerns the general impact of the theory and such input as you give will be used to refine the theory (or even discard it!) and direct empirical research into further areas needed to enhance the depth, scope and utility of the theory.

Components of the Theory

The major components of the theory are reflected in three dimensions: technical, human and spiritual (please refer to Illustration 1). Each dimension is defined and understood as follows:
Technical Dimension: deals with goal-setting, organization of labor, systems coordination, process evaluation, allocation of resources, organizational fidelity to the goals and optimal output and service from all components in the organization.

Human Dimension: deals with the concerns generated out of human beings interfacing with the process and tools of the organization and the physiological and psychological welfare of the human resource.

Spiritual Dimension: deals with the belief system of individuals (in this case, Christians) that entails the reality for them that beyond the physically recognizable universe lies another realm of existence which people can and should perceive and which acts in, influences and demands a response from the world of humanity such that all human activity must be brought into accord with the divine will of God.

Basic Rationale For Each Dimension In The Theory

The body of the dissertation gives substantial reason for stating that there are three critical elements that must be considered in studying leadership and that these three are the dimensions named above. Given below is a very concise rationale as to why each dimension is considered integral to the formation of a theory of Christian leadership.

Technical Dimension. In the secular world theory and practice regarding goals, means and evaluation are heavily emphasized, studied, scrutinized and applied. Technical consideration is the "sine qua non" of effective and efficient organization and is found to a high degree in organizations which have been termed "excellent" by experts in the field.

Human Dimension. As organizations emphasize and move along technical lines toward meeting their profit-making and/or service-rendering goals a counter-balance of emphasis must be made toward the human cost involved.
Research shows that where people are challenged, have their basic needs cared for, given equitable remuneration for service rendered and are made to feel an important part of the organization—sharing in its philosophy and goals—human productivity increases (or at least remains on a par) qualitatively and quantitatively. Due to the flux of society and individual idiosyncrasies, the human element must be under constant study so as to best merge this resource with the ongoing process of the organization.

**Spiritual Dimension.** The all-pervasive nature of one's belief system may have an impact on every dimension of one's life. It forms a distinct and powerful element in a person's motivation, commitment to task, integrity, accountability, and predictability. With a high degree of spiritual maturity and sensitivity the leader of the organization is more apt to discern the needs and aspirations of the subordinates and so engage in programs and procedures which might increase their performance and more positively affect their attitudes toward the task.

**Significance of Dimensional Ratings**

The theory holds that there are less effective, extreme manifestations of behavior in each dimension and that there is a highly positive, optimal point of behavior in each dimension (see Illustration 2). The individual's behavior may lie at any point on or between the two extremes. The significance of the main points in each dimension are as follows:

(Low Extreme = LE; Optimal Point = OP; High Extreme = HE)

**Technical**

**LE:** laissez-faire behavior where the organization and its systems are left to run themselves and produce what they may. No control, organization or evaluation of systems or goals is actively pursued.

**OP:** the leader exerts influence over goal setting, organization and goal achievement so as to assure the most efficient and effective use of resources while maintaining an awareness of and responsiveness to the physical and human environment in which the organization operates.

**HE:** autocratic behavior is demonstrated where the organization with
The dominant philosophy is that the end justifies the means. The value system espoused precludes consideration of any cultural, moral, social or religious elements in its operational environment.

**Human**

**LE:** "Hermit" behavior where no inclination is shown toward the cultivation of human relationships nor the psychological and physiological welfare of people. A leader of this type would view the self as all-important and self-preservation and growth more a matter of avoiding or contending against people rather than working with them.

**OP:** A leader with this frame of mind considers the total welfare of people as vital to the organization with its goals and that provision for their welfare requires an active, on-going effort to discern people's needs, meet those needs in an equitable and reasonable manner and provide opportunity for personal challenge and growth. Human shortcomings and idiosyncracies are dealt with so that the individuals involved might have opportunity to meet the behavioral and performance requirements of the organization.

**HE:** Humanism is the characteristic of the leader in this position where a heavy emphasis is placed on accommodating the physical and psychological needs and desires of individuals while holding little regard for structural implications or spiritual guidelines. Absolutes are negated. Principles and rules of procedure and/or behavior are deemed appropriate in only a general sense and must give way to any unique demands made by human beings as individuals or as a group.

**Spiritual**

**LE:** Agnosticism characterizes this individual who places no emphasis upon nor recognizes any value in seeking out the existence of a supernatural being—God—nor in establishing a relationship with this being. Humankind is viewed as accountable only unto itself.

**OP:** At this point the leader recognizes the existence of God and endeavors to abide by the will of God (as presented in the Bible) in his or her personal and public life. Specific effort is made to act in and influence the world and society along the lines of Christianity and to help others grow in the knowledge of God and how their lives might be brought into harmony with him. The principal motivation in life comes from the desire and duty to honor God and act as responsible stewards of the time, resources and opportunities one has in life.

**HE:** Monasticism is seen when the individual places absolute emphasis on his or her relationship to God to the exclusion of all other thought and activity. Life in and interaction with society is disparaged as the individual isolates him or herself from everything in the physical world except that which is absolutely necessary to sustain human life.

**Synchronicity**

"Synchronicity" is the term which summarizes the content of the study.
(see Illustration 3). What it means is that the greater the extent to which the simultaneous application of all three dimensions is evidenced the greater the likelihood the effort expended will occur in an effective and efficient manner. This is not to say that all three dimensions must be equally employed but that the total implication of each dimension must be considered prior to and during any activity. Occasional extreme behavior is not considered negative (there may be times when being in the extreme is the most propitious step to take) in that the number and depth of such occurrences, be they limited, do not reflect an extreme orientation. Synchronicity declares that people who can maintain a balanced approach to life are better equipped to perceive and act because they take into consideration all the variables (technical, human, spiritual) of life.

