CHAPTER 3: AN EXPLORATION OF STEREOTYPICAL LEADERSHIP IDENTITIES AND THE RATIONALE FOR AN EQUIPPING LEADERSHIP IDENTITY

"In other words, the job of pastors, teachers, and other ministers is to equip, prepare, and train the believers so they can learn to function in their own ministries. This is the way that the church will be built up; not by the leaders doing everything themselves, but by the leaders equipping the rest of the people to function in their own ministries" - Dr. Ralph F. Wilson

Introduction:

Several paradigms of leadership exist today, each of which arises out of a particular ministry philosophy or theological framework. Christian leaders have been socialized into many of these models of leadership (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:5). Furthermore, Christian leaders have also borrowed cultural images which have been allowed to shape their understanding of the Church and its expectations of leaders (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:5).

In one study, Richard Nageraud identified ten different perspectives on the pastoral ministry (Leer 1989:98-99). The Alban Institute newsletter, "Action Information" also listed ten different models of leadership (Leer 1989:99). This plethora of leadership paradigms sometimes results in confusion as to what the roles of Christian leaders are. Symptomatic of this confusion, Henry and Richard Blackaby cite the book "Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge" by Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus in which they report that they discovered over 850 different definitions of leadership (2001:16).

This chapter seeks to classify popular leadership models into six broad categories. The purpose of this is to show into which general leadership paradigm an Equipping model of leadership fits. Suggestions are also offered as to why there is a multiplicity of leadership paradigms. Lastly, reasons are then given as to why a new paradigm for Christian leadership is needed, despite the existence of so many leadership models. To do this, a general critique of stereotypical leadership paradigms is offered. This is followed by a more focussed critique of the archetypal paradigm of the leader as "pastor" or "shepherd" in the light of an Equipping paradigm of leadership. The reason for focussing on the pastoral paradigm is not only that this paradigm is arguably the pre-eminent leadership model today, but that it also stands almost diametrically opposed to the philosophy of ministry inherent in an Equipping leadership paradigm.

The chapter concludes by showing that there is already a growing consensus in leadership literature that the time has come to embrace an Equipping paradigm for leadership, a consensus which is ushering in what has come to be termed the "New Reformation (Ogden 1990:25; also Beckham 1995:9). This "New Reformation" is one in which the practical implications of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers are being applied through "every-member ministry" (Ogden 1990:25).

3.1. A Summary Overview of Leadership Paradigms

Christian leadership paradigms today can be classified into six broad categories:

- Spiritual Leadership Paradigms
- Strategic or Missional Leadership Paradigms
- Characterological Leadership Paradigms
- Relational Leadership Paradigms
- Functional Leadership Paradigms
- Administrative Leadership Paradigms

Most leadership models adhere to one of these paradigms at the ***core*** of their approach to leadership and ministry. However, no leadership model fits exclusively into one paradigm. Rather every model, while having a particular paradigm at its center, will also share some characteristics with all the other paradigms, to different degrees. Consequently, instead of listing these six paradigms as "paradigms", they might alternatively be listed as six *foundations* for Christian leadership. Different leadership paradigms and different leadership models have chosen to focus on a particular foundation, whilst at the same time drawing from the other five foundations, albeit to a lesser degree.

It is important to categorise and evaluate stereotypical leadership models and see which paradigm they belong to. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, it serves to confirm that there is no one single prescribed paradigm for Christian leadership and that there is no leadership model which is intrinsically better than others (Stevens and Collins 1993:58). Tidball says that, "The church has constantly revised its models of ministry to reflect the age in which it lives" (1999:10). Secondly, categorizing and evaluating leadership models throws into relief the framework into which an Equipping model best fits. An Equipping model essentially belongs to a strategic or missional paradigm. Since leaders will equip believers for *ministry* and not simply for spiritual growth, it is anticipated that those they equip will engage in serving alongside them. Together they will also minister with a view to extending the Kingdom of God.

3.1.1. Spiritual Leadership Paradigms

Spiritual leadership paradigms focus on the unique spiritual nature of Christian leadership. They acknowledge that although Christian leadership shares many principles with its secular counterparts, the unique nature of Christian leadership lies in the fact that God raises leaders to fulfill His purposes. Furthermore, the ability to accomplish these purposes does not lie within the leader's grasp, but is a gift from God. The spiritual leader is one who "is confident in God, knows humanity, truly knows God, seeks to

find God's will, is self-effacing, finds and follows God's methods, delights to obey God, is motivated by love for God and man and is dependent upon God" (Hogue 1995:10).

The unique aspect of this paradigm is that the focus is on leaders having received a divine call to fulfill God's purposes. God grants them the spiritual endowments needed to accomplish these purposes (Hogue 1995a:9; Means 1993:93). The paradigm also concerns itself with the following: ministry to the *spiritual* needs of humanity; the responsibility of answering God's call; an intimate relationship with God; moral values; the belief in the intervention of God in human affairs; and with issues surrounding the future culmination of human history.

3.1.1.1. The Leader as Prophet

"Being prophetic is not optional, but an important feature of the pastor's role, identity, and Christlikeness (Johnson 2007: no pages). In the primary sense of the word a prophet was a person who "stood in the council of God", who heard and even "saw" his word, and who in consequence "spoke from the mouth of the Lord ... faithfully" (Stott 1989:161). A prophet was "a mouthpiece or spokesman of God, a vehicle of his direct revelation" (Stott 1989:160). Johnson argues for the prophet as a paradigm for church leaders, saying that leaders are required to stand and preach with divine authority, with a passion and a conviction that God has revealed his will to them (2007: no pages). Prophets today are seen as those who have learned the discipline of listening to God and who are able to impart a clear vision and discerning counsel to others (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:xiii).

3.1.1.2. The Leaders as Priest

This "sacramental" paradigm is adhered to mainly by Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches and to a lesser extent by the Anglican Church (Cunnah 2003:22). The priestly role dominated clergy's priorities from the earliest times in the Roman Catholic Church. Pastors or priests

mediated between God and humanity in offering Christ in the Eucharist (Cunnah 2003:22). Means describes this approach as follows:

> "Through that ministry 'the grace of the Saviour flows for the good of mankind'. Other pastoral roles were adjuncts to this central ministry" (1993:81).

The sacramental paradigm even continues in churches which do not view themselves as sacramental. In Protestantism, the ministry of the Word of God has also taken on a sacramental form (Leer 1989:99). Here it is chiefly left to the pastor to administer the "sacraments" of believer's baptism and communion (Hansen 1994:160-161), and it is mainly the pastor who meets the spiritual and religious needs of the people (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:11). Reggie McNeal characterises this model as "The Leader as Holy Man" (1995:12).

3.1.1.3. The Charismatic Model

This is a "spiritual" leadership model that emphasizes the leader as endowed with special spiritual gifts (or "charisms") whereby he or she is enabled to lead (Pohlmann 2006:87). Although the term "charismatic" as used here is not a reference to the Charismatic church movement, this model has become characteristic of Pentecostalism and the Charismatic movement (Pohlmann 2006:87). It is also a model often prevalent in "megachurches", these being defined as churches compromising 1000 members or more (Schwarz 1996:23).

3.1.2. Strategic or Missional Leadership Paradigms

This paradigm focuses on the leader as steward in the Kingdom of God, entrusted with another's property. The models in this paradigm also lay stress on the urgency of completing the Great Commission and the need

to make an impact on society. "Mission" is not seen as a program, event or project which is engaged in. Rather the church is seen as being missional in its very nature (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:xv). Leaders then function as missional leaders in "missional communities" (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:3).

3.1.2.1. Church Growth Models

Church growth literature on the topic of leadership typically characterizes the leadership style of leaders in this paradigm as being project- and goal-orientated (Schwarz 1996:22). Leaders who are exemplified in these models are pragmatic "technocrats" (Schwarz 1996:23) and are leaders whose effectiveness is measured in terms of quantitative growth of ministries. Techniques are developed as strategies to accomplish more effective ministry and leaders may become performance-orientated in the way that they view their ministry (Lischer 2005:170).

3.1.2.2. Equipping Models

Equipping models of leadership focus on leaders empowering other Christians for ministry and on "unleashing" the potential in others (Davis 1995:15). Leaders in this paradigm "equip, support, motivate and mentor individuals, enabling them to become all that God wants them to be" (Schwarz 1996:22). Based on Ephesians 4:11-16, these models see "'equipping' as the primary purpose of the leaders of the church (***not*** the purpose of the church itself)" (Ligon 2001: no page numbers).

