

Theology of
Leadership
JOURNAL

Volume 3, Issue 1, 2020



Table of Contents

<i>Editorial: A Noteworthy Mile-Marker for Theory and Praxis: Schuringa</i>	3
<i>The Effects of Transformational Leadership and Management Experience of Pastors on Church Business Operations: Butler & Senses-Ozyurt</i>	5
<i>Pastoral Authenticity and the Duplex Cognito Dei: DiVietro</i>	24
<i>What Aren't Christian Leadership Outcomes? An Expansion of Bell's Theoretical Model of Christian Leadership: Cushman</i>	34
<i>Ministry Involvement of Church Staff and Volunteers: The Role of Organizational Commitment and Work Engagement: Dunaetz & Boccock</i>	51
<i>The Head Bowed Generation: An Ethical Perspective on Social Media, Culture, and Leadership: Simon</i>	68
<i>Spiritual Formation and Leadership Development: Is Intellectual and Spiritual Balance Possible for the Ecclesial Leader?: Mizzell & Henson</i>	83
<i>Book Review: A Postcolonial Leadership: Asian Immigrant Christian Leadership and its Challenges: Bekker</i>	98
<i>Book Review: The Golden Key for Life and Leaders: The Idea of Office: Spranger</i>	101

Abigail Boggan, a student at Toccoa Falls College, created the cover artwork. She explains that Christian leadership is learning to sit in the hurt and brokenness of our lives and to embrace the changing of the seasons. In doing so, we see new life blooming as we rejoice in the brokenness, knowing that the Father is at work in our lives. Christian leadership is learning to step into the process of mourning, reflecting, and growing over and over again so that we can lead others through the same process. She hopes we never forget that our role as a leader is one of loving others deeply as we seek out the new growth that comes from seasons of brokenness.

Theology of
Leadership



Volume 3, Issue 1, 2020
All material licensed under
CC BY-NC-ND 4.0
theologyofleadership@gmail.com

Editorial Team

Editor: Russell L. Huizing, Ph.D.
Content Editor: MaryJo Burchard, Ph.D.
Production Editor: Chris Hamstra, Ph.D.
Theology Representative: H. David Schuringa, Ph.D.
Leadership Representative: Artem Kliuchnikov, Ph.D.

WHAT AREN'T CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP OUTCOMES? AN EXPANSION OF BELL'S THEORETICAL MODEL OF CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP

Barry Cushman

Liberty University's Rawlings School of Divinity

ABSTRACT: This paper extends Bell's (2019) theoretical development of a model of Christian leadership, which explored the dimensions of toxic leadership and their associations with the leadership characteristics Jesus rejected as revealed in Matthew 23:1–7. Bell inferred those rejected characteristics form the antitheses for a model of healthy (Christian) leadership consisting of at least six dimensions. Bells' suggestion that the seven woes of Matthew 23 address toxic leaders was accepted, and those verses were analyzed for their insights into the potential outcomes of toxic leadership, which, it is assumed, also form the antitheses of the outcomes of healthy leadership. Those outcomes and the toxic behaviors and qualities of another popular model were mapped to Bell's dimensions and compared. The analyses suggest at least one additional dimension of toxic leadership: incompetence.

KEYWORDS: *Toxic Leadership, Destructive Leadership, Healthy Leadership, Matthew 23 Woes*

What Aren't Christian Leadership Outcomes? An Expansion of Bell's Theoretical Model of Christian Leadership

Recently, in this journal, Bell (2019) presented an interesting approach to develop a theory of Christian leadership: He suggested that by identifying the leadership characteristics and traits Jesus rejected, Christian alternatives could be identified. To identify those characteristics, Bell analyzed Jesus' discussion of the leadership styles of the scribes and Pharisees presented in Mt 23:1–7. He asserted Schmidt's (2008, 2014) five dimensions of toxic leadership (abusive supervision, authoritarian leadership, narcissism, unpredictability, and self-promotion) corresponded to, and therefore formed the framework for a better understanding of, Jesus's rejected leadership characteristics, and he reasoned that those (rejected) characteristics provide insight into the leadership characteristics Jesus prefers. Bell concluded that from those preferred characteristics emerges a six-dimension model of (healthy) Christian leadership (reasoning that healthy leadership dimensions are essentially the opposites of the toxic dimensions). The dimensions of each are provided in Table 1.

Table 1

Bell (2019): Dimensions of Toxic and Healthy (Christian) Leadership

Matthew 23	Leadership dimensions	
verse(s)	Toxic	Healthy
4	Abusive supervision	Respectful oversight
2–3	Authoritarian leadership	Volitional leadership
6–7	Narcissism	Altruism
3	Unpredictability	Stable consistency
5	Self-promoting	Follower advocate
	Hypocrisy *	Sincere integrity

Note. Adapted from Bell, R. M. (2019). "What's Not Christian Leadership?" *Theology of Leadership Journal*, 2(1), 56–72.

* Bell considered hypocrisy to be common to all toxic leadership dimensions, which justifies his rationale that the opposite dimensions must form what is healthy leadership.

Bell (2019) stopped his analysis at Mt 23:7. This paper examines Jesus's pronounced woes on the scribes and Pharisees in Mt 23:8–33. The goal is to further develop a theoretical model of Christian leadership. Theoretical models have been described as metaphors to help understand complex phenomena, but metaphors distort reality (Morgan, 2006). Therefore, it is important to avoid stretching a model beyond what it can reasonably communicate and to avoid thinking that a single model can fully encapsulate the entire range of phenomena it seeks to explain. Thus, the theoretical model expanded here remains incomplete, but it is hoped that it is incrementally closer to the reality it is designed to represent.

ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

For the purpose of the following analysis, and as recommended by Bell (2019), it is assumed that the “seven woes [are] directed toward toxic leader exemplars [and therefore] provide insight regarding the potential outcomes of toxic leadership in a contemporary context” (p. 69). This is consistent with France’s (1994) understanding of the text in that Jesus’s comments repudiate the Scribes’ and Pharisees’ leadership.

Consistent with Bell (2019), a socio-rhetorical approach is used. However, unlike Bell, which focused on the social and cultural texture, the analysis here will also include the inner texture, particularly the argumentative texture. The social and cultural analyses will follow the method described by Bell and therefore will not be repeated here except to restate the emphasis on common social and cultural topics, e.g., honor and shame, contracts, challenge-response, purity codes, status (Robbins, 1996/2012).