Use of the Theoretical Model

The first use of the theory is in the field of training. While primarily created to serve those entering areas of Christian service or management in Christian organizations, it is seen as having utility for all managers who ought to take into consideration individuals' ideology. At this level it would point out the crucial elements to effective leadership and show the interrelationships that exist amongst them.

The second use is for evaluation. An objective test could be administered to all people involved in the organization's functions. The orientation of the organization would be determined and the individual's score then compared to determine the "fit" and so suggest areas for improvement.

Final Thoughts

One of the greatest concerns I have is the empirical treatment of anything in the spiritual realm. Since the stated purpose of the theory is
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training and evaluation, then most certainly testing is necessitated. The Bible speaks very clearly against the possibility of rating or ranking a person's faith or spirituality (cf., Matthew 7.1; John 8.15-17; Romans 2.1), while at the same time encouraging the Christian to discern the spirit of others (cf., I John 4.1; I Corinthians 2.14, 15). As this study progresses I will be very sensitive to the input I receive regarding this area of spiritual "testing."

I firmly believe that technical, human and spiritual considerations must be emphasized and actively pursued in any organization, secular or Christian, for that organization to be successful in its purposes. You may be in total agreement with this and personally see nothing new in what is presented here. However, I have found, through the course of my research, that organizations (and in particular, Christian organizations), while they may agree to this principle, fall very short in the area of practice. I am striving to bring these three elements together in a format and program which would help ensure their incorporation into the daily life of the organization, its leader(s) and subordinate personnel.

This study is a single, initial step toward the objective stated above. As such it leaves much to be explained and much to be yet studied. But, it is an exciting area and one which promises beneficial utility. I appreciate your insights into this area.
The following questions are to serve only as a guide in critiquing the theory summarized on the following pages. They are not meant to restrict the scope or depth of your comments. Any references you might give along with your comments would be helpful. Please feel free to write comments anywhere on the summary and/or on a separate sheet of paper.

1. Regarding the compartmentalization of organizational leadership into technical, human and spiritual orientations; is it valid to draw these distinctions?

2. Are the terms "technical," "human" and "spiritual" adequately defined?

3. Is "spirituality" a unique element in effective leadership?

4. Are there "optimal" levels of technical, human and spiritual orientation?

5. Are the descriptions of the extreme behaviors reasonable and adequate?

6. Do contradictions or possible contradictions with the Bible exist?

7. Is it inappropriate to "spiritualize" leadership theory?

8. Does the theoretical model promise utility in training leaders?

9. Does the theoretical model promise utility in evaluating leaders?

10. What areas need greater clarification?

11. Are contradictory terms and concepts present in the theory?

12. What other studies have been carried out in this area?

13. What tests are currently available for determining the degrees of orientation an individual has in technical, human and spiritual areas?

14. What precautionary advice would you give in pursuing the research on and development of the theory?

15. Additional comments:
APPENDIX B

Summary of Comments From Expert Review
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SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM THE CRITIQUE OF THE THEORY SUMMARY

Dr. Chris Argyris:

1. The theory is worthwhile pursuing.
2. The definitions and interrelationships are clear.
3. The concept of "synchronicity" is interesting.
4. The hypothesis of a smaller gap equalling greater effectiveness may not be correct since it could be curvilinear.

Dr. Harold N. Englund:

1. The ability to choose is a key element.
2. A leader must have a sense of vision.
3. A leader must be willing to pay a high price to make the dream happen.
4. Encouragement to continue with the development of the theory.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh:

1. The definition of "spiritual" could be fulfilled by a secular humanist with a strong value system.
2. Greater clarity is needed on what is meant by "Christian."
3. The use of "optimal" may be open to question and challenge since effectiveness is contingent upon a number of variables.

Lt. Col. Kenneth Hodder:

1. Technical, human and spiritual distinctions are of degrees, not absolutes.
2. The spiritual element is only appropriate where human values are reversed from "power to rule" to "power to serve."
3. Perhaps there are optimal levels.
4. The definitions of extreme behavior are appropriate.
5. No contradictions with scriptures observed.
6. It may be appropriate to spiritualize in certain situations.
7. The model promises utility in training and evaluating leaders.
8. No contradictory terms or concepts were observed.
9. Keep the theory simple as it develops.

Mr. Gordon D. Loux:

1. Lack of management training in Christian organizations is a problem.
2. It is valid to make the technical, human and spiritual distinctions.
3. "Human" could be better termed so as not to equate with secular humanism.
4. "Spiritual" is a highly critical element.
5. Describe better what is meant by "optimal" in order to provide
greater contextual validity.

6. The descriptions of extreme behaviors may be understatements.
7. A biblical approach to management is highly sound and needed.
8. "Spiritualizing" leadership theory is appropriate if it means bringing every aspect of life under the lordship of Christ.
9. Aspects of the model will be very helpful as organizational training philosophy is updated.
10. A study of this sort is greatly needed in the Christian world.

Dr. Thomas J. Sergiovanni:

1. The theory is a good idea and worth pursuing.
2. It is valid to draw technical, human and spiritual distinctions.
3. The terms are adequately defined.
4. "Spiritual" is a unique element.
5. There probably are optimal technical, human and spiritual levels.
6. No biblical contradictions were observed.
7. "Spiritualizing" leadership theory is not inappropriate.
8. The theory appears to offer utility.
9. The theory should study and account for organizational culture and cultural leadership.