3.1.2.3. Apostolic and Evangelistic Models

Despite the debate as to whether or not the ministry or office of the apostle is defunct, there have been renewed calls for an apostolic style of leadership (Hirsch 2008:33; McNeal 1995:12). This model of leadership

does not necessarily endorse or necessitate that leaders be considered to be apostles as they were thought of in the New Testament. The reference to "apostles" had a broad sematic range in the New Testament (Snodgrass 1996:203). Present-day leaders "are apostolic because they have a vision to plant churches where the Gospel has not yet been proclaimed" and insofar as they also "appoint and coach elders of local churches" as the first apostles did (McClung 2008:89). Furthermore, apostolic leaders also build trans-local networks (Hirsch 2008:34). They are "entrepreneurial leaders who can birth new faith communities" (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:xiii). In addition to ensuring that faith is transmitted from one context to another, apostolic leaders also ensure that faith is transmitted from one generation to the next (Hirsch 2008:34). McNeal says that this style of leadership is one that is characterised by the following: vision; a missional, evangelistic thrust; the empowering of others by sharing ministry; the development of leaders as a priority; creative, entrepreneurial strategies to connect the gospel to culture; and having a Kingdom-consciousness (1995:13). Many have compared apostles to our modern-day concept of "frontier missionaries" (Erdman 1966:90; Criswell 1974:216; Lincoln 1990:249; Neufeld 2002:180), and leaders in this model are seen as "missionary strategists" (Tidball 1999:11).

3.1.2.4. The Leader as Social Activist

The leader as "minister in community" (Tidball 1999:10), or as social activist is one of ten leadership models of the ordained ministry identified by the Alban Institute (Leer 1989:99). Also known as the "politician-prophet" model, this sees the leader as a conscience-raiser in society and is a model that is characteristic of liberation theology (Calian 1977:12). Conn says that Liberation theologians typically apply themselves to addressing the plight of the poor and marginalized; attending to socio-economic disparity on a national and international scale; aiding those experiencing injustice and political oppression;

combating racial inequalities and segregation; and seek transformation through ministry engagement with society's social, economic and political structures (1988:387-391). Since Liberation theology is a theology of engagement, many of its theologians also serve as leaders in practice, and have adopted this model of leadership. However, as exemplified through the likes of Martin Luther King, Jnr., this model of leadership need not restricted to adherents of Liberation theology. It could be integrated into a leader's total theological understanding of standing within the midst of the people of God as a change agent of communities (Calian 1977:13). Christian leaders may also emerge as leaders in their community by virtue of the esteem attached to church leadership in certain communities, particularly when they have displayed competence and conducted themselves with integrity (Hansen 1994:148-150).

3.1.3. Characterological Leadership Paradigms

These paradigms stress that leadership is built upon foundations of godly character and personal integrity (Davis 1995:14; Hogue 1995a:8). They point to the fact that several passages which refer to the qualities necessary for leadership deal with the issue of personal character (1 Tim. 3:1-13; Titus 1:6-9), and that the Bible often stresses character over performance (Pohlmann 2006:90). Jesus himself set new standards for the character of leaders of his day (Munro 2000:12). The quality of the leader's character is seen as a critical factor in determining a church's health and growth (Hogue 1995b:11). It is also character that will determine the measure of influence that an individual has as a leader (Hogue 1995b:12).

3.1.3.1. Servant-Leader

Often proposed as the "most favored" (Gaston 1987:38) or most Biblical model of leadership, servant-leadership has been described as a model which seeks to embody the spirit, attitude, and disposition of Jesus Christ (Agee 2001:9; Segler 1987:6-7; Munro 2000:13). This model assumes that correct and effective leadership flows from within and that leaders lead out of who they are, and not by technique (Agee 2001:9). The model has come under criticism, since in some instances servant leadership has been more of a reflection of leadership insecurity than leadership humility (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:106). Furthermore, the incorrect application of this model has frustrated congregations. This happens when leaders interpret passivity as humility and relinquish their responsibility to give proper leadership in the form of providing direction, pursuing mission and setting goals for congregations (Agee 2001:8-9). Therefore the model of "leading servants" has come to be preferred, as one which holds attitudes and functions of servanthood and leadership in proper tension (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:106).

3.1.4. Relational Leadership Paradigms

Models in this paradigm focus on the influence that leaders exert by virtue of their relationships to others. It sees leadership as an "interpersonal influencing process" (Dale 1987:23). It is to be expected that many models of leadership would incorporate the relational nature of Christian leadership since relationships are central to the Christian religion. Certain leaders, notably Martin Luther King, Jnr. appeared to have exerted their leadership influence because of a "special" relationship between them and their followers (Cardwell 1997:132).

This relationship produced specific reactions in followers, including the following (Cardwell 1997:132):

- Higher effort and performance than might normally be expected
- High levels of devotion and loyalty towards the leader
- Enthusiasm for the leader's ideas
- A willingness to sacrifice self-interest for the collective good of the group

3.1.4.1. The Leader as Pastor or Shepherd

This model continues to be attractive to leaders who have a strong desire to build relationships with people and care for them. These leaders may at the same time find themselves frustrated or disillusioned by the demands of administrating and managing churches (Wagner, et al 2000:26). Demands such as these have the tendency of removing leaders from direct ministry to hurting and needy people. Yet this is often the very reason for which leaders responded to God's call in the first place.

The term "pastor" comes from the Latin word "passere" which means to pasture", or "to feed", and in biblical terminology frequently refers to a shepherd caring for a flock, and figuratively of a leader caring for followers (Armentrout 1990:871). Shepherding leaders focus on ministering to people through the building of close relationships (Armentrout 1990:871; Richards and Hoeldtke 1980:92; Wagner, et al 2000:26) rather than on ministering through programs (Davis 1995:14). Hirsch describes pastoral leadership as follows:

> "Shepherds nurture and protect. Caregivers of the community, they focus on the protection and spiritual maturity of God's flock, cultivating a loving and spiritually mature network of relationships, making and developing disciples" (2008:34).

3.1.4.2. The Leader as Parent

This role of the leader in the "house of God" is to a large extent similar to the role of a parent in a home (Cunnah 2003:23; Calian 1977:9). Like a good parent, he or she cares for the members personally, directing and correcting them as necessary. Leadership and charisma are important but secondary requirements (Cunnah 2003:23). Leaders may serve as parents when they find themselves being called upon "to be parent and elder to all without being intimate to any" (Calian 1977:10). Though not common in individualistic secular societies, this model has resonance in Scripture (1 Cor. 4:15, 17; 2 Cor. 6:11-13; Phil. 2:22; 1 Thess. 2:7; 1 Tim. 1:2; 2 Tim. 1:2; 2 Tim. 2:1; Titus 1:4; Philemon 1:10; 1 Peter 5:13). Paul, in his epistles balanced the feminine leadership image of the loving mother with the masculine image of the leader as a godly father who provided individual care and instruction (Tidball 1999:87-101). Spiritual mothers and fathers provide much needed love, mercy and understanding and impart spiritual life and nurture through close relationships (Damazio 1988:75). Furthermore, spiritual parents see their responsibility as providing care and protection and are able to teach sensitive and difficult subjects in the Church without spiritually hurting or permanently offending the people of God (Damazio 1988:76).

3.1.5. Functional Leadership Paradigms

This paradigm and its models emphasise a utilitarian approach to leadership. It may be argued that most leadership models are functional, but these models are termed "functional" because they specifically define leaders in terms of what leaders "do" or what leaders are able to "get done". Many times a leader's functional effectiveness is a criterion in determining the leader's appointment to lead (Cunnah 2003:22). While leaders will be required to display a basic maturity of character, inevitably they will be called to do something or accomplish something.

Their identities are centered on the roles which they fulfill. However, when this happens, leaders risk developing "professional identities", similar to professionals in the secular environment (Hansen 1994:20).