It is important to note, however, the prominence of honor and shame (or disgrace) as a means of social control. According to deSilva (1999), those living in the Mediterranean at the time of Jesus were raised to seek honor and shun shame, which provided a strong incentive for people to engage in behaviors and hold views that the community, as a whole, tended to view as honorable while abstaining from those viewed as dishonorable. DeSilva also noted that societal perception of one’s degree of honor determined, to some extent, his or her status in society or a group. Thus, by seeking honor for oneself (by replicating the behaviors and adopting the views of the group with which one best identifies), one was also seeking what was best for the group. These dynamics will be observed repeatedly in the woes and therefore are important to note.

The argumentative texture consists of the inner reasoning within a text, which may progress logically or qualitatively (Robbins, 1996/2012). The woes pronounced in Matthew 23 result from wrong behaviors and attitudes and describe, from God’s perspective, the condition of those on whom they are pronounced (Tasker, 1996). According to Robbins (1996), “one of the most characteristic aspects of logical argumentation is the function of unstated premises in the discourse” (p. 59). Discerning what is unstated but suggested or implied (i.e., enthymematic analysis) can be very revealing and informative. Therefore, it is expected that the stated or deducible premises (or cases) justifying, explaining, clarifying, or persuading listeners of the aptness of the resulting woes provide insights into the thoughts and behaviors that shaped the woeful conditions addressed.

Despite limiting the analyses to only two textures, they will often overlap. To differentiate the approaches, each analysis will typically be presented separately. However, each analysis may inform the other, and to avoid redundancy, one analysis may reference the other. Additionally, every enthymeme in a syllogistic argument, for example, will not be stated explicitly as others, such as Combrink (2003), have done much more thorough work in that regard. Instead, the focus will be upon the implications of the argumentation whether explicitly stated or implied in the text.

ANALYSIS OF THE WOES OF MATTHEW 23:8–33

WOE ONE (V 13)

But woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you shut off the kingdom of heaven from people; for you do not enter in yourselves, nor do you allow those who are entering to go in. (Mt 23:13, NASB)

ARGUMENTATIVE TEXTURE. As with all but the third woe, the first woe begins, “but woe to you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites” (Mt 23:13). The reasons for the woe include the following: The religious leaders—those who should have had the knowledge of how to open the door to heaven for others—were neither competent to enter themselves nor to allow their followers to enter. The argument implies followers were very dependent on the leaders, looking for direction (Barbieri, 1985) and information, but good direction was not being provided.

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL TEXTURE. The Pharisees had much influence within their communities and clearly had the support of the Scribes (Weren, 2014), which is consistent with what the passage also suggests: The religious leaders, those believed to possess knowledge of how to enter heaven, possessed social power, e.g., coercive power, expert power (French & Raven, 1969; Mintzberg, 1983), which elevated their social status (and which Jesus was challenging). Other passages also support the leaders’ status as power wielders, but, as Jesus argued here, in doing so, they missed the organizational mission and thus misused their power. They gained their power, in part, because they were hypocrites—a term originally used for Greek actors who wore masks to assume their multiple roles (Wilkins, 2004). That is, Jesus was communicating the leaders achieved their status by taking on the roles of religious leaders without inwardly being what they claimed and presented, which implies alternative motives.

WOE TWO¹ (V 15)

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you travel around on sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he becomes one, you make him twice as much a son of hell as yourselves. (Mt 23:15)

ARGUMENTATIVE TEXTURE. The unstated premise is that the leaders were chosen to make heavenly converts (Robbins, 2002); however, despite their calling, they failed to make the converts God desired. Therefore, this woe addresses the zealotry of the leaders (Barbieri, 1985). Although zeal can be good, in the case of toxic leaders, the followers became even worse off than the leaders. Making converts was not wrong—it was very proper—but the followers were being equipped with the wrong information (Keener, 1993) and the leaders were replicating themselves (Robertson, 1933) and their errors rather than producing converts who would be prepared to carry out the true mission.

¹Although omitted in many manuscripts, Mt 23:14 presents an eighth woe. If authentic, the woe suggests the religious leaders were inconsistent (Barbieri, 1985), covetous (Ryle, 1993), and willing to take advantage of followers (Wiersbe, 1996).

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL TEXTURE. The leaders again were identified as hypocrites, but here they were also identified as “son[s] of hell”—a strong challenge to their social identities. If the religious leaders were present as Bell (2019) concluded, then the challenge-response went unanswered before the crowd. If they were not present, as Combrink (2003) concluded, then Jesus’s challenge (to the absent religious leaders’ honor) still would have had its intended effect on hearers. Although the religious leaders made converts, it was their personal agendas, i.e., their interests in growth to gain greater honor and status—not their interest in their followers needs—that was behind their zeal (Ryle, 1993).

WOE THREE (VV 16–22)

ARGUMENTATIVE TEXTURE. The third woe addresses the leaders’ methods of invalidating their oaths, and the results of the arguments include the leaders being classified as “blind” (twice), and “fools”:

Woe to you, blind guides, who say, “Whoever swears by the temple, that is nothing; but whoever swears by the gold of the temple is obligated.” You fools and blind men! Which is more important, the gold or the temple that sanctified the gold? And, “Whoever swears by the altar, that is nothing, but whoever swears by the offering on it, he is obligated.” You blind men, which is more important, the offering, or the altar that sanctifies the offering? (Mt 23:16–19)

Jesus argued that all such attempts to invalidate oaths equated to deception and dishonesty (Barbieri, 1985). That is, the leaders demonstrated a serious lack of integrity and a distorted value system (France, 1985). It is not clear that the leaders were fully aware of the extent of their deception or its effects given Jesus’ multiple references to the leaders as “blind.” The leaders seem to have accepted their own rationalizations for deception as justified.

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL TEXTURE. Ryle (1993), however, suggested the leaders were more manipulative and diabolical in that by distinguishing between oaths, the leaders attached more importance to certain oaths than others. Jesus pointed out that by doing so, the religious leaders did not address the implications:

Therefore, whoever swears by the altar, swears both by the altar and by everything on it. And whoever swears by the temple, swears both by the temple and by Him who dwells within it. And whoever swears by heaven, swears both by the throne of God and by Him who sits upon it. (Mt 23:20–22)

Ryle (1993) concluded the effect of distinguishing between oaths was to make “men overrate the value of charitable giving and offerings [which] advanced their own interests” (p. 218). Doing so appears to have been designed to bolster one’s sense of status and honor—and therefore, power. Given the Pharisees were known for their greed (Lk 16:14), Ryle’s view is not unreasonable. Regardless, it is clear from the argumentative texture that several of the leaders were neither consistent, nor were they highly ethical. Instead, they were willing to change the rules in whatever way best suited them (Ryle, 1993). The more complicated the rules, perhaps particularly as regards purity, the more the leaders’ perceived knowledge increased in value as a commodity, which, again, would work to satisfy a need for power while enhancing social status. Regardless, their errors resulted in faulty teaching by sending faulty messages of what is proper.