Dr. Walter C. Wright, Jr.:

1. "Spiritual" can be equated with "values."
2. An investigation of "culture" and "work spirit" should be made in connection with the "spiritual" element.
3. A statement on the identity and position of humankind vis-a-vis God should be made.
4. Does "optimal" include explicit proclamations of implicit beliefs? (One may be appropriate for Christian organizations but inappropriate for secular organizations.)
5. Christian organizations may fall short on "human" while pursuing "technical" and proclaiming "spiritual" concerns.
6. "Spiritual" needs greater defining concerning its impact on other areas.
7. Technical, human and spiritual elements are present in the context of leadership.
8. "Spiritual" is a unique element.
9. Extreme definitions are ok.
10. It is appropriate to spiritualize leadership theory.
11. The theory shows promise of utility in training and evaluation.
12. The study is on to something important — keep going.
13. The instrument should be kept universal.
APPENDIX C

Follow-up Letter to Expert Reviewers
Dear X,

Several weeks ago I mailed a summary of a theory of Christian leadership to you in order to obtain your critique of the material. Your input in this area is very important as it would serve to compliment and broaden responses received from other authorities in the field of leadership theory. The response you give may be as general or specific as your time and inclination dictate but a response of any kind would be most valuable in setting the direction of the theory's development. Please, would you respond soon?

Thanking you for your attention, I remain very truly yours,

Nicholas V. Kroze
doctoral candidate

5647 Powderhorn
Kalamazoo, MI 49009
APPENDIX D

Cover Letters for Summary and Questionnaires
February 7, 1986

X
X
X

Dear X

As part of my doctoral dissertation I am positing a theoretical model of Christian leadership. The purpose of this model is to help provide a basis for the training and evaluation of individuals in positions of leadership in Christian organizations. I am contacting you because of your recognized expertise and experience in the fields of leadership theory and practice so that I might obtain your input on and critique of the model as presented here.

Though I wish that you might see the full scope of work that has led up to this point, I recognize that such a lengthy document would be too much to expect anyone to review in their spare time. On the other hand, I hope that you do not find the succinctness of the enclosed document so abbreviated that no conclusions could be drawn from nor purposeful advice given on the theory.

I would like to have your reaction to the theory's viability in these areas:
   a. Theological affinity from a Christian perspective.
   b. Comprehensiveness in the areas of technical, human and spiritual skills.
   c. The potential utility of the theoretical model.

A reaction guide sheet has been provided but I encourage you to comment freely as you wish. If there is an area in which you do not feel qualified to comment do not feel constrained to respond to the area under question. You may write directly on the summary itself or on your own stationery. Feel free to keep a copy of the summary. The time frame I am working under is thirty days. If it is possible I would appreciate receiving your critique within that time. If you wish further information and/or would like a summary of the results from this dissertation please contact me.

Though it is an insignificant amount to compensate you for your time and effort with this material, I hope that you will accept the enclosed check as a token of my gratitude. Your assistance is sincerely appreciated.

Thanking you for your help,
April 28, 1986

Dear Director of Personnel,

I am carrying out a doctoral dissertation study on excellence in leadership in secular and Christian organizations. The study will be used in constructing a training and evaluation tool for leaders in Christian organizations.

The questionnaire enclosed asks for a rating of the behaviors of your organization's chief executive officer. The name of the CEO is not to be identified but you should ensure that the respondents have the same person in mind.

There are three copies of the test instrument enclosed. They are to be distributed to these people: (1) you, as Director of Personnel, (2) any central office secretary and (3) any other employee outside the central office. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is provided for each respondent.

The questionnaire takes about 10 minutes to complete. I would appreciate receiving the completed questionnaires in two weeks or sooner.

All responses are guaranteed anonymity. The code number on the questionnaire identifies your organization. The code key, which only I possess, will be destroyed once the data has been entered and analyzed on computer.

Your participation in this survey is very important. I sincerely appreciate your taking the time to distribute and complete it. If you have a question or need clarification on this material please call me collect at the number given below. If you would like the summary data from this study please indicate so on the questionnaire. If for company policy or other reasons you cannot participate in this survey PLEASE inform me so by writing "NO" at the top of this letter and returning it in one of the envelopes provided.

Thanking you for your help,

Nicholas V. Kroeze  
doctoral candidate

Phone: (616) 375-2841

P.S. Regarding the balloon kits:
I know it's not much to pay for your time
But please accept this token from a hobby of mine
It has brought joy to kids and lots of grownups too
And I hope that this day it will bring joy to you!
A THEORETICAL MODEL OF CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP

February 5, 1986

Dear X

The letterhead title reflects the topic of a doctoral dissertation I am carrying out at Western Michigan University. The preliminary research I carried out has shown a need for and the feasibility of a theoretical model which could be used for the training and evaluation of administrators, managers and leaders of Christian organizations. The theory is now at the point of being tested and this is where your help and insight is needed.

I am soliciting expert opinion from both theoreticians and practitioners in the field of organizational leadership to analyze a test being used in my study. As a member of this group you could greatly help the progress of developing the theoretical model. Your evaluation of the material which follows is requested in two areas: (1) to determine if the domain is sufficient and (2) to determine if the variables are significant and important. The variables are organized by type (technical, human and spiritual) and by degree (low, medium and high). All of the variables are behaviorally anchored.

The test items represent a sample of the domain of behaviors that give evidence of the stated characteristics. If you determine that items should be eliminated or that some should be added please write this information on the test. Any additional comments may be written on the face or back of the test form. Your timely attention to this request would be very sincerely appreciated. A stamped, self addressed envelope is provided for your convenience.

Again, my sincere thanks to you for taking the time and making the effort to help me in this area.

Sincerely,

Nicholas V. Kroeze

5647 POWDERHORN, KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN 49009
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Christian Leadership Discernment Questionnaire
Purpose. This questionnaire is designed to collect subordinates' perceptions of their organization's chief executive officer (CEO).