3.1.5.1. Therapeutic Models

"In the 1600's, the Puritans enhanced the concept of the Christian leader as a "pastor", by stressing the leader's role as 'physician of the soul'" (Shelley 2000:34). Pastors were expected to know the spiritual condition of their flocks and prescribe some remedy to restore spiritual health and vitality where necessary. The "government of souls" became the preeminent pastoral role, although the role sometimes became excessive and corrupted (Means 1993:81). Leaders functioned as parish ministers or chaplains among their flocks (McNeal 1995:12).

Modern times have seen this leadership responsibility expand beyond concern for the spiritual well-being of individuals - to include their general social and emotional well-being. Leaders in this model are "recovery experts" (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:13). This function is in increasing demand as social support systems collapse because of the fragmentation of the extended family and the inability of government and volunteer agencies to mobilize resources to meet demands (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:104). Means says that it was during the twentieth century that psychology took a quantum leap in popularity and "parishioners began to have more personal problems and also seemed more ready to talk about them. Pastoral counselling suddenly became a primary activity in many minister's schedules" (1993:86). Attempts were made to integrate biblical teaching with psychology and other fields of learning. Pastors were "reduced to therapists", a focus which detracted from traditional biblical roles (Means 1993:86-87; Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:5). It was Seward Hiltner, who in his book "Preface to Pastoral Theology", stamped the theology of pastoral care with a psychological trademark and firmly bound pastoral training to psychological training (Tidball

1988:494). Leaders are seen "as wounded healers in the community of the compassionate" (Tidball 1999:10). However, due to the tremendous need in today's society, this model of leadership has resulted in many leaders becoming overwhelmed by their pastoral load (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:104).

3.1.5.2. The Leaders as Teacher and Preacher

There is only one definite article covering both pastors and teachers in the original Greek text of Ephesians 4:11-12 and some have taken this to mean that these are two inseparable functions given to church leaders – leaders are to be "teaching shepherds" or "teachers who also shepherd" (Graham 1997:310; Martin 1991:52; Brachter and Nida 1982:101; Simpson and Bruce 1980:96; Eadie 1977:304; Hendrikson 1976:197; Allen 1971:157; Erdman 1966:90; Vincent 1888:858).

This model sees teaching and preaching the word of God as "The first essential never changing distinctive of the work of the pastor" (Cunnah 2003:23; Kohls 1998: 123; Yount 1996:15), an emphasis that emerged during the Reformation (Shelley 2000:34). During Reformation times, ministers preached, taught, prayed, administered the sacraments, presided over the church, and cared for the needy, but preaching always occupied the central place (Means 1993:82). Preaching was the primary way in which people were "fed" (Shelley 2000:34). With the rise of the modern university system, "Luther and Calvin signalled a return to biblical study and redefined the church leader's role as resident scholar in biblical studies... Educational credentials and skills in preaching were highly valued and leadership centered around the pulpit" (McNeal 1995:12). This model is based upon leaders assuming leadership on the basis of their knowledge (McClaren 2006:114) and sees the leader as an educator who has the Bible as the textbook (McNeal 1995:12).

3.1.6. Administrative Leadership Paradigms

Administrative leadership paradigms lay emphasis on the managerial aspect of leadership and highlight the leader's role as the administrator of resources, whether this be the logistics managing a church's physical property and finances, its human resources, or the management of the corporate vision (Pinder 1994:7). Cunnah says:

> "In this model the pastor is seen primarily as an administrator of an institution known as the church. His appointment to the pastoral office is determined by his functional effectiveness and organizational skills" (2003:22).

"Administrators tend to concentrate on the short-term concerns; the routine, house-keeping questions, the issues of order and efficiency. Leaders focus more on purpose, mission, values, goals and roles" (Leer 1989:102-103). Leaders in this paradigm follow the pattern of the latest trend offered by the most influential business schools (Pohlmann 2006:91). Even as spiritual leaders, they may draw parallels between themselves and political presidents, school department heads, business executives and the like (Richards and Hoeldtke 1980:90). Leaders in this model tend to be task-orientated. They employ the resources available within the organisation and define policies and procedures to organise the activities of people toward certain common goals (Richards and Hoeldtke 1980:90).

3.1.6.1. The Leader as Chief Executive Officer

Means says that:

> "In 1956 Niebuhr advanced the suggestion that the emerging pastoral role was that of spiritual director, which had its roots in

the bishop or overseer of the ancient church, Augustine being a prototype" (1993:87).

Niebuhr believed that the pastor should be the teacher of teachers, the primary enabler, the manager of the educational objectives of the church, the chief facilitator, and the administrator of the community of faith (Means 1993:88). In Niebuhr's view preaching and teaching retained a place of importance, but with the aim of instructing and motivating people to carry out the mission of the church (Means 1993:87). However, over time attempts were made to synthesize insights from the world of professional business management with pastoral work, something which minimized traditional pastoral functions such as preaching and teaching (Means 1993:88-89). Means says that in many churches today we have a perversion of Niebuhr's original design where ministers function as CEO's (Means 1993:88), a paradigm that is fast becoming the dominant leadership paradigm (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:27).

Even denominational systems that arose in the twentieth century were modelled after North American corporate organisations (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:14). In this paradigm, ideas and strategies for church growth are borrowed from the latest processes in the business world and churches are run as one would run a successful business enterprise (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:13). This approach to ministry has been popularized by influential mega-churches (Siebert 1996: no page numbers). A key characteristic of this model is that "executive priests" (Lischer 2005:169) are seen to have "power to make decisions" (Richards and Hoeldtke 1980:90). The effects of this leadership style has been that power and control becomes centralised in a single individual (Odom 2001:27). Leaders also become removed from those whom they minister to (Wagner 2000:26). The many expectations placed upon leaders in this model of leadership have resulted in a high rate of burnout and personal failure among leaders (Ogne and Roehl 2008:16).

3.1.6.2. The Omniscient Leader

"Never in history have pastors been expected to accomplish so many tasks skilfully" (Means 1993:84). "The pastor is faced with more identifiable functions within a church than any other person. This is particularly true of small churches" (Bargiol 1996:30). "The pastor is at various times chaplain, cheerleader, coach, CEO, visionary, fundraiser, preacher, plumber, spiritual director, fellow struggler, disciplinarian, confidant, and urgent care coordinator" (Wagner, et al 2000:24). Church leaders are required to be "astute politician, motivational speaker, discerning psychotherapist, visionary leader and institutional fund raiser, with rarely a full day off" (Swicegood 2000:27).

This phenomenon at times gives rise to "a dark side of spiritual leadership" and the leader becomes the only "key player" and "captain" in the life of a congregation (Smit 1995:36). "At first this could have been borne out of a genuine desire to serve, but as it develops, it becomes a usurpation of the congregation's ministry and a personification of the authority of the Gospel now vested in an authoritarian leadership style" (Smit 1995:36). The leader can become a "professional answer man" (Young 1988:54) and a know-it-all problem solver (Kimball 2003:194). Furthermore, this model may be perpetuated by a fear of identity loss (Smit 1995:37) since leaders function as "fragmented generalists" in a society of specialists (Means 1993:84). In such an environment leaders are tempted to prove their relevance by undertaking any myriad of responsibilities. Leadership burnout often results because "pastors are often forced into roles for which they are eminently unsuited" (Codrington 2003:184). Conflict may later ensue as the congregation's unrealistic expectations are not realised (Barna 1993:155).

3.2 Reasons for the Multiplicity of Leadership Identities And Models

The multitude of leadership models and images for Christian leaders often results in "uncertainty and role confusion" among leaders (Leer 1989:98, 100). Several reasons can be postulated which together may account for the plethora of leadership models and leadership identities. These reasons help us understand the varied factors which give rise to leadership models and also help us understand the contexts in which leadership models emerge:

3.2.1. No Normative Leadership Model Exists

In the closing part of Chapter 2 of this thesis, "Exegesis of Ephesians 4:11-12 and Issues Raised by the Text", it has been demonstrated that neither in the New Testament nor in the post-Apostolic period can we see any definitive leadership models, leadership structures or leadership roles (point 2.6.5.). Tidball says that when attempts are made to synthesize biblical leadership models with more current models of Christian leadership, three problems arise (1999:11):

1. Models used tend to reflect the dominant leader-images of the day
2. We read into models what we think they mean
3. What we do in practice is different to what we say and think about ministry

Although many attempts have been made to integrate different leadership models and functions, Means says:

> "no single or simple historical pastoral role exists. An enormous variety of ecclesiastical traditions exist, and Scripture gives only a broad outline of pastoral work, leaving ample room for the great diversity of roles throughout history and in our contemporary

> world. Denominational authorities, local church leaders, or ministerial educators have never agreed on the constitution of pastoral work, except in generalities ... The pastoral role has tended to shift depending on the varying circumstances and differing biblical emphases" (1993:80-81).