 WOE FOUR (V 23–24)

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you tithe mint and dill and cummin, and have neglected the weightier provisions of the law: justice and mercy and faithfulness; but these are the things you should have done without neglecting the others. You blind guides, who strain out a gnat and swallow a camel! (Mt 23:23–24)

ARGUMENTATIVE TEXTURE. The fourth woe again concludes the religious leaders are “hypocrites” and “blind guides,” and the argument supporting the woe addresses the leaders’ meticulousness in tithing while neglecting “the weightier provisions of the law: justice and mercy, and faithfulness” (v. 23). That is, the text suggests the leaders majored on the minors while minoring on what should have been of major importance (Barbieri, 1985). By focusing on the minutiae, they neglected what mattered most and therefore could not be trusted to do (or complete) what was proper. Their hyper-focus on gnats resulted in their blindness to the camels that slipped past them! Moreover, it demonstrated their inconsistency.

In arguing the rationale for this woe, Jesus used a typical argumentative approach by alluding to ancient text as a means of persuasion (Robbins, 1996/2012). In verse 23, he apparently reminded his audience of a portion of Micah 6:8 regarding justice, kindness, and mercy. The leaders were anything but humble: They thought they were better than most (Mt 9:11), and they tended neither to display mercy or kindness nor to seek justice (Mt 22:15). Rather, they tended to be hypercritical of others and seemed to believe adherence to religious rituals was more important than righteousness (Wilkens, 2004). By neglecting justice, mercy (kindness), and faithfulness, Jesus implied they demonstrated the opposite outcomes: unfairness/inequity, hostility, and untrustworthiness.

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL TEXTURE. Although the Pharisees disagreed about the Law’s requirement to tithe cumin (Keener, 1993), it seems doing so was just another way for them to boast about their self-righteousness. Verse 23 reveals they were doing what they should have been doing, at least to some extent (tithing), but their reasoning was flawed. They should have made the weightier matters their priorities. Instead, they seemed to have been more concerned about flattering their own egos (i.e., they were prideful) and presenting an (honor-increasing and) elevated appearance of righteousness before others.

 WOE FIVE (VV 25–26)

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you clean the outside of the cup and of the dish, but inside they are full of robbery and self-indulgence. You blind Pharisee, first clean the inside of the cup and of the dish, so that the outside of it may become clean also. (Mt 23:25–26)

ARGUMENTATIVE TEXTURE. The fifth woe again concludes the religious leaders are “hypocrites” and “blind.” Here (as in the sixth), Jesus argued that the leaders were more concerned with their outward appearances than their internal morality (France, 1985) and therefore unwilling to change. Robertson (1933) described Jesus’s words as depicting ruthless leaders. Jesus argued they were greedy (willing to rob—an act of violence/hostility or threatened violence) and self-indulgent, and the argument was framed in such a way as to bring attention to leaders’ deceptive actions, which were designed to create the façade of morality (Barbieri, 1985).

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL TEXTURE. The argumentative texture clearly presents a case for being inwardly—not just outwardly—clean, and the leaders' lack of inner cleanness would have been viewed as shameful (as well as hypocritical) rather than honoring. The leaders—and hearers—surely would have been concerned about how others perceived them (Robbins, 1996/2012), and therefore Jesus's statements here (and throughout the woes) are designed to persuade others to also reject projecting a façade.

WOE SIX (VV 27–28)

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs which on the outside appear beautiful, but inside they are full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness. So, you, too, outwardly appear righteous to men, but inwardly you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness. (Mt 23:27–28)

ARGUMENTATIVE TEXTURE. The sixth woe is like the fifth in that Jesus's argument in support of the leaders being classified as “hypocrites” references the externalism of the leaders. “The difference is that the [fifth] woe castigates the concealment of avarice, whereas the [sixth] condemns the concealment of hypocrisy and lawlessness” (MacDonald, 1995, p. 1290). MacDonald (1995) further noted that followers did not receive what they expected. That is, followers expected their experiences with the leaders to be sanctifying, leading to (healthy) growth, but instead they were defiling. The need for Jesus to make the argument and thereby point out the true status of the religious leaders reveals just how successful the leaders were in deceiving others.

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL TEXTURE. Just as ossuaries were beautified to hide the decaying bones of the deceased inside (Wilkins, 2004), the leaders here (as in woe five) effectively kept their appearances clean to hide the inward reality. As noted already, their blindness suggests at least some were even deceiving themselves despite the extent of their inward defilement. Still, their false projections served to enhance their honor and status. However, Jesus's argument again highlighted the reality that it is shame—not honor—to which the leaders were entitled.

WOE SEVEN (VV 29–33)

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you build the tombs of the prophets and adorn the monuments of the righteous, and say, ‘If we had been *living* in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partners with them in *shedding* the blood of the prophets.’ So, you testify against yourselves, that you are sons of those who murdered the prophets. Fill up, then, the measure *of the guilt* of your fathers. You serpents, you brood of vipers, how will you escape the sentence of hell? (Mt 23:29–33)

ARGUMENTATIVE TEXTURE. Two results appear in the discourse of the final woe (Combrink, 2003). The first is the typical classification of the leaders as hypocrites, and the second appears in verse 32: “Fill up, then, the measure of the guilt of your fathers.” This woe reveals the narcissism and self-deception of the leaders as they belittled their murderous forefathers and failed to learn from their mistakes. The leaders believed themselves to be more capable, and therefore less likely to sin, than their ancestors, but their rejection of Christ proved differently. Combrink (2003) concluded an unexpressed rule in the discourse included that as true descendants of murderous ancestors, they should behave similarly. In the remaining verses, Jesus made clear just how hostile the leaders would become.