Instructions. On the pages which follow thirty items are listed which may describe the behavior of your organization's CEO. To the left of each numbered statement is a blank space upon which you can note your agreement with how your CEO reflects the described behavior. Please use the following response key in this process:

1 = Rarely behaves this way
2 = Sometimes but not often behaves this way
3 = Neutral (You neither agree nor disagree.)
4 = Often behaves this way
5 = Very consistently behaves this way

When you finish please return this questionnaire in the self-addressed, stamped envelope that has been provided for you.

All responses are held in confidentiality. The only information you need to give about yourself is your position in your organization.

Thank you for your participation through this questionnaire. Your input will be valuable in the training and evaluation of leaders in a variety of organizations.

My POSITION (job title) in the organization is _____________________.

Please say "Yes" if you wish summary data on this questionnaire: ________
1 = Rarely behaves this way
2 = Sometimes but not often behaves this way
3 = Neutral (You neither agree nor disagree)
4 = Often behaves this way
5 = Very consistently behaves this way

1. Sees the primary motivation to work as being spiritual in nature. Is not preoccupied by physical reward or monetary remuneration for services rendered.

2. Does not seek subordinate participation in making organizational decisions. Does not allow subordinates to have influence on the decisions made.

3. Shows a concern for the spiritual life of subordinates. Encourages subordinates to develop a positive and growing understanding of and love for God.

4. Recognizes and provides for physical, mental and psychological differences among subordinates. Accomodates individual differences in subordinate performance ability and attitude.

5. Coordinates the tasks of subordinates to increase production. Perceives the interrelations between tasks and can organize them for more effective and efficient processing of goods and services.

6. Evaluates organizational goals. Assesses goals to determine if the goals are still valid.

7. Clearly identifies the work required for individual tasks. Specifies and defines subordinate tasks in order to facilitate the coordination of means to goals.

8. Encourages subordinates to support and serve the organization. Develops subordinates' sense of ownership in the organization's philosophy and mission.

9. Does not credit and honor God when successes are realized. Focuses attention and praise on his or her own personal accomplishments.

10. Provides a professional environment in the organization. Sets parameters for worker behavior in order to provide an environment that increases worker performance.

11. Seeks subordinate involvement in determining their available resources and means to task accomplishment. Allows subordinates to influence the manner and amount of work required.

12. Gives leadership in providing subordinates with maximum individual comfort in their work areas. Makes efforts to give subordinates an aesthetically pleasing as well as functional work environment.
1 = Rarely behaves this way
2 = Sometimes but not often behaves this way
3 = Neutral (You neither agree nor disagree)
4 = Often behaves this way
5 = Very consistently behaves this way

13. Does not pray with subordinates. Is not free to lead in prayer over particular matters in both formal and informal situations.
14. Utilizes biblical mores in establishing the means to the goals. Requires that all means used be within acceptable Christian parameters as presented in the Bible.
15. Encourages subordinates to read the Bible daily. Seeks to have subordinates prioritize their lives around the teachings of the Bible.
16. Evaluates the means used to achieve organizational goals. Assesses the means to determine if more effective and efficient steps toward goal accomplishment are available and preferred.
17. Does not base decisions on the organization's formal policies. Makes exceptions to rules and when exceptions are made such are not subjected to organizational review.
18. Utilizes biblical mores in setting organizational goals. Operates on the principle that no goal is valid that violates biblical teachings.
19. Clearly communicates the goals of the organization. Understands the organization's purpose and goals and acts to advocate these goals.
20. Does not use God's name in a profane manner. Avoids using God's name in a context which does not bring respect to God's name.
21. Adheres to organizational lines of authority. Enhances control and the decision-making process by using consistent lines of authority.
22. Provides subordinates with opportunities for advancement and job enrichment. Chooses valid criteria for promotional selections and shows a willingness to be innovative with subordinates who desire new challenges.
23. Prescribes the organization's lines of communications. Manages the communications process by ensuring that the proper information is communicated to the appropriate people.
24. Provides leadership in order to assure that the working climate is safe from physical hazards. Has a high concern for subordinates' safety.
1 = Rarely behaves this way
2 = Sometimes but not often behaves this way
3 = Neutral (You neither agree nor disagree)
4 = Often behaves this way
5 = Very consistently behaves this way

25. Evaluates subordinate performance and provides constructive feedback to them. Reviews and revises methods of performance as conditions, tools and methods change.

26. Does not give subordinates appropriate and specific feedback on their performance. Ignores subordinates' sense of self-worth and ability.

27. Does not provide the resources needed to accomplish the organization's goals. Does not assure that the availability of personnel, time, space and materiel is consistent and adequate.

28. Is open and candid in communicating with subordinates. Seeks to hear the concerns and opinions of subordinates and respond to these in a constructive fashion.

29. Promotes an atmosphere of mutual respect among subordinates. Encourages subordinates to look for and appreciate the positive contributions of other employees.

30. Provides socioemotional support to subordinates. Shows a concern for the social life and emotional welfare of subordinates.
APPENDIX F