Leer maintains that there is also no single integrating role model for ministry (1989:100). These realities urge one to tread cautiously when advocating new models for Christian leadership or when denigrating leadership models that have already been in existence.

3.2.2. Confusion Between the Issues of Leadership Identity, Responsibilities, Character and Call

When issues surrounding leadership are discussed, the terminology used is often imprecise and this itself causes confusion as to whether a leader's identity, roles, character or call is under discussion. This directly influences attempts to distinguish one leadership model from another. The Bible itself seldom distinguishes between what a leader is to be and what a leader is to do. For example, Jesus taught that leaders are to assume the *identity* of servants and that they should adopt the *nature* of servants (Matt. 20:26-28; Luke 22:26; John 13:14-16). The interchangeability of titles for local church leaders in the NT – elders, bishops and pastors – also suggests that no sharp distinction was made between their identities and their roles (Richards and Hoeldtke 1980:91).

However, the ambiguity of the terminology used does compound the difficulty of delineating one model from another and naturally results in a continuous superfluity of new paradigms. This fact and the multitudinous responsibilities laid on the shoulders of leaders contribute to leadership identity crisis. Leadership paradigms must distinguish between these various components of leadership if this confusion is to be alleviated. When referring to leadership identity and leadership roles,

Eugene Peterson makes the salient point that "Pastoring in the twentieth century requires two things: one, to *be* a pastor, and two, to run a church. They aren't the same thing" (Leer 1989:129).

3.2.3. The Organic and Organizational Nature of the Church

The church is both a community of believers and an organization of people, and as such has much in common with other organizations of people (Leer 1989:101). Sometimes either the lack of awareness of the complexity of the church or the unwillingness to accept its dual nature leads to the uncertainty and frustration over leadership roles (Leer 1989:101). Noel Pearse identifies four *organizational* features which apply to churches (1995:22-28):

3.2.3.1 Churches are Solidary-Incentive Organizations (Pearse 1995:22)

Individuals participate in and adhere to the church as an organization on the basis of the incentive received from this participation. In churches the incentive is a "solidary" incentive as opposed to the incentive being financial remuneration. Solidary incentives are those derived from relational participation in the group. These incentives include the act of associating and include rewards such as socializing, congeniality, a sense of group membership and identification, the status resulting from membership, fun and conviviality, and the maintenance of social distinctions, etc. (Pearse 1995:22).

3.2.3.2. Churches as Normative Organizations (Pearse 1995:25-26)

There are certain ways in which churches exercise organizational control. As organizations, churches maintain control through requiring the compliance of members to normative values and consensual social practices. This 'normative power' is effected by the allocation and

manipulation of symbolic rewards and deprivations, through employment of leaders, manipulation of mass media, allocation of esteem and prestige symbols, administration of ritual, and influence over the distribution of 'acceptance' and 'positive response'(Pearse 1995:26).

3.2.3.3. Churches as Congregations (Pearse 1995:27-28)

Churches belong to a specific organizational type, namely the "congregation". Congregations are defined as "relatively small-scale, local collectivities and organizations in and through which people engage in religious activity" (Pearse 1995: 27). Viewing churches as congregations highlights the religious dimension of this organizational type. Religious organizations differ from non-religious organizations because of their values; the existence of clergy and the perception of the role and authority of clergy; and in the nature of their organizational goals.

3.2.3.4. Churches as Voluntary, Non-Profit Organizations (Pearse 1995:31)

Organizations have been classified into three sectors, namely the private sector, the public sector and the non-profit sector. The non-profit sector constitutes an array of self-governing private organizations, not dedicated to distributing profits to shareholders or directors and who pursue public purposes outside the formal apparatus of the state. Churches fall into this sector and are regarded as a type of voluntary organization since the organizational behaviour of congregations is not fully explained by religious factors. Voluntary associations are essentially groupings run by volunteers rather than paid staff, and provide the opportunity for mutual participation and benefit with the express purpose being the realization of commonly defined interests. Churches are viewed as voluntary organizations particularly in groupings

where the members of the church are viewed as the "owners" of the church.

In Christian communities, "If the focus is on the community of believers, the role of the pastor becomes that of prophet, priest or witness. But if the focus is on the church as an organization, the pastor becomes the administrator, guiding the body in corporate life" (Leer 1989:101). Often because of the dual nature of the church, leaders find themselves assuming a multiplicity of roles and identities and need to respond to both the organizational and communal needs of the church. Leaders may then frequently find it difficult to hold their identities and responsibilities in a healthy balance.

3.2.4. The Influence of Church Size on Church Leadership Roles

Another factor that influences the identity and roles that leaders are required to fulfill is the size of the community in which they minister (Odom 2001:23). The size of the community also influences the type of relationships forged between members and the leader. Every size church requires different skills and different roles from leaders (Warren 2009:1-2). The primary work of a pastor will be directly affected by the number of people who are in the congregation (Odom 2001:23). Church size influences leadership roles and identities in the following ways (Odom 2001:21-36):

3.2.4.1. Family church – attendance of less than 50

Here the pastor is able to develop close relationships and be a "chaplain" who is able to provide pastoral care. Most pastors start out ministering in small churches (Bargiol 1997:33) as "owner/operators", doing most of the work themselves (Warren 2009:1).

3.2.4.2. Pastoral Church – attendance of 50-150

Here the pastor functions as the central figure in the congregation and leads most of the preaching, teaching and worship. The pastor is still able to provide spiritual care on a one-to-one basis. A large percentage of "family" churches and "pastoral" churches are served by bi-vocational pastors (Bargiol 1997:33).

In the above-mentioned size churches, the role of the pastor tends to be varied and flexible and pastors in these situations will be called upon to fulfill traditional spiritual roles, perform practical administrative and logistical roles, as well as serve as the director for more than one ministry department in the church (Bargiol 1997:34).

3.2.4.3. Program Church – attendance of 150-350

In churches of this size and larger, pastors provide leadership and direction through preaching and teaching large groups. They will also be called upon to supervise, manage, nurture and encourage other paid and volunteer leaders, and will function as a model to all (Warren 2009:1; Bargiol 1997:34). In churches of this size, responsibilities carried out by pastors in small churches are shared between several staff members and the "senior" leader assumes the function of overseeing other leaders and ministries and coordinating the ministry of the church. "Senior" pastors become leaders of a team (Bargiol 1997:35). An additional function is that leaders now also become responsible for equipping other members of staff (Synan 1989:663).

3.2.4.4. Corporate Church – attendance above 350

Typically churches of this size and larger are multi-congregational – there are several identifiable congregations belonging to the larger whole (Warren 2009:1). Here the (senior) pastor is the chief preacher and

teacher and guides staff to accomplish the mission and goals of the church. They set the tone of the church and cast the vision as they are led by God (Warren 2009:1). In larger churches, the caring and nurture given by pastors in smaller churches, is done by other members of staff, possibly by assistant pastors and members. Church members will probably build closer relationships with staff members than with the (senior) pastor. In larger churches each of the church's leaders may perform different, but complementary roles.

3.2.5. The Complexity of Modern Life and Christian Ministry

Leadership identity is closely linked to societal needs and the concomitant role expectations that the society has of its leaders (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:11). Since some societal are common to all societies at all times, there are some leadership roles which remain constant. For this reason, some elements of leadership identities are transferable cross-culturally and from one milieu to another. Nevertheless, in order to minister in a relevant way, leaders are also called upon to continually make adjustments in their approaches to leadership. Differing contexts and changing times all require different modes and models of leadership (Pohlmann 2006:90). Changes in societal needs bring with them new or different role expectations of leaders. These continuous changes are another reason for the variety of leadership models and leadership identities.