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL TEXTURE. Had the leaders truly honored their ancestors' memories, they would have practiced what those prophets taught (Levertoff, 1942). It seems the leaders wanted credit for honoring their ancestors—thereby identifying with their ancestors' successes—while ignoring the fact that they were just as hostile to God's messengers as were their forefathers (France, 1985). By identifying with their ancestors positively, the leaders were attempting to increase the honor due them. Jesus, however, exposed their hypocrisy and said they deserved hell rather than heaven, thus, shaming them again.

GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE WOES AND LEADERSHIP OUTCOMES

Jesus spoke about a particular group of religious leaders, and the application of the woes is most relevant in that regard; however, the principles gleaned from the outcomes of the religious leaders' leadership certainly must apply beyond the target group living at the time. Additionally, Jesus spoke in generalities; he was not developing a leadership model. Still, several principles are applicable to leadership, and Jesus's statements support the toxic leadership framework. Thus, the woes provide insight into the outcomes of toxic leadership.

The leadership characteristics of those addressed in the first two woes hindered people who desired to please God, and the leaders' approaches made followers worse off. The remaining woes demonstrated the inadequacies of the leaders' values (France, 1994). Whereas the religious leaders were replicating themselves (v. 15), their inadequate values were being passed on to others and got worse with each iteration. Jesus's concern seems to be the harm those leaders did (or could do) to their followers—a concern noted in the research literature as well. For example, Lipman-Blumen (2005) asserted toxic leaders often leave followers in a worse condition. Thus, perhaps the most troubling outcome of toxic leadership is that toxic leaders tend to replicate themselves.

Christ's language in the woes suggests a continuum exists—a continuum from nontoxic to various levels (or degrees) of toxic leaders. Moreover, in verse 15, Jesus, speaking about the leaders' converts said, "you *make* [emphasis added] him twice as much a son of hell as yourselves," which suggests toxic leaders do not necessarily start out as toxic: They are made. They learn toxicity over time. A continuum is consistent with Lipman-Blumen's (2005) findings. Thus, whereas toxic leaders can be made, and whereas the leaders replicated themselves, the characteristics described in the woes are themselves outcomes. Those outcomes are summarized in Table 2, and following Bell (2019), the opposite outcomes expected to form healthy leadership are suggested.

In brief, the outcomes of toxic leadership are increasing manifestations of toxicity. The same pattern is expected from healthy leadership: Healthy leadership produces greater health. The principle is similar to what the Scriptures state regarding wisdom, e.g., "Give instruction to a wise man and he will be still wiser; Teach a righteous man and he will increase his learning" (Prv 9:9). By exercising biblically based leadership, followers should tend to respond accordingly.

Table 2*Toxic and Healthy Leadership Outcomes Based on the Woes of Matthew 23*

Woe	Outcomes	
	Toxic	Healthy
1	Power use resulting in harm (missed opportunities); incompetence (inability to fulfill true mission); overly dependent followers; false motives	Power used ethically; competent (to fulfill mission), capable followers; pure motives
2	Zealousness (motivated by personal interests); effectiveness, but limited (due to self-promotion); (increasingly) negative effect on converts/followers (left worse off); replicate toxicity; ill-equipped followers	Zealousness (motivated by organizational interests); effectiveness; (increasingly) positive effect on converts/followers (left better off); replicate healthiness; well-equipped followers
3	Dishonesty; distorted values; unethical; inconsistency; complicated rules; faulty teaching; possible self-deception; manipulative; power hungry	Honesty; sound (biblical) values; ethical; consistency; straightforward rules; sound teaching; self-awareness; deferential; contentedness
4	Misplaced priorities; unfairness/inequity; hostility; untrustworthiness; pridefulness; incomplete (neglectful) performance; inconsistency	Befitting priorities; fairness/equity; kindness; trustworthiness; humility; complete performance; consistency
5	Focus on external appearances to hide internal reality; violence/hostility; ruthlessness; self-indulgence; greediness; unwillingness to change	Focus on and acknowledgement of internal realities; peacefulness; mercifulness; self-control; benevolence; willingness to change
6	Fraudulent image projection; hypocrisy; disregard for rules or propriety; defilement/spoliation of followers	True/credible image projection; authenticity; respect for/adherence to rules or propriety; growth/improvement
7	Narcissism; arrogance; sense of superiority; hostility (including violence); repeat errors of others; honor wrong values; take credit of others	Unpretentiousness; humility; sense of lowliness; peacefulness; learn from others' errors; honor; give credit to those due
All woes	Hypocrisy; words inconsistent with deeds; honor-seeking; shamefulness	Genuineness; words consistent with deeds; humility; honor

Note. Distinct descriptive terms are used of outcomes to differentiate them from the dimensions in Table 1.

Jesus' general statements in the woes are consistent with the literature regarding the potential negative outcomes of toxic leadership—some of which Bell (2019) already noted—which suggests Bell's novel approach to develop a Christian model of healthy leadership is well founded. The outcomes identified in the woes are certainly not all inclusive, but they appear to be foundational to

many observed in the scientific literature. Whereas the outcomes identified cannot be exhaustive given Jesus's goal was not leadership theory development, the dimensions and outcomes were compared to toxic leadership variables (i.e., the toxic behaviors and characteristics) Lipman-Blumen (2005) identified through her own extensive research.

MATTHEW 23 DERIVED VARIABLES COMPARED TO LIPMAN-BLUMEN'S (2005)

MAPPING VARIABLES TO DIMENSIONS

The Lipman-Blumen (2005) toxic leadership model was selected for comparison with Bell's (2019) findings because her model is well known and accepted by leadership scholars and is more descriptive than the equally influential "bad" leadership patterns identified by Kellerman (2004). If the theory Bell proposed is accurate, then Bell's theoretical model should overlap with Lipman-Blumen's. To assess how well the two models agree and how one might inform the other, the outcomes from the analyses above that are mappable to the dimensions proposed by Bell were entered into Table 3. Outcomes were assigned to the dimension to which they most likely map. The same was done for the variables Lipman-Blumen identified.