References Used in Formulating the Questionnaire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM*</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Reddin 38; Hersey/Blanchard 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Blake/Mouton 143; Bogard 14; Hersey/Blanchard 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Bogard 14; Drucker 9, 16; Hersey/Blanchard 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Blake/Mouton 144, 145; Tannenbaum 147.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Tannenbaum 153; Hersey/Blanchard 96; Farace 132.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Farace 76; Bogard 3; Hersey/Blanchard 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Reddin 31; Tannenbaum 153; Drucker 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Blake/Mouton 158; Bogard 14; Hersey/Blanchard 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Blake/Mouton 169; Rausch 134.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Hersey/Blanchard 96, 160; Reddin 31; Drucker 130; Tannenbaum 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Drucker 9; Hersey/Blanchard 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Drucker 20; Goodman (Wexley 582); Nord (Wexley 570).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Reddin 31; Hersey/Blanchard 160.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Reddin 32; Hersey/Blanchard 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Farace 76; Reddin 31; Hersey/Blanchard 96; 160.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Walker 160; Bogard 43; Drucker 116; Tannenbaum 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Drucker 127; Hersey/Blanchard 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Hersey/Blanchard 96, 160; Blake/Mouton 160; Bogard 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Bogard 3; Rausch 145; Hersey/Blanchard 96, 160.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Teel (Wexley 605); Simonds (Wexley 622); Wexley 590.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Tannenbaum 160; Bogard 15; Hersey/Blanchard 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Blake/Mouton 154; Reddin 31; Hersey/Blanchard 160.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Sanders 20; Engstrom 90; I Corinthians 12; I Thessalonians 5.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Sanders 75; Engstrom 118; Romans 12.12; Ephesians 6.18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Sanders 29; Engstrom 102; James 1.19-26; Ephesians 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Sanders 116; Engstrom 89; Philippians 1.27; Psalm 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Sanders 127; Engstrom 190; Matthew 4, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Sanders 11; Engstrom 207; 2 Chronicals 26.16; 2 Corinthians 3.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Sanders 39; Engstrom 90; Acts 17.11; Romans 15.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Sanders 13; Engstrom 49; Galations 5. 16-23; Hebrews 13.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>Sanders 53; Engstrom 118; James 4.13ff; Nehemiah 1:4ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Sanders 74; Engstrom 31; Romans 8; I Peter 4; I Corinthians 13.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*T = technical; H = human; S = spiritual
BEHAVIORAL TYPES UNDER STUDY

(T = technical orientation; H = human orientation; S = spiritual)

T1: basing decisions according to organizational policy.
T2: clearly defining organizational goals.
T3: clearly setting job parameters.
T4: promoting the organization to employees.
T5: setting clear lines of authority.
T6: setting clear lines of communication.
T7: evaluating goals and means to the goals.
T8: clearly defining expectations.
T9: evaluating performance of employees.
T10: organizing the work to be carried out by employees.
T11: providing necessary resources to accomplish task.
T12: providing a disciplined environment in the organization.
H1: promoting close relationships amongst subordinates.
H2: providing socioemotional support to subordinates.
H3: encouraging meaningful communication.
H4: providing for individual differences in employees.
H5: allowing employees input with the decision making process.
H6: allowing employees input with regard their specific tasks.
H7: motivating employees through positive feedback.
H8: providing for the physical safety of employees.
H9: establishing a comfortable working environment.
H10: providing socioemotional support beyond the working environment.
S1: encouraging spiritual maturity.
S2: encouraging the development of an active prayer life.
S3: holding high moral values.
S4: setting plans in accord with scriptural guidelines.
S5: acting in accord with scriptural guidelines.
S6: showing humility in action.
S7: encouraging the development of patterned Bible study.
S8: placing emphasis on spiritual duty and reward.
S9: placing God's wisdom ahead of humankind's.
S10: emphasizing the reality of spiritual outcomes.
APPENDIX G

Questionnaire Draft and Summary Comments
BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS -- TECHNICAL ORIENTATION

1. L: Always makes decisions not in accord with organizational policy and practice.
   M: Decisions are based upon organizational policy and practice unless circumstances require otherwise.
   H: Never violates established organizational policy and practice when decisions are made.

2. L: Never draws attention to or explains organizational goals to subordinates.
   M: Only explains organizational goals when he/she believes that subordinates are not functioning properly.
   H: Frequently defines and explains organizational goals to subordinates.

3. L: Allows subordinates to become involved in whatever organizational projects they wish to whenever they wish to.
   M: Allows subordinates to move from one project to another in the organization under a planned, coordinated program.
   H: Restricts subordinates to one well-defined project until such time as he/she believes it expedient to change them around.

4. L: Is not concerned as to how subordinates view or feel about the organization.
   M: Holds a personal allegiance to the organization but does not try to impose these upon others.
   H: Always promotes allegiance to the organization whenever he/she speaks with subordinates.

5. L: Allows subordinates to circumvent their superiors in bringing matters to the attention of other superordinates.
   M: Allows circumvention of lines of authority under some circumstances.
   H: Always demands that the established lines of authority be understood and respected.

6. L: Does not care by what means communication is given or received.
   M: Under some circumstances will allow communications to occur outside organizational channels.
   H: Only accepts and gives communications through established channels of communication.

7. C: Never evaluates the effectiveness of the means being used to achieve organization goals.
   M: Evaluates means to the goals on a random, nonscheduled basis.
   H: Constantly seeks to determine if appropriate means are being used to achieve goals.

8. C: Does not define or explain the work required of subordinates.
   M: Gives subordinates a general understanding of the work each is required to do.
   H: Checks with subordinates on a regular basis to see if each has a clear and detailed concept of the work each is required to do.

   M: Only evaluates the performance of subordinates when it appears that production and performance have dropped.
   H: Frequently evaluates subordinates performance through formal and informal means.
10. **L:** Allows subordinates complete say in determining how their work is organized.
   **M:** Coaches subordinates on how they might best organize their work to meet organization’s goals.
   **H:** Intervenes in subordinates’ organization of their work only when the survival of the organization is threatened.

11. **L:** Makes no effort to provide subordinates with the tools and supplies needed to carry out their work.
    **M:** Provides subordinates with tools and material and allows them to decide how to organize and process their work.
    **H:** Always organizes and provides the tools and material used by subordinates in carrying out their job requirements.

12. **L:** Never shows concern about subordinates’ behavior in the organization.
    **M:** Allows subordinates to behave within the general guidelines of the organization.
    **H:** Strictly enforces all rules and regulations with regard to subordinate behavior.

**BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS -- HUMAN ORIENTATION**

1. **L:** Discourages the formation of any close relationships amongst subordinates.
   **M:** Allows subordinate interrelationships to exist on a superficial level.
   **H:** Constantly encourages subordinates to develop strong relationships amongst all the workers.

2. **L:** Keeps him/herself completely removed physically, socially and emotionally from subordinates.
   **M:** Interacts with subordinates only on a professional level.
   **H:** Encourages subordinates to interact socially and emotionally with their superior(s).

3. **C:** Never allows subordinates to communicate with superiors.
   **M:** Allows subordinates to communicate with superiors only through official lines of communications.
   **H:** Encourages subordinates to use both formal and informal channels of communications with superiors.

4. **C:** Demands that all workers conform to a single style in their work habits.
   **M:** Allows for individual differences in work habits as long as the organization does not have to make extra provisions.
   **H:** Adapts the organization in order to accommodate all individual differences in subordinate work habits.

5. **C:** Never allows subordinates to participate in or influence the decision making process of the organization.
   **M:** Will listen to subordinates’ suggestions regarding organizational decisions but may or may not act upon them.
   **H:** Always seeks out subordinates’ opinions regarding organizational decisions and adapts the decisions accordingly.
6. **L:** Completely ignores suggestions and concerns coming from subordinates.
   **M:** Listen to subordinates suggestions and concerns only when he/she initiates the inquiry.
   **H:** Encourages subordinates to voice their suggestions and concerns whenever they wish to do so.

7. **L:** Constantly criticizes subordinates' efforts on the job.
   **M:** Says nothing negative nor positive regarding subordinates' work performance.
   **H:** Always gives positive feedback and encouragement to subordinates on their work performance.

8. **L:** Totally disregards the safety needs of subordinates on the job.
   **M:** Provides subordinates with the minimal safety requirements established by law.
   **H:** Provides employees with all the safety features possible for their jobs.

9. **L:** Considers "creature comforts" a waste of time and resources.
   **M:** Allows subordinates to provide their own "creature comfort" items.
   **H:** Makes every effort to provide subordinates with a comfortable working environment.

10. **L:** Shows no concern for subordinates' private life.
    **M:** Inquires into subordinates' personal life when it appears to be affecting job performance.
    **H:** Frequently seeks to know the status of the personal life of each subordinate.

**BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS -- SPIRITUAL ORIENTATION**

1. **L:** Shows no concern for the spiritual life of subordinates.
   **M:** Shows concern for subordinates' spiritual life when he/she feels such could be stronger.
   **H:** Always encourages subordinates to grow spiritually and helps them to do so.

2. **L:** Never prays with subordinates.
   **M:** Joins in prayer with subordinates only in formal gatherings.
   **H:** Prays daily with subordinates in an informal setting.

3. **L:** Constantly uses words in conversation that demean or defame others.
   **M:** Uses demeaning or defamatory language only when upset with the individual being referred to.
   **H:** Always uses language free of defamatory and demeaning words.

4. **L:** Sets organizational goals without regard to biblical mores.
   **M:** Takes biblical mores into consideration when setting organizational goals but may or may not follow them.
   **H:** Will never set as a goal for the organization something that might lead to the violation of biblical mores.
5. L: Encourages goal achievement by any means.
   M: Allows means outside the parameters of biblical teaching to be used
       on an occasional basis.
   H: Always insists that all means to goals be in accord with biblical
       guidelines.

6. L: Claims and accepts personal credit when his/her personal efforts
    lead to success.
   M: Passes off statements of acclamation as inconsequential.
   H: Credits and honors God when personal efforts lead to success.

7. L: Shows no concern as to whether or not subordinates engage in daily
    Bible reading.
   M: Tells subordinates that it is good to read the Bible daily.
   H: Requires subordinates to meet for daily Bible reading in the
       organizational setting.

8. L: Always considers physical reward the greatest influence in his/her
    taking action.
   M: Will accept physical rewards but does not pursue such actively.
   H: Refuses any physical rewards for the work he/she performs.

9. L: Always makes new decisions without praying about them first.
   M: Prays before making new decisions when he/she considers such to be
       of major consequence.
   H: Always prays as a prerequisite to making new decisions.

10. L: Pays no attention to both the physical and spiritual outcomes of
    work.
    M: Draws attention to the physical and spiritual outcomes of work in
        formal group gatherings.
    H: Always draws attention to life and work having a spiritual as well
        as a physical outcome.
1. Decisions are consistent with the organization's policy. (Avoids making exceptions to rules or following personal inclinations that would be inconsistent with organizational policy.)
   -- Leader not like a robot, can act to transcend policy for organization's benefit rather than personal gain.
   -- "policy" = "formal policies."
   -- after "rules or" add "when made are subjected to organizational review"

2. Understands and communicates the goals of the organization. (Evidences a clear concept of the organization's purpose and goals and the ability to propagate these in the organization.)
   -- is "ability" really "ability" or "means"?
   -- Rewrite parenthetical comment: "Understands the organization's purpose and goals and acts to advocate these goals."

3. Sets the scope and depth of the work required for individual tasks.
   (Delimitates [defines] the tasks to facilitate the coordination of means to goals.)
   -- "Sets...of" = "Clearly identifies"
   -- "Delimitates" = "Specifies"

4. Encourages employees to support and serve the organization. (Positively influences employees to have a sense of ownership in the organization's philosophy and service.)
   -- "Encourages" is a human skill.
   -- Rewrite: "Developes employee sense of ownership in the organization's philosophy and mission."

5. Establishes and enforces organizational lines of authority. (Enhances control and the decision-making process by using consistent lines of authority.)
   -- "enforces" is too strong a word.