Furthermore, when one considers that society is currently undergoing change at a pace and on a scale that is unprecedented, a greater diversity of leadership roles, models and identities is to be expected (Wagner, et al 2000:24). Change is no longer developmental and incremental or even restricted to certain geographical regions. Cultural change is happening on a rapid, global scale, particularly in developed nations and in cities that are worldwide centers of technological innovation (Gibbs 2005:9). In addition to this, the Church, particularly in the West, has "slipped

from cultural majority to waning influence in a religious plurality" (Williams 2000:31). The combined force of these changes "have precipitated a crisis in leadership" since even adjustments to existing leadership models have not been adequate to meet the demands placed on leaders that these changes have elicited (Gibbs 2005:9). The complexity of our times has made it difficult to define clear-cut role definitions for church leaders (Wagner, et al 2000:24) and have given rise to an ever-increasing diversity of leadership roles and identities.

3.3. The Need for Paradigmatic Changes in Leadership Models

The following subsection discusses the need for paradigmatic changes in stereotypical leadership models. The first basis of the call for a paradigm change stems from some inherent flaws within many of the stereotypical leadership models. Secondly, the "pastoral" or "shepherding" model which has guided Protestant churches is given special mention, since this has been an archetypal leadership paradigm. The last argument in favour of a paradigm shift for leadership stems from paradigmatic changes in society which require a new approach to leadership in the Church.

3.3.1. Critique: Deficiencies in Stereotypical Leadership Models

Notwithstanding the legitimate factors that lead to the emergence of diverse leadership models, some cursory critiques can be offered regarding the models in general. These critiques apply to different models to varying degrees, and are offered as overall critiques, relative to an equipping model of leadership. They show why certain of the stereotypical models of leadership need augmenting in order to develop more holistic paradigms of leadership. Some paradigms have served their purpose and are either in need of an overhaul or should be discarded in their entirety.

3.3.1.1. Most Leadership Paradigms Exhibit an Innate Clerical Paradigm.

Most of the stereotypical leadership paradigms focus on the role and ministry of Christian leaders to other believers, and not on the ministry of Christian leaders within the context of the ministry of the whole priesthood of believers. They highlight the leader's responsibility as a minister to others, whether this be to the community of faith or to the larger community outside the walls of the church. Several interpretations of Ephesians 4:11-12 have limited the ministry envisioned in this text to being the ministry of "preachers, pastors and teachers" (Schnackenburg 1991:183; Page 2005:26). Leadership models based on this interpretation have served to endorse the notion of a special class of "officers" within the church, given by Christ to the church (Shnackenburg 1991:182). These models have contributed to a "two-class system of priest and people, clergy and laity, professional and amateur", one which has been disastrous in stifling the growth of the church (Smitsdorff 2005:13; Watson 1989:250). These leadership models reveal a hierarchical, organizational approach to the church where leaders function "at the top" or "from the front" and minister "to" others. This is as opposed to an organic, networked, communal view of the church. This is one in which leaders minister alongside others - an approach in which the entire community is mobilized for ministry.

3.3.1.2. Some Models Develop an Unhealthy Co-Dependent Relationship With Leaders

Clerical paradigms of Christian leadership cause individuals to develop an unhealthy "co-dependant relationship with their clergy" (Foss 2000:31). These relationships may also stem from a leader's "need to be needed" (Foss 2000:31). This is particularly true of the therapist model of leadership. Congregation members may demand constant personal

attention and care from leaders, something which places time demands on leaders. A corporate symptom of this dependency phenomenon is that believers feel that "ordained leaders" must be present at corporate gatherings in order for the event or meetings to be validated (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:12). Even in instances where the ministry of "non-clerical" members of the community would be more effective or appropriate, such ministry is deemed to be "second-class" (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:12). From an organisational perspective, this may also result in leaders involving themselves in every possible meeting for fear of decisions being taken of which they may not approve (Smit 1995: 36). This in turn leads to a loss of confidence by others in their own ability and the stifling of personal initiative. The result of this may be that a controlling style of leadership may emerge (Gibbs and Bolger 2005:192).

3.3.1.3. Many are Ecclesial-Centered

These leadership paradigms furthermore limit the sphere of Christian leadership to the growth, development, administration and maintenance of local congregations of believers (Smitsdorff 2005:13). The missional responsibilities of leaders to reach the world outside of the church become secondary to that of their responsibilities within the church (Smitsdorff 2005:13). Stereotypical leadership paradigms are of the "traditional maintenance mould" (Gibbs 2005:13). This narrow focus of the role of the leaders has left them handicapped in a post-Christian world. For example, Ballard says that the increased secularization taking place within Britain, along with other factors, has "helped to provoke a crisis in ministerial role and identity. What are clergy for, and what role should they perform ... in the community? ... The post-war years saw acceleration in the pace of secularization and the decline in confidence in traditional clerical skills and roles" (Ballard 2000:63, 64).

3.3.1.4. Many Leadership Paradigms Mistakenly Assume a Defunct Constantinian View of The World

Many leadership models mistakenly function with a Constantinian Christian view of the world (Gibbs and Bolger 2005:17). From about AD 313 until about the midpoint of the twentieth century, the Church occupied a central position as a key social institution in Western societies (Gibbs and Bolger 2005:17). Christian leadership paradigms and identities were formed against this backdrop. Churches focused on maintenance, and developed corresponding models of Christian leadership which focused on the tasks of the spiritual growth of believers and the management and administration of congregations. In addition to serving in churches, Christian leaders served as village priests or as civic community leaders (Gibbs and Bolger 2005:17).

However, two influences have contributed to society entering into a "post-Christendom" phase (Gibbs and Bolger 2005:17). The first is modernism, which began just prior to the Renaissance and the second is secularism, which has impacted society since 1950 (Gibbs and Bolger 2005:17). The results of these influences is that the Church as an institution has lost its privileged position and increasingly occupies a place on the margins of society, alongside other recreational and non-profit organizations (Gibbs and Bolger 2005:17).

As a result, the Church and Christian leaders can no longer employ the leadership models which were used in "Christian" societies. Whereas in the "Christendom" era leadership models focused on the maintenance and care of established congregations, leadership paradigms need to be reinterpreted in the light of massive global cultural shifts (Gibbs 2005:11). Leaders must learn to serve as cross-cultural missionaries who intentionally engage the secular culture or community in order to transform it (Ogne and Roehl 2008:16; Gibbs 2005:12-13). Roxburgh and Romanuk contend that leaders must also adapt their leadership

proficiencies in order to lead churches as *missional communities* in the new post-Christendom culture (2006:3).

3.3.1.5. The Word "Pastor" as the Normative Designation for Christian Leadership is a Misnomer

The shepherd image is considered to be the "favourite metaphor" used by the Lord (MacArthur 1986: no page numbers) and a "dominant" metaphor used in Scripture to define leadership (Van Rheenen 2003: no page numbers). This image continues to be the governing stereotypical image for church leadership. The nomenclatures associated with this shepherding paradigm are those of the Christian leader as a "shepherd" or "pastor" (Ogden 1990:85; Van Rheenen 1996: no page numbers).

a) Critique of the Use of the Pastoral Paradigm as the Norm for Christian Leadership

While the pastoral paradigm has helped to preserve certain Biblical leadership nuances, it has also limited the perceptions of what Christian leaders are to be and restricted the functions of Christian leaders to those functions associated with the pastoral metaphor. The appellation stands in contradistinction to an Equipping paradigm (Ogden 1990:85, 117). It sees the leader as the primary caregiver as opposed to seeing the leader as an equipper of others so that they in turn would share the caring ministry incumbent upon all believers. Several criticisms have been raised from different quarters as to the inappropriateness of continuing to employ the pastoral metaphor as the normative image for church leaders:

i. The pastoral metaphor has been applied in contemporary church life almost to the exclusion of other biblical metaphors for Christian leaders. Congregations and leaders have been socialized to view this model as one of only a select few viable ones (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:5). The pastoral metaphor does not include other

aspects of ministry such as the priestly and prophetic functions of Christian ministry (Armentrout 1990:871). The dominance of this paradigm in congregations has also led to the exclusion of evangelists, prophets and apostles in church leadership as well as the marginalization of these leadership functions from church structures (Hirsh 2008:33-34).

ii. Shepherding as a concept is one that is remote from modern urban life (Armentrout 1990:871).

iii. The meaning of the word "pastor" as used today does not have the meaning that it did in the first century (Snodgrass 1996:203). Roxburgh and Romanuk argue that, "The pastoral model in its contemporary practice is not actually derived from New Testament models of the pastor. In its current usage, the word has been directly shaped (and redefined) by the fields of psychology and therapy as well as by modernity's focus on the self and the expressive individual" (2006:26).