Clearly, any such mapping of outcomes, characteristics, and qualities requires some subjectivity; however, the outcomes were mapped based on the analyses of the woes and the definitions of toxic and healthy leadership dimensions as described by Bell (2019). Some were more easily mapped by considering the expected outcomes from healthy leadership dimensions. For example, analyses of the first and third woes revealed the religious leaders were power hungry. That desire for power could certainly be related to the self-promoting dimension of toxic leadership (i.e., to ensure higher statuses than those of their followers); however, Bell defined the healthy compliment to the narcissistic dimension (i.e., altruism) as "an unselfish concern for the health and well-being of followers" including modeling of "humility and meekness through caring" (p. 66) about their followers. Whereas the woe analyses suggested a greater sense of entitlement to power (a narcissistic trait), power is classified as deriving from the narcissism dimension. Some could easily map to more than one dimension (and are likely context dependent). Where each outcome maps is less important than those outcomes that do not seem to map to any dimensions. The same is true for the Lipman-Blumen (2005) behaviors/qualities that do not correspond to the findings from Matthew 23.

Table 3

Mt 23 outcomes and Lipman-Blumen (2005) variables mappable to toxic dimensions.

Matthew 23 derived		Lipman-Blumen
Dimensions	Outcomes	Behaviors and qualities
Abusive supervision	Ruthlessness; hostility (with and without violence)	Violations of basic human rights
Authoritarian leadership	Power use results in harm (missed opportunities); complicated rules	Squelch dissent; play to base fears/needs; <i>structuring overthrow to be self-destructive</i>
Narcissism	Arrogance; incomplete (neglectful) performance; narcissism; possible self-deception; pridefulness; repeat errors of others; unwillingness to change; sense of superiority; honor-seeking; self-indulgence; power hungry	Blinding ego* ; arrogance* ; insatiably power-hungry*
Self-promoting	Replicate toxicity (to own advantage); zealousness (self-motivated); take credit of others	Build sympathetic dynasties/regimes; <i>maliciously incite dissention; treat followers well while encouraging hating others; encouraging castigation of identified scapegoats</i>
Unpredictability	Inconsistency	
Hypocrisy	Dishonesty; distorted values; focus on external appearances to hide internal reality; greed; honor wrong values; hypocrisy; shamefulness; unethical practices; untrustworthiness; words inconsistent with deeds; disregard for rules or propriety; misplaced priorities; unfairness/inequity; false motives; fraudulent image projection; manipulative	Lack integrity* ; amoral* ; avarice* ; mislead (lie to) followers; engaging in wrongful acts; subverting truth and structures/processes to allow wrongful acts; reckless disregard for self and follower costs* ; ignoring/promoting corruption and incompetence

Notes. Behaviors/Qualities are adapted from Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). *The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and politicians—and how we can survive them* (pp. 19–22). Oxford University Press. Italicized variables were not identified in Matthew 23. *Indicates a variable identified by Lipman-Blumen as a toxic quality (as opposed to a behavior).

ASSESSMENT OF MAPPED VARIABLES

UNPREDICTABILITY DIMENSION. Except for the unpredictability dimension, Lipman-Blumen (2005) identified qualities and characteristics that map to the dimensions identified by Bell (2019). Bell's definition of unpredictability differed from that of Schmidt (2008, 2014).² Bell defined it as a general inconsistency in behavior. Schmidt (2008), however, said unpredictability "involves enacting a wide range of behaviors that reflect *dramatic shifts in mood states*" (p. 88, emphasis added). In other words, based on Schmidt's research, unpredictability refers to the leader-created follower hesitancy to approach a toxic leader due to the leader's unstable mood. Despite not listing inconsistent moods among toxic leader characteristics or qualities, Lipman-Blumen said nontoxic (healthy) leaders could be identified "by their even-handed attitude toward others" (p. 253) that results from a recognition of each person's inherent value. That would seem to suggest some agreement with Schmidt. The hostility outcomes derived from the analyses of the woes probably would include such moodiness issues, but that is not clear. Schmidt (2014) found unpredictability to be highly predictive (albeit redundant) of some organizational outcomes, suggesting it is an important dimension.

LIPMAN-BLUMEN CHARACTERISTICS AND QUALITIES. Lipman-Blumen (2005) listed several characteristic destructive behaviors observed in toxic leaders (which she defined as leaders engaging in one or more of those destructive behaviors). She did the same for several personal qualities or characteristics she concluded fuel toxic leaders. She noted that neither list was exhaustive, but presumably they are the most common she observed. Those behaviors and qualities that map to any of Bell's (2019) proposed dimensions are included in Table 3. (The remainder appear in Table 4, discussed below.) Several overlap with the outcome variables identified in Matthew 23; however, some do not.

At least a couple of obvious points emerge from the comparison of Lipman-Blumen (2005) behaviors and characteristics that seem to map to Bell's (2019) dimensions of toxic leadership. First, Lipman-Blumen's analyses of multiple contemporary toxic leaders is remarkably consistent with the analyses of the historical record of a group of religious leaders who lived about 2,000 years ago. That is, the dimensions, behaviors, and characteristics have remained stable for about two millennia. Second, whereas Lipman-Blumen's findings are empirically based, they cannot be dismissed and instead suggest a complete theory of toxic or healthy leadership cannot be based on Matthew 23 alone. Although Matthew 23 is rich and highly informative, it is not a complete view of the full spectrum of behaviors, characteristics, and outcomes of toxic leadership—a point that will be returned to shortly.

ASSESSMENT OF NON-MAPPING VARIABLES

INCOMPETENCE: A NEW DIMENSION? Table 4 reflects that some outcomes, behaviors, or characteristics do not easily map to any of the six dimensions. They are associated with a potential new dimension, incompetence. Overly dependent followers, for example, are observed in the woes and in Lipman-Blumen's (2005) findings. That outcome could be viewed as mapping to

² Schmidt's (2008) initial qualitative assessment of inconsistency was more consistent with Bell's understanding. However, when Schmidt validated the Toxic Leadership Scale, the inconsistency dimension was limited to the definition provided above, i.e., inconsistency referenced only unstable mood states.

self-promoting behavior, for example, but ultimately, it, like some of the others, results in followers that are not as competent as they should be were the toxic leaders doing what they should. Properly equipped followers should be left better off—not worse off—than they started, and failing to train to competence (or failing to be competent to train others to competence) means leaders neglect their teaching roles—and teaching is an essential leadership function (Bredfelt, 2006; Burns, 1978).