6. Establishes and enforces organizational lines of communications. (Controls the communications process by placing limits on the flow of information.)
   -- What kind of "limits"? direction, amount, kinds?
   -- "Controls" = "opens"
   -- "placing limits on" = "setting guidelines for"
   -- "enforces" is too strong a word.
   -- Rewrite: "Manages the communications process by choosing what information to communicate and to whom."

7. Evaluates the validity of individual organizational goals. (Reviews goals to help assure that the organization is doing the right things.)
   -- "doing" = "aiming for"
   -- "validity" = "appropriateness"
   -- Rewrite: "Evaluates organizational goals."
   -- Rewrite "is doing..." = "to determine if the goals retain internal validity."

8. Evaluates the validity of the means used to achieve organizational goals. (Reviews the means to help determine if more effective or efficient ways of task accomplishment are available or preferred.)
   -- Delete "the validity of" "help"
   -- "ways...-ment" = "steps used to accomplish goals."
9. Provides creature comforts in individual work stations. (Makes efforts to give employees an enjoyable as well as tolerable working environment.)
   "Provides for maximum individual comfort in the work stations of subordinates."
   "Give employees an aesthetically pleasing as well as functional work environment."

10. Provides socioemotional support to employees outside the work situation. (Desires that the social situation and emotional welfare of the employee outside the workplace is stable and acceptable to the employee.)
   "Socioemotional support" is vague. One could cross the limits and so interfere.
   "How? Is this legal?"
   "Is willing to provide socio..."?
   "To employees in situations outside the workplace."

Comments:
   "Integrates individual employee goals into the corporate strategy." This includes finding the best "fit" of an employee's skills and abilities and the corporate need for those skills.
   "Provide good opportunities for advancement and job enrichment." This includes choosing good criteria for promotional selections and a willingness to be innovative (short term job rotations, etc.) with employees who desire new challenges.

[Under Spiritual Orientation consider these changes:]

S3: The variables refer only to moral language. These should be broadened to include the "right and wrong" of actions and words.

S7: (High) Suggest a more practical description in the work environment: "Encourages Bible reading and provides suitable environment and time during the work day."

S8: (High) Suggest a more practical description. "Consider spiritual rewards to be more important than physical rewards during the work day."

--Add an item to determine personal relationship with Christ.

--Consult Katz!!!
HUMAN ORIENTATION -- THE LEADER'S BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS

(Please add to, delete from or critique the items on this page.)

1. Encourages subordinates to form close relationships amongst themselves. (Promotes feelings of acceptance and kinship between employees.)
   -- Drop "st" in "amongst."
   -- What kind of "close relationships"? Better to say "one of mutual respect."
   -- Shorten to "Promotes relationships amongst subordinates."
   -- Is "acceptance and kinship" too open to interpretation?

2. Provides subordinates with socioemotional support. (Shows a concern for the social life and emotional welfare of the employee.)
   -- Does this mean "listening"?
   -- "Provides socioemotional support to subordinates."

3. Encourages and practices candid and open communications with employees. (Seeks to hear the concerns and opinions of employees and respond to these in a constructive fashion.)
   -- "Encourages and practices" = "Is".
   -- "employees" = "subordinates."

4. Provides for physical, mental and psychological employee differences. (Accommodates individual differences in employee performance ability and attitude.)
   -- "Provides for the p, m, p differences of employees."
   -- "Recognizes and provides p, m, p differences among subordinates."
   -- Paranthetical statement should be better stated.

5. Seeks employee input on organizational decisions. (Allows employees to have influence on the decisions made in the organization.)
   -- Change "input" to "participation in making"
   -- Change "employee" to subordinates.

6. Seeks employee input with regard to their task structure and demands. (Allows employees to influence the manner and amount of work required.)
   -- "Seeks employee involvement in determining..."
   -- "Allows employees input in regard to..."
   -- Change "employee" to "subordinate."
   -- "to their means of task completion and resources."

7. Gives employees positive feedback on their performance. (Reenforces the employee's sense of self-worth and ability.)
   -- The converse? "Gives employees negative feedback on their performance when necessary."
   -- How about negative? Critique with documented info for development.
   -- "positive" = "appropriate and specific."
   -- "employee" = "subordinate."

8. Assures that the working environment is safe from physical hazards. (Has a high concern for employee safety.)
   -- "environment" = "climate"
9. **Evaluates the effectiveness and efficiency of employee work and provides feedback to them.** (Reviews and revises methods of work accomplishment as work conditions, tools, methods and resources change.)
   --add "such" after accomplishment.
   --"work" = "performance"
   --"provides constructive feedback..."  
   --delete entire item.

10. **Coordinates the tasks of employees for increased production.** (Perceives the interrelations between tasks and can organize them for more effective processing of goods and/or services.)
   --change "increased" to "effective" or "satisfactory" or "to increase."
   --add "or efficient" after "effective."
   --get rid of all slashes.

11. **Provides all the resources needed to accomplish the organization's goals.** (Assures that the inflow of tools/materials is consistent and adequate.)
    --delete "all."
    --delete slash.
    --better word for "inflow"
    --"tools/materials" = "personnel, time, space and materials."

12. **Provides a disciplined environment in the organization.** (Controls worker behavior in order to provide an environment that increases output.)
    --Change to "disciplined" to "professional."
    --"Controls" = "sets parameters for"
    --"Control" does not necessarily "increase" output. Incongruent
    --"disciplined" = "safe and orderly."
    --"controls worker behavior" should be better stated.

**COMMENTS:**

--Statements are stock. Industrial humanism is the issue, not Christian values per se.

--Something about employee development plans?

--Something about defining specific, measurable job objectives and standards?