iv. Similar to the above, the nurturing and feeding functions inherent in the word "pastor" have been restricted, particularly by Reformed theologians to "feeding" through preaching and teaching the word of God. Ephesians 4:11 indicates that more than a "word ministry" is envisaged in their responsibilities. The context of Ephesians 4:11 associates an equipping function with "ποιμεν" as opposed to the traditional caring motif. There is also an emphasis on oversight, and leadership inherent in the shepherding metaphor (Vooys 1991: no page numbers). Schooley is also critical of the spiritualizing of the functions of shepherds as attempts are made to find analogies for literal shepherding functions in Christian ministry (2000: no page numbers). He says that, "The problem with this ... is that there are no inherent controls on the analogy itself—those making the analogy may interpret any duty in any manner they choose. The

usual understanding that emerges from this approach lays great emphasis on personal care for the congregation by the pastor. This may or may not be what was intended by the New Testament use of the term to describe a type of leader within the church" (2000: no page numbers).

v. When the word "ποιμεν", from which the pastoral metaphor is derived is employed as a noun, it vests the nurturing and caring ministry of the community of faith in an individual. Odom argues that a shepherding ministry properly belongs to the entire community of faith and not just its leaders (2001:29). The shepherding paradigm may also foster an unhealthy relationship of dependence between pastors and church members (Hirsch 2008:34).

vi. The contemporary application of the metaphor has been to create administrative "solo-pastorates", where one shepherd is assigned to care for one flock. This is as opposed to developing pastoral- or ministry-teams, which is considered to be a more biblical approach (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:190).

b) Etymology of The Term "Pastor"

The Greek term "ποιμεν" (English "shepherd" or "pastor") is used of Christ in John 10:11, 14; Heb. 13:20 and 1 Peter 2:25, but is used of Christian leaders only in Ephesians 4:11 in the NT. It refers to "one who tends flocks or herds, a shepherd, herdsman" (Moulton 1978:333). It's English equivalent, "pastor" is derived from the Latin word "passere", meaning "to pasture" or "to feed" (Armentrout 1990:871). In biblical terminology its literal meaning, that of referring to a shepherd caring for a flock, is often employed. It is this image that is used to describe the function of a Christian leader caring for other believers (Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 5:1-4; John 21:16) (Lincoln 1990:250).

Traditionally this pastoral image and the term "pastor" itself have been used throughout Church history to describe the relationship between a minister and a congregation (Armentrout 1990:871). This is because the Middle Eastern analogy of the leader as the shepherd of a flock has enabled church leaders to care for people, to build relationships with a variety of people and to exhibit this as an example for the entire congregation to emulate in the church (Wagner 2000:26). Shepherding suggests the nurture, care (O'Brien 1999:300), feeding, protection and rule of the flock (Robinson 1979:181), and of ministering through personal friendship, wise counsel and moral empathy (Mitton 1991:151).

c) The Wider Semantic Range and Application of "ποιμεν"

The noun "ποιμεν" is not only translated literally, but also figuratively or metaphorically in the Bible. It is when these figurative usages are considered that we come to understand the broader semantic range attributed to the noun and its cognate verb than is traditionally conceived of. Consequently figurative interpretations also attribute a broader understanding of the functions of church leaders than is encapsulated in the traditional shepherding motif of care and nurture.

i. Christian Leaders as Overseers, Initiators and Directors

The cognate verb, "poimano", also means "to tend, direct, superintend" (Matt. 2:6; John 21:16); "to rule" (Rev. 2:27) (Mitton 1989:151; Moulton 1978:333). This verb was applied to those already in leadership in Acts 20:28 and 1 Pet. 5:1-4 and Peter's activity in John 21:16 (Lincoln 1990:250). The verb also suggests the exercise of leadership (Mitton 1989:151) through guidance (Lincoln 1990:250-251; Neufeld 2002:180) governance (Abbott-Smith 1964:370; Eddie 1977:304) and decision-making (Jackson 2002: no page numbers). The later office of bishop which developed in the second century may've developed from among

those who had excelled at pastoral care and the building others up in the faith (Mitton 1989:151). Their competence at pastoral care naturally afforded them the positions of leadership of congregations. Even today pastors are still required to function as guides, directors and leaders of the church's corporate life (Leer 1989: 102). Thomas says that it is significant that in 1 Peter 5:1-2, "the ... Pastor ... is not a 'chief sheep' amongst the sheep but in fact a shepherd who leads" (2003:114).

ii. Christian Leaders as Administrators

Another meaning attached to the noun and verb as used in the New Testament is that of the administration of a congregation (Bauer 1979:683) or management of a flock (Getz 1984:140). It is probable that the term "pastor" in Ephesians 4:11 and elsewhere in Paul's writings includes the concepts of "management" (1 Thess. 5:12; Rom. 12:8), "administration" (1 Cor. 12:28), and "oversight" (Phil1:1) (Eddie 1977:304; Lincoln 1990:251; O'Brien 1999:300). This is because the general notions of oversight in the term "bishop, overseer" taken from the Hellenistic world had close associations with the shepherding notion of Jewish thought. It is therefore understandable that the terms "episkopos" - "bishop" and "poimen" - "pastor" are "interchangeable in the Christian movement", themselves also "being equivalent to "presbuteros" - "elder" (Lincoln 1990:251).

iii. Christian Leaders as Guardians

The term "pastor" when used in a metaphorical sense includes the idea of guardianship (Moulton1978:333) and protection (Acts 20:28-31) (Getz 1984:140; Robinson 1979:181).

iv. Christian Leaders as Equippers

There is a further connotation of the word "ποιμεν", one which comes to the fore in the word's unique occurrence in Ephesians 4:11. Here it is not specifically its etymological precedent that helps us understand the function of Christian leaders, but rather the context in which the word appears. Once it is conceded that Christian leaders are in view in Ephesians 4:11-12, a further critical function of Christian leaders emerges. This is the function of Christian leaders as equippers of God's people for service (Mitton 1989:151; Ogden 1990:85; Snodgrass 1996:204; Virgo 2003:133). Best says that the ministry of leaders "does not find its fulfilment in their own existence but only in the activity of preparing others to minister" (1997:173).

d). Conclusions

i. The Contemporary Pastoral Leadership Paradigm is Parochial In Its Approach to Shepherding Functions

The term "pastor" in its popular usage as the standard designation for church leaders is a misnomer and is misleading. The shepherding motif employed by Scripture incorporates the additional functions of providing visionary direction, governing, administration, protection and equipping believers for ministry. The Greek word "ποιμεν" upon which the contemporary pastoral leadership paradigm is based incorporates these functions.

Therefore either the conventional pastoral paradigm must be extended to incorporate these functions or the pastoral paradigm and the designation of leaders as "pastors" should be dispensed of as the norm for Christian leaders. Christian leaders are no longer called upon to simply shepherd a flock.

ii. The "Church Leader as Pastor" is a Leadership Paradigm that has Restricted Leaders from Exploring Other Important Leadership Functions

The functions of leadership associated with the conventional designation of the leader as "pastor" hinders leaders from exploring other important functions and "from considering and assessing other organizational structures and leadership models used by the church" (Guenther and Heidebrecht 1999:9). The conventional paradigm favours maintenance and pastoral care. It has resulted in the neglect of the church's larger mission and ministry, and has marginalized apostolic, evangelistic and prophetic leadership functions (Hirsch 2008:34). In post-Christian cultures, a missional church with pioneering, innovative, organizationally adaptive, and externally focused leadership is required (Hirsch 2008:34; Ogne and Roehl 2008:16; Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:12-13).

iii. The Traditional Shepherding Paradigm is Mainly Suited To Small to Medium-sized Churches

It is mainly in smaller to medium-sized churches that leaders can function as shepherds. As churches grow in size, the growth will place other demands on a leader's time, effectively disengaging him/her from one-on-one ministry. The Pastoral Activities Index, published by the Presbyterian Church, listed 189 types of tasks which leaders may be called upon to perform in eight distinct categories (Harper 2009: no page numbers). When considering the demands made on leaders, Foss says, "today a pastor cannot be with his people every minute, know the intimate details of their lives, and anticipate their every spiritual need.