Table 4

	Matthew 23 derived	Lipman-Blumen
Dimensions	Outcomes	Behaviors and qualities
Incompetence	Followers left worse off; limited effectiveness; ill-equipped followers; incompetence (inability to fulfill true mission); overly dependent followers; faulty teaching; misplaced priorities; defilement/spoliation of followers	<i>Cowardice (in decision-making);* failure to comprehend and respond to problems;* failure to train new leaders (to maintain power); overly dependent followers (by feeding on fears); leave followers worse off</i>

*Notes. Behaviors/Qualities are adapted from Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and politicians—and how we can survive them (pp. 19–22). Oxford University Press. Italicized variables were not identified in Matthew 23. * Indicates a variable identified by Lipman-Blumen as a toxic quality (as opposed to a behavior).*

This potentially new variable is not so new, however. Kellerman (2004) noted incompetence as one of the seven patterns of bad leaders (and she also noted patterns related to the unethical conduct of such leaders). More recently, Erickson et al. (2015) identified incompetence (along with unethical behaviors and other variables) as important for identifying destructive leaders; however, the incompetence variables made up half of their 22-item instrument. In his study, Schmidt (2008) also wrestled with the issues related to competence and ethical conduct, and his experience is instructive for the current discussion.

INCOMPETENCE AND UNETHICAL PRACTICES: OLD PROBLEMS. When Schmidt (2008) originally developed the Toxic Leadership Scale, he did so in stages. He and an assistant interviewed members of two focus groups, consisting of experienced members of the U.S. Marine Corps and the U.S. Navy, respectively, training to become eligible to be commissioned as officers. Using the same semi-structured interview, he later interviewed two officers. The interviews centered on critical incidents the participants identified. Using the transcripts of the interviews and his knowledge of the literature, Schmidt found six possible dimensions of toxic leadership, the five noted above and unprofessional behaviors. He defined unprofessional behaviors as those that “show that leaders lack task competence, personal and professional integrity, and collegial respect for peers and subordinates” (p. 88). Non-collegial respect for others seems to have been consumed largely by abusive supervision and therefore need not be discussed further. However, competence and integrity are important to consider given the findings derived from Bell’s [2019] and the present analyses of Matthew 23.

Next, Schmidt (2008) coded the leaders' behaviors identified during the prior interviews. He identified 157 behaviors, (e.g. ridicules subordinates) which he combined with 32 empirically derived behaviors in the published literature associated with abusive supervision, authoritarian leadership, and narcissism. Then, he had seven doctoral students, unfamiliar with toxic leadership but trained in psychodynamics, categorize the 187 behaviors using the six hypothesized dimensions.

Schmidt's (2008) seven classifiers struggled with the unprofessional behaviors dimension for a couple of reasons. First, they argued that all the other behaviors and dimensions were unprofessional, and second, they believed that many integrity behaviors (e.g., adultery) occurred outside of duty and therefore would not be something subordinates would witness directly (despite adultery, for example, being a crime under military law). Schmidt therefore concluded such behaviors were an artifact of his study using military personnel (whose cultures emphasize integrity and professionalism). He surmised the dimension would not generalize to non-military organizations, so he dropped the unprofessional behaviors dimension from his study.

INCOMPETENCE: IT'S ABOUT LEADERSHIP. It is important to be clear what is meant by incompetence. A toxic leader can be highly technically competent (and a toxic leader's technical competence could have been the reason for promotion to a leadership position!). McIntosh and Rima (2007) noted narcissistic leaders may be driven to succeed in some ways, which makes the important point that incompetence is not total. Of course, the narcissist is not interested in the true mission but rather his or her self-interests, limiting effectiveness, which is consistent with what is observed in the first two woes, as is a general inability (or perhaps unwillingness) to train followers to become mission-oriented leaders.

Both Lipman-Blumen (2005) and Kellerman (2004) discussed incompetence as it relates to leadership abilities as opposed to general abilities. Erickson et al. (2015), who studied destructive leadership—an arguably broader construct than toxic leadership—found the 11 behaviors they classified as “generic management incompetence” (p. 268) were associated with destructive leaders. Arguably, they blended technical incompetence (i.e., the inability to deal with new technology and change) with leadership incompetence (e.g., an inability to communicate effectively, negotiate, or make good decisions, unwillingness to seek others' input on major decisions). Gangel (2008) differentiated between incompetent leaders (leaders who do not know what they should be doing) and ignorant leaders (leaders who do not know how to lead)—a distinction that may be worthy of further consideration.

BELL'S EXPERIENCE WITH A NON-MAPPING DIMENSION. Bell (2019) began his analysis of Matthew 23:1–7 using the five dimensions of toxic leadership identified by Schmidt (2008, 2014) as his initial framework; however, when he completed his analysis, he proposed a sixth dimension: hypocrisy. Although Schmidt (2008) eliminated unprofessional behaviors from his assessments, Bell, based on his analysis, included a hypocrisy dimension in his model. The hypocrisy dimension is equivalent to the integrity-related behaviors in Schmidt's unprofessional behaviors dimension. In Matthew 23:3, the religious leaders were identified as not practicing what they teach, which is clearly hypocritical (and inconsistent, as their words were inconsistent with their actions). The inclusion of a hypocrisy dimension is therefore justified despite Bell's findings not mapping directly to the five dimensions Schmidt (2008, 2014) validated.

Bell (2019), however, also noted what Schmidt (2008) concluded. A dimension that includes moral/ethical failures, whether identified under the umbrella term of unprofessional behaviors or the single term Bell used (hypocrisy), can be said to apply to any dimension and all behaviors or

outcomes that result from those dimensions. The religious leaders in Matthew 23 were supposed to be altruistic, respectfully overseeing followers, etc., and therefore being narcissistic or abusive means the leaders were also being hypocritical, which is a point Bell conceded.

TREES ARE KNOWN BY THEIR FRUITS. Jesus said false prophets could, like trees, be identified by the fruits they produce (Mt 7:15–20). The former and current analyses of Matthew 23, along with the empirical investigations of others noted above, are common in that they used the fruit, so to speak, of toxic leaders to identify the possible dimensions and outcomes of toxic leadership. That is a common and valid research practice, and statistical methods have been developed to assist researchers in identifying latent factors that underly suspected constructs. (Schmidt, 2008, used one such method: factor analysis.) Given that at least some variables identified here and in Lipman-Blumen (2005) do not clearly map on formerly established dimensions, the toxic leadership model does not yet appear to be complete. (cf. Table 4.)