--"Provides opportunities for continuing education of employee."

--"Promotes productive and efficient work."

--"Provides recognition for good work."

--"Promotes constructive problem solving with employees in a timely manner."

--Where does training fit? #11?

--Katz's "conceptual" element may be a crucial addition in dealing with the Christian orientation.

--narrow the focus on what is meant by "leadership."

--Where in all of this is a key leader behavior -- motivating employees by assessing their needs and providing extrinsic and intrinsic rewards to meet them?
APPENDIX H

Questionnaire Used With Trial Group With Role Descriptions
ROLE CATEGORY "I"

ROLE: You work in an organization that is notably Christian in character and is considered "excellent" in its field. Much of the success of the organization is attributed to your chief executive officer who seems to embody these outstanding traits of your organization.

ROLE CATEGORY "II"

ROLE: You work in an organization that is notably Christian in character but is rather poorly run and not considered successful in its field. Much of this situation is due to your chief executive officer who seems to try hard but lacks the ability to organize systems and work with people in accomplishing the organization's goals.

ROLE CATEGORY "III"

ROLE: You work in an organization that is secular in purpose and character and which is considered "excellent" in its field. Much of the success of the organization is attributed to your chief executive officer who, while not Christian, works well with people and can see to it that the organization meets and surpasses its goals in profits, quality and growth.

ROLE CATEGORY "IV"

ROLE: You work in an organization that is secular in purpose and character but is rather poorly run and not considered successful in its field. Much of this situation is due to your chief executive officer who seems to lack the ability to organize systems and work with people in accomplishing the organization's goals.
1 = Almost never behaves this way
2 = Sometimes but not often behaves this way
3 = Neutral (You neither agree nor disagree)
4 = Often behaves this way
5 = Very consistently behaves this way

1. Sees the primary motivation to work as being spiritual in nature. Is not preoccupied by physical reward or monetary remuneration for services rendered.

2. Does not seek subordinate participation in making organizational decisions. Does not allow subordinates to have influence on the decisions made.

3. Shows a concern for the spiritual life of subordinates. Encourages subordinates to develop a positive and growing understanding of and love for God.

4. Recognizes and provides for physical, mental and psychological differences among subordinates. Accommodates individual differences in subordinate performance ability and attitude.

5. Coordinates the tasks of subordinates to increase production. Perceives the interrelations between tasks and can organize them for more effective and efficient processing of goods and services.

6. Evaluates organizational goals. Assesses goals to determine if the goals are still valid.

7. Clearly identifies the work required for individual tasks. Specifies and defines subordinate tasks in order to facilitate the coordination of means to goals.

8. Encourages subordinates to support and serve the organization. Develops subordinates' sense of ownership in the organization's philosophy and mission.

9. Evaluates the means used to achieve organizational goals. Assesses the means to determine if more effective and efficient steps toward goal accomplishment are available and preferred.

10. Provides a professional environment in the organization. Sets parameters for worker behavior in order to provide an environment that increases worker performance.

11. Seeks subordinate involvement in determining their available resources and means to task accomplishment. Allows subordinates to influence the manner and amount of work required.

12. Gives leadership in providing subordinates with maximum individual comfort in their work areas. Makes efforts to give subordinates an aesthetically pleasing as well as functional work environment.
1 = Almost never behaves this way
2 = Sometimes but not often behaves this way
3 = Neutral (You neither agree nor disagree
4 = Often behaves this way
5 = Very consistently behaves this way

13. Does not pray with subordinates. Is not free to lead in prayer over particular matters in both formal and informal situations.

14. Utilizes biblical mores in establishing the means to the goals. Requires that all means used be within acceptable Christian parameters as presented in the Bible.

15. Encourages subordinates to read the Bible daily. Seeks to have subordinates prioritize their lives around the teachings of the Bible.

16. Does not credit and honors God when successes are realized. Focuses attention and praise on his or her own personal accomplishments.

17. Does not base decisions on the organization's formal policies. Makes exceptions to rules and when exceptions are made such are not subjected to organizational review.

18. Utilizes biblical mores in setting organizational goals. Operates on the principle that no goal is valid that violates biblical teachings.

19. Clearly communicates the goals of the organization. Understands the organization's purpose and goals and acts to advocate these goals.

20. Demonstrates prudence and discernment in content and tone of speech. Does not use words that purposefully offend or degrade subordinates.

21. Adheres to organizational lines of authority. Enhances control and the decision-making process by using consistent lines of authority.

22. Provides subordinates with opportunities for advancement and job enrichment. Chooses valid criteria for promotional selections and shows a willingness to be innovative with subordinates who desire new challenges.

23. Prescribes the organization's lines of communications. Manages the communications process by choosing what information to communicate and to whom.

24. Provides leadership in order to assure that the working climate is safe from physical hazards. Has a high concern for subordinates' safety.
1 = Almost never behaves this way
2 = Sometimes but not often behaves this way
3 = Neutral (You neither agree nor disagree
4 = Often behaves this way
5 = Very consistently behaves this way

25. Evaluates subordinate performance and provides constructive feedback to them. Reviews and revises methods of performance as conditions, tools and methods change.

26. Does not give subordinates appropriate and specific feedback on their performance. Ignores subordinates' sense of self-worth and ability.

27. Does not provide the resources needed to accomplish the organization's goals. Does not assure that the availability of personnel, time, space and materiel is consistent and adequate.

28. Is open and candid in communicating with subordinates. Seeks to hear the concerns and opinions of subordinates and respond to these in a constructive fashion.

29. Promotes an atmosphere of mutual respect among subordinates. Encourages subordinates to look for and appreciate the positive contributions of other employees.

30. Provides socioemotional support to subordinates. Shows a concern for the social life and emotional welfare of subordinates.
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