And, frankly, he shouldn't. When I read Paul's letters it is intriguing how much spiritual direction is given and how little pastoral care is provided" (2000:30).

We conclude therefore that while there will always be a need for church and Christian leaders to provide care for others, there are several objections which can be raised against the uncritical adoption of the pastoral paradigm as a normative model for church leaders.

iv. The Term "ποιμεν" is a Metaphor for Christian Leadership

Apart from the specific shepherding functions inherent in the term "ποιμεν", the term "is used in the Old Testament and the New Testament in a figurative sense simply as a metaphor for 'leader' or 'ruler'" ("Pastor" in ILlumina Encyclopaedia 2002; Best 1997:167). As a result, many have conceded that it is church leaders who are in view in Ephesians 4:11 (Lincoln 1990:250; O'Brien 1999:300), and that this list of leaders is not complete (Snodgrass 1996:204). It is only in Ephesians 4:11 in the NT that the term "pastor" is used to describe church leaders (Lincoln 1990:250). The terms "shepherd" and "teacher" as used in this text were terms drawn from the secular world where they had already been applied to leaders" (Best 1997:177).

e) Contemporary Metaphors for Christian Leaders

If the nomenclature "pastor" is dispensed of as the normative description for Christian leaders, the inevitable question that arises is then: "What name, designation or title should we use to refer to Christian leaders?" Best says, "It is difficult to know what title to give church officials ... it could be leaders, ministers, officials, office-bearers" (1997:160). The issue is not easily resolved, even when turning to the New Testament for guidance. Even if the NT is used as a resource, several factors

complicate the issue of attempting to find normative designations for church leaders based on the evidence of the NT:

i. There is no single exhaustive or definitive list of leaders mentioned in the New Testament (Hendrikson 1976:195; O'Brien 1999:298; Stott 1989:159).

ii. Certain common leadership designations, notably that of overseer, elder and pastor were used interchangeably in the New Testament (Thomas 2003:113). Thomas says, "the office of Overseer/Pastor/Elder is one office with 3 different titles given to this one office" (2003:114). One reason for this is perhaps that no one designation fully described all that a leader's ministry would encompass.

iii. The titles used in the New Testament for spiritual leaders were never meant to restrict the sphere of ministry of those leaders to the ministry that the designation described (Getz 1984:150).

iv. The NT describes the functions of an emerging leadership – not completely developed at the time of writing (Snyder 1977:83). By the third century we see that the "pastor" of a local congregation did not function alone in the exercise of administrative, pastoral and liturgical leadership. Walker says, "The third century saw a growth in the number of offices, and these included not only bishops, deacons and presbyters, but also, from time to time, lectors, widows, subdeacons, virgins, deaconesses, catechists, acolytes, exorcists, and doorkeepers" (1986:99).

v. References made to leaders in the NT are functional terms, and were never intended to serve as formal titles. The terminology is descriptive of the leader's task in the body of Christ and not their position (Merkle 2003: no page numbers). Merkle says that the

> New Testament does not share our present-day pre-occupation with definitions, titles and status (2003: no page numbers).

In attempting to answer the question of what designation to give to leaders, it is to be remembered that New Testament writers freely drew upon the existing nomenclatures used in the secular arena when referring to Church leaders. When they imported these designations into their writings, they invested these designations with new meaning (Lincoln 1990:251). This legitimizes the use of contemporary metaphors as designations for Christian leaders. Contemporary metaphors can serve as vehicles to communicate biblical truths using terms with which contemporary society is more conversant. Metaphors must not be uncritically adopted, but should communicate the same ethos of leadership and similar leadership functions as those prescribed by the New Testament.

From a sociological perspective, several terms used to refer to leaders in secular leadership theory are compatible with a Christian frame of reference (Hirsch 2008:35). Current leadership models are already borrowed from psychology (counselor, therapist), the field of medicine (healer), the business world (strategist, coach, manager), and the educational world (teacher) (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:5). Christian leaders have also been referred to as entrepreneurs, communicators, philosophers (Hirsch 2008:35), chief executive officers, cultivators (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:27), visionaries, trainers, coaches, mentors, chaplains, spiritual directors (Ogne and Roehl 2008:16, 21, 31), and managers (Gibbs and Coffey 2001:115).

Designations that are used to describe the collective leadership of congregations are: "leadership executive" (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:10), "church board" (Ogne and Roehl 2008:16), or "leadership team" (Gibbs 2005:93). The Church itself has been called a "faith community" (Ogne and Roehl 2008:26); "corporate organism" (Steven

and Collins 1993:xiv), "system" (McLaren 2006:50), "network" (Gibbs 2005:86), "institution" (Ogden 1990:45), "enterprise" or "organization" (Gibbs and Coffey 2001:109, 104). All of the above terms, whether referring to Christian leaders, congregational leadership teams or the Church itself reveal the propensity to solicit metaphors from secular culture to describe Biblical phenomena. One caveat is that the cultural images borrowed from society must not displace NT understandings of the Church or its expectations of leaders (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:5).

In summary, the New Testament employs a wide diversity of metaphors for leaders, none of which is prescriptive. Nomenclatures that were used in the New Testament of leaders were images borrowed from secular culture and invested with new meaning. More often than not it was the context in which terms appeared, rather than the terms themselves that communicated the new spiritual significance attributed to the terms. For these reasons, while we may continue to use the terms the New Testament used for leaders, we are also at liberty, within certain parameters to employ contemporary idiomatic metaphors from within our cultures as designations for Christian leaders. Since leadership roles vary from congregation to congregation, we may also find that a wide variety of terms are used in different contexts to describe the same leadership functions (Best 1997:177). It must be acknowledged, however, that whatever title or metaphor is used to describe church leaders, these descriptions will have their own limitations in trying to encapsulate the full scope of leadership functions. We must also be careful to not allow one leadership metaphor to become dominant as has been the case with the pastoral paradigm.

3.4. Paradigm Shifts That Require Concordant Changes in Leadership

Eddie Gibbs says that changes currently taking place in society are of such "seismic" proportions that they require styles or models of leadership that supersede the stereotypical leadership paradigms (2005:41; also Gibbs and Coffey 2006:24; McLaren 2006:113; Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:3). Paradigm shifts in society necessitate corresponding changes in ministry, which in turn require radically different kinds of leaders (Ogne and Roehl 2008:15; Gibbs and Bolger 2006:193). These changes need leaders with new skills and new capacities (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:10, 13). In addition, conditions under which leaders lead have changed significantly over the last few decades (Gibbs 2005:9). Concerning these changes, Gibbs says,

> "They are not only unnervingly unfamiliar, but at times incomprehensible, having changed beyond all recognition (2005:9).

These changes are not developmental changes being made to established culture, and they are not just a fad, experiment or general adjustment (Ogne and Roehl 2008:8). They are "discontinuous" (Thomas 2003:67), paradigmatic changes and have been described as the transition of society from the Industrial Age to the Quantum Age (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:24). Whereas continuous change is incremental change - change that develops out of what has gone before, the change within a paradigm, discontinuous change breaks with the past and brings about the emergence of something completely new (McLaren 2006:31, Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:7). "Discontinuous change is dominant in periods of history that transform a culture forever, tipping it over into something new" (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:7; McLaren 2006:25).

Smit says that changes of this magnitude are paradigmatic changes. Paradigmatic changes do not entail a few minor adjustments that enable

people to perform better in a familiar environment (1995:34). He describes this change as follows:

> "Paradigm ... means that life in a particular society is characterized by a pattern of forms, roles, structures and customs that sustain meaning, motivate behaviour, regulate relationships and largely predetermine decisions. These patterns are created by people, but tend over years and decades to gain an existence of their own even to the point where they perpetuate themselves in and through the very societies that created them... Thus it follows that paradigmatic change is about a different way of living, thinking, behaving, relating, ordering and structuring..." (1995:34).

Roxburgh and Romanuk maintain that the classical skills in which most Christian leaders were trained were not wrong (2006:11). However they argue that the level of discontinuous change taking place in society renders many of them insufficient and unhelpful (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:11).