Any of a leader's significant deviations from what is recognized as proper could be classified as hypocritical. Still, that should not preclude the development of a model that incorporates specific hypocritical behaviors or outcomes. Although a five-dimensional model, from a statistical perspective, may be just as efficient at predicting organizational outcomes or classifying toxic leaders as a six- or seven-dimensional model, limiting the variables (based on each variable's proportion of explained variance) does little for practitioners seeking to identify and squelch toxic behaviors early on, before leaders have the opportunity to spiral out of control. Rather, a complete model, if only theoretical for now, provides a guide for practitioners to recognize the signs of toxicity and address them. Thus, the competency variables should not be overlooked any more than the hypocrisy dimension should. Competency related behaviors are seemingly easily recognized fruit with good discriminative power (Erickson et al., 2015).

WHAT THE RESEARCH SUGGESTS

INCOMPLETE MODEL. Lipman-Blumen (2005) and the current analyses suggests the current toxic leadership model (and thus, the complementary healthy leadership model) is not complete. Although analyses of Matthew 23 support a substantial model, they do not inform a complete model. Therefore, future research should expand on what is supported in Matthew 23 by examining other passages that provide insights into toxic and healthy leaders and leadership. For example, toxic leaders' inconsistent emotions characterized by vastly changing moods (Schmidt, 2008, 2014) do not appear in Matthew 23. However, other passages suggest the Pharisees allowed their emotions to dictate how they reasoned and functioned (e.g., Lk 6:11), and a thorough examination of such texts could serve to build a more complete model.

THE IMPORTANCE OF INTEGRITY, COMPETENCE, AND ALTRUISM. When Paul advised Timothy on overseer qualifications (1 Tm 3:1–7), he did not emphasize issues of doctrine, but instead focused largely on issues of morality/ethics (Liefeld, 1999). He also noted, albeit briefly, a leader had to have a record of proven management competencies. Those requirements dovetail nicely with the findings developed from the analyses of toxic and healthy leadership models summarized across Tables 3 and 4. Even a glance at the tables suggests the behaviors and outcomes associated with the hypocrisy, incompetence, and narcissism dimensions provide a lot of information that could be used to identify and prevent toxic leaders maturing while

encouraging their opposite dimensions: integrity, competence, and altruism. After all, identifying and addressing toxic behaviors early is the best way to stop them before they get out of control (Erickson et al., 2015).

CONCLUSION

The present paper extends Bell's (2019) model of Christian leadership by considering the woes of Matthew 23 as providing insight into the outcomes of toxic leadership. By investigating the outcomes of toxic leadership, the expected outcomes of healthy leadership were assumed to emerge. Mappings of the outcomes along with the behaviors and qualities Lipman-Blumen (2005) identified in her model revealed that although analyses of Matthew 23 provide a rather thorough model of toxic (and thereby, healthy) leadership, the model is incomplete. The data suggests that incompetency forms an additional dimension of toxic leadership, and general unpredictability (inconsistency) should be investigated and considered independently from unstable moods, the latter of which has empirical support as a separate dimension of toxic leadership. Additionally, for practical purposes, those tasked with holding leaders accountable can watch for some of the more prominent and easily identifiable behaviors and qualities associated with toxic leadership prominent in Matthew 23: hypocrisy, (leadership) incompetence, and narcissism.

REFERENCES

- Barbieri, L. A., Jr. (1985). "Matthew." In J. F. Walvoord & R. B. Zuck (Eds.), *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures* (Vol. 2, pp. 13–94). Victor Books.
- Bell, R. M. (2019). What's Not Christian Leadership? *Theology of Leadership Journal*, 2(1), 56–72.
- Blum, E. A. (1985). "John." In J. F. Walvoord & R. B. Zuck (Eds.), *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures* (Vol. 2). Victor Books.
- Bredfeldt, G. (2006). *Great Leader, Great Teacher: Recovering the Biblical Vision for Leadership*. Moody Publishers.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row Publishers.
- Carroll, S., Paine, F. & Ivancevich, J. (1972). The Relative Effectiveness of Training Methods—Expert Opinion and Research. *Personnel Psychology*, 25(3), 495–509. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1972.tb00833.x>
- Combrink, H. J. B., (2003). "Shame on the Hypocritical Leaders in the Church." In D. B. Gowler, L. G. Bloomquist & D. F. Watson (Eds.) *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honour of Vernon K. Robbins* (pp. 1–35). Trinity Press International.
- deSilva, D. A., (1999). *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation*. Wipf & Stock.
- Erickson, A., Shaw, B., Murray, J. & Branch, S. (2015). Destructive Leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44(4), 266–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2015.09.003>
- France, R. T. (1985). *Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (Vol. 1). InterVarsity Press.
- France, R. T. (1994). "Matthew." In D. A. Carson, R. T. France, J. A. Motyer & G. J. Wenham (Eds.), *New Bible commentary: 21st Century Edition* (4th ed., pp. 904–945). Inter-Varsity Press.

- French, J. P. & Raven, B. (1959). "The Bases of Social Power." In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in Social Power* (pp. 150–167). University of Michigan Institute for Social Research.
- Gangel, K. O. (2008). *Surviving Toxic Leaders: How to Work for Flawed People in Churches, Schools, and Christian Organizations*. Wipf & Stock.
- Keener, C. S. (1993). *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*. InterVarsity Press.
- Kellerman, B. (2005). How Bad Leadership Happens. *Leader to Leader*, 2005(35), 41.
- Levertoff, P. P. (1942). "Special Introduction." In C. Gore, H. L. Goudge, & A. Guillaume (Eds.), *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture: Including the Apocrypha* (Vol. 3, pp. 128–207). The Macmillan Company.
- Liefeld, W. L. (1999). *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*. Zondervan.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). *The Allure of Toxic Leaders: Why We Follow Destructive Bosses and Politicians—and How We Can Survive Them*. Oxford University Press.
- MacDonald, W. (1995). *Believer's Bible Commentary: Old and New Testaments*. (A. Farstad, Ed.). Thomas Nelson.
- McIntosh, G. L. & Rima, S. D. (2007). *Overcoming the Dark Side of Leadership: How to Become an Effective Leader by Confronting Potential Failures*. Baker Books.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and Around Organizations*. Prentice Hall.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0017084068400500419>
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of Organization* (VitalSource Bookshelf Edition). Sage. Retrieved from vbk://9781544344478
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology*. Routledge.
- Robbins, V. K. (2002). "Argumentative Textures in Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation." In A. Eriksson, T. H. Olbricht & W. Überlacker (Eds.), *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference* (pp. 27–65). Trinity Press International.
- Robbins, V. K. (2012). *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-rhetorical Interpretation*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Robertson, A. T. (1933). *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. Broadman Press.
- Ryle, J. C. (1993). *Matthew*. Crossway Books.
- Schmidt, A. A. (2008). "Development and Validation of the Toxic Leadership Scale" (Order No. 1453699). Available from *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*. (193655997).
- Schmidt, A. A. (2014). "An Examination of Toxic Leadership, Job Outcomes, and the Impact of Military Deployment" (Order No. 3627674). Available from *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*. (1558874321).
- Tasker, R. V. G. (1996). "Woe." In D. R. W. Wood, I. H. Marshall, A. R. Millard, J. I. Packer & D. J. Wiseman (Eds.), *New Bible Dictionary* (3rd ed.). InterVarsity Press.
- Weren, W. J. C. (2014). *Studies in Matthew's Gospel: Literary Design, Intertextuality, and Social Setting*. Brill.
- Wiersbe, W. W. (1996). *The Bible Exposition Commentary* (Vol. 1). Victor Books.
- Wilkins, M. J. (2004). *The NIV Application Commentary: Matthew*. Zondervan.

CONTRIBUTORS

Corné Bekker, Ph.D. - serves as the Dean of the Regent University School of Divinity. His research interests are centered on Biblical perspectives in Leadership and the organizational realities of the early Church communities.
clbekker@regent.edu

Julie Boccock - M.S. in Organizational Psychology, Azusa Pacific University, is interested in both engaging work and engaging ministry. She is a business operations specialist at Azusa Pacific University.
jbock@apu.edu

Preston Butler, Ph.D. - is an ordained minister and retired Army Lieutenant Colonel. He has served in church and secular leadership positions for over 40 years and currently serves as the Director for Procurement & Subcontracts for Vinnell Arabia LLC. While earning his Doctor of Philosophy in Leadership at Alliant International University, Dr. Butler developed an instrument called the Church Business Operations Tool that measures the business health of a church. Dr. Butler conducts workshops and seminars on leadership and business ethics. His passion to see healthy marriages led him to establish PK3 Ministries and publish a book called, *It's OK to Have an Affair (With your Spouse)*. Dr. Butler, along with his wife, conducts workshops for married couples.
prestonbutlerjr@yahoo.com

Barry Cushman - is a student in the research-based Ed.D. in Christian Leadership program at the Rawlings School of Divinity (Liberty University). He is a retired police detective who now serves as an accreditation program manager, pastor of a small church, and chaplain of a large, international, non-profit law enforcement organization. He lives in northern New England with his wife and their three daughters. He has a master's degree in public policy and management and a graduate certificate in applied research and evaluation methods and has a strong background in quantitative analyses.
bcushman@liberty.edu

Chris DiVietro, Ph.D. - is the Senior Pastor of Park Road Presbyterian Church, has a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership, and is an adjunct professor at both Eastern University and Alvernia University. Chris is married to his best friend Liz and is Daddy to Aletheia, Judah, and Evangeline. In his spare time Chris likes to...wait...what's spare time?
Chris@parkroadchurch.com

David R. Dunaetz, Ph.D. - a graduate of Claremont Graduate University, is Associate Professor of Leadership and Organizational Psychology at Azusa Pacific University. His research focuses on interpersonal processes in Christian organizations, especially churches and mission organizations. He was a church planter in France for 17 years.
ddunaetz@apu.edu

Joshua Henson, Ph.D. - is the founder of Rediscover Oikos, LLC, a Christian leadership coaching and church consulting company. He is also an adjunct professor of Organizational Leadership at Regent University and Southeastern University. He serves as the Editor of the Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership. He has published multiple articles and books including: *Exegetical Analysis: A Practical Guide for Applying Biblical Research in the Social Sciences*. He also serves as the Lead Pastor of Crossroads Church in Ocala, FL.
joshhen@regent.edu

Nathan Mizzell - is a Senior Contracting Officer and Procurement Analyst at the Department of Education, Federal Student Aid. He is a Senior Elder serving as the Director of Discipleship at First Church of Christ Holiness, USA, located in Washington, DC. He is also completing his doctoral degree in Strategic Leadership with a concentration in the Ecclesial at Regent University. He has published an article entitled *When Servant Leadership Fails: The Importance of Aligning Values* in the Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership and a book chapter in: *Modern Metaphors of Christian Leadership: Exploring Christian Leadership in a Contemporary Organizational Context*.
nathanmizzell@comcast.net

Saba Senses-Ozyurt, Ph.D. - is an associate professor and program director in the California School of Management and Leadership at Alliant International University. She received her Ph.D. in political science and political psychology from the University of California, Irvine. Before joining Alliant University, she taught at the University of California San Diego (UCSD), the University of California Irvine (UCI), and Chapman University. Dr. Senses-Ozyurt's research focuses on the impact of non-governmental organizations, political processes and public policies on the rights and empowerment of women, religious minorities, and immigrants into pluralist societies. Her research is published in some of the leading academic journals such as Political Psychology, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, and the Journal of Organizational Theory and Behavior.
sozyurt@alliant.edu

Mark Simon - has more than 20 years of cross-cultural management experience in the fields of Information Technology, Leadership Development, and Christian Ministry. He holds a B.S. in Information and Computer Science from the University of California, Irvine, and a M.A. in Human Services Counseling from Liberty University. He is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Intercultural Studies from Biola University's Cook School of Intercultural Studies. He lived in China for fifteen years and has three children and one wife.
marksimon.biola@gmail.com

Angela Spranger, Ph.D. - is an encouraging, engaging facilitator who transfers her knowledge and experiences in ways that learners and participants can relate to and remember. Dr. Spranger is a consultant and Gallup-trained Strengths coach, who also uses the MBTI and Emotional Intelligence tools to help clients identify and address issues that may hinder personal and professional development or team effectiveness. Her instructional experience includes eight years of teaching adult non-traditional learners at Hampton University and Regent University in the business curricula, specializing in Marketing, Labor Management Relations, and Human Resources courses. As of 2012, she added instructional experience with traditional young adult learners at Christopher Newport University, facilitating courses in Leadership Theory and Research, Organizational Behavior, Human Resource Management, and Leadership in Business. Additionally, Dr. Spranger has provided professional development and motivational presentations to local churches, women's groups, military installations, and professional associations, and always seeks to offer a unique and inspirational way of approaching the theme topic. Angela is a scholar-practitioner who worked for over 20 years in non-profit, state, and corporate management and HR positions while undertaking graduate studies.
angela.spranger@cnu.edu