Changes that are taking place are too numerous to mention. However, for the purpose of illustrating the need for new leadership paradigms, the following changes can be noted as exemplifying the scale of discontinuous, paradigmatic change:

3.4.1. The Shift from a Modern Worldview to a Post-Modern Worldview

There is currently "a massive *cultural* shift taking place from a modern worldview to a postmodern worldview" (Ogne and Roehl 2008:8). This shift has been fuelled by technology, the emergence of the Internet, the ensuing repercussions of globalism and the pluralism of cultures and faith (Ogne and Roehl 2008:8). Modernism is characterised by the following: humanism; belief and trust in the empirical sciences; belief in

the existence of absolute truth and ageless principles; belief in the existence of universal values and ethical norms; belief in evolution and materialism (matter that can be seen and touched); belief in linear progression; and individualism (Bester 2009:32; Crane 2003:49).

"Postmodernism" on the other hand, is a term that is "virtually indefinable" (Crane 2003:49) but is one that is used to cover an emergent, comprehensive worldview embracing philosophy, the arts, culture, politics and certain branches of science, theology and popular culture (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:28). It is characterised by among other things: commitment to philosophical pluralism and relativism and refuses to see any meta-narrative as normative (Walton 2005:no page numbers); a rejection of propositional truth and certainty (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:29); the rejection of hierarchy, a suspicion of institutions and distrust of authority figures; trust in technology; fatalism (believing that we have no control over circumstance); tolerance of the values of others; the valuing of subjective experience; a strong emphasis on personal choice and community" (Bester 2009:32; Crane 2003:49; McLaren 2006:169; Moynagh 2003:31). Adam mentions that postmodernism is:

> "not a marketing ploy, neither is it a Christian fad. By the time postmodernism has run its course and has done its best and worst ... the world will think, talk and act in ways that will seem quite foreign to us" (2008:20; also Ogne and Roehl 2008:8).

Gibbs and Coffey mention that the "transition from modernity to postmodernity has contributed to the collapse of an integrated and self-contained worldview. Now we are faced with a fragmented society..." (2006:69). They mention that the "cultural chaos" that has arisen as the result of this transition "has affected all institutions, including churches" (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:69). Churches as social institutions are losing their prominence or influence in their community – they are significant

only to their members – and are being marginalised (Gibbs 2005:41; Ogne and Roehl 2008:9).

The same marginalisation is happening to many church leaders. McClaren says that there was a period in time when Christian leaders were once viewed as a pedagogues, professionals or civic leaders and when pastors functioned at the cultural centre of a community (2006:9; also Moynagh 2001:96). However, Christian leaders have also been marginalised along with the church as an institution. One reason for this may be that many existing church leaders are from the previous generations of modernists who accept the assumptions of modernity and have expressed it in their approach to leadership (Gibbs 2005:51, 59; Gibbs and Bolger 2005:192; Gibbs and Coffey 2001:85). In post-Christendom and postmodern cultures, new leaders are needed (Gibbs 2005:175). Previous assumptions about leadership that were cultivated for a different era and context need to be re-examined and rewritten (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:10).

3.4.2. Post-Denominationalism, New Denominations and Networks

Current trends towards fragmentation in society will accelerate the trend of the late twentieth-century for people to be less focused on traditional denominations (Moynagh 203:104). Moynagh contends that this fragmentation will result in a twofold decline in adherence to existing traditional denominations and a rise in the formation of a myriad of new "denominations" (Moynagh 203:104). He says that these new denominations will no longer be based on the eccentricities of doctrine, governmental or other church structure, allegiance to an influential founding leader, or on particular worship styles (Moynagh 203:104). Instead people will attach themselves to a "denomination" based on the common interests, similar needs, and passion for the same causes that they may share with others (Moynagh 203:104).

These denominations or churches may be either small or large "megamagnets" depending on what the basis of their union is and the number of people in that location who hold those things in common (Moynagh 2003:102). Moynagh argues that people will probably belong to new, large networks in order to combine their efforts to accomplish larger objectives that require collaborative efforts or to experience ministry which the smaller group cannot afford them (Moynagh 2003:102, 106). Networking in this way is reminiscent of the clusters and networks around which churches in the New Testament were organised (Gibbs 2005:86). Corporate collaboration may also form around "apostolic networks" (Gibbs and Coffey 2001:77; McNeal 1995:12). These are networks of churches which either voluntarily place themselves under the guidance of a recognized leader or which may be "daughter churches" which continue to maintain a close relationship to the "mother-church" which planted them (Gibbs and Coffey 2001:79). These networks may be "apostolic" in their approach to mission, but do not necessarily requiring an "apostle" to lead the network. Leadership within conventional denominations functions in pyramid hierarchies with centralised authority and clear lines of command and control. Networks on the other hand are fluid, flexible and capable of creatively and intuitively adjusting to diversity (Gibbs 2005:91-92). They are neither centralised, nor decentralised, but polycentric – there are many centres of leadership which all interrelate (Gibbs 2005:92).

3.4.3. The Transition of the Word "Pastor" from a Noun to a Verb: The Shepherding Ministry of the Body of Christ

One problem with interpreting the noun "ποιμεν" in Ephesians 4:11 as a reference to a Church office-bearer is the assumption that the responsibility of shepherding is the chief domain of leaders appointed to this office. However, Odom argues that in the future the word "pastor" may move in emphases from a noun to a verb as the Church lays more

emphasis on ministry by the whole community of faith rather than vesting ministry in an individual (2001:29).

Most of the allusions to pastoring in the New Testament, even when applied to leaders, refer to the function or service that is rendered rather than an "office" which is to be occupied (cf. Acts 20:28; 1 Peter 5:2) (Neufeld 2002:180). As a spiritual gift and function this ministry responsibility is given to leaders, but is equally given to other members in the body of Christ as well (Watson 1989:247, 257). For this reason the "solo ministry syndrome" or modern-day "pastor" system is seen as a departure from the New Testament (Stevens and Collins 1993:88). Jackson says that no one person can assume the role of pastoring an entire congregation (2002:no page numbers). Getz also say that it has never been God's intention that either one leader, or a group of "several leaders ... do the work of ministry. He intended for the *whole* church to do this work" (1984:115-116).

This change in emphasis of the word "pastor" from a noun to a verb will bring about several paradigm shifts. Firstly, it debunks the archetypal leadership paradigm of the leader as *the* shepherd of a congregation. It lifts the prior restricting of the pastoral ministry to a few individuals, and places this ministry in the hands of the entire body of Christ. Stevens and Collins outline three subsystems which already exist in the body of Christ through which believers can provide care for each other (1993:75-91):

- The Family Subsystem (Stevens and Collins 1993:78): The church contains biological family units in which family members care for each other. Furthermore, as the "family" or "household of God" (Gal. 6:10; Eph. 2:19; Heb. 2:11), the church functions as an extended family in which people can become "functional relatives". Through these relationships care is given and received.

- The Restorative-Reparative Subsystem (Stevens and Collins 1993:85): By structuring the life of the congregation to include Sabbath rest and communal recreational events, care is given to families and individuals who often experience busy and stressful lives.

- The Lay Leadership Subsystem (Stevens and Collins 1993:88): In every congregation there are many "laymen" who have been gifted by God to serve as leaders. When pastors and church leaders cultivate, support and release these "lay" leaders for ministry, both they (the pastor) and the congregation can receive care.

The second change that this paradigm shift could bring about is in changing the theology and philosophy of ministry of the Church. When leaders understand that shepherding is the responsibility of the entire community of faith, they may be mobilised to assume the equipping function advocated in Ephesians 4:12 as a central and strategic leadership responsibility. This will require changes in their priorities, ministry goals and time allocation so that they equip others to care (Stevens and Collins 1993:90).

The third change is a change in the way congregations are viewed and the way in which believers view themselves. Roxburgh and Romanuk mention that:

> "Congregations must become a place where members learn to function like cross-cultural missionaries rather than be a gathering place where people come to receive religious goods and services" (2006:13).

3.5. The Equipping Identity of Leaders Based on Eph. 4:11- 12 – A Growing Consensus

There is growing consensus that the task of equipping believers for ministry is a central responsibility of Christian leaders (Young 1988:50). Greg Ligon relates the example of Chris Hardy who is "the team coach of a group of people who see their calling and ministry as that of helping to facilitate the movement of all people to a receptive culture that embraces equipping *as a basic core value"* (2001: no page numbers, *italics added*).

3.5.1. Equipping as a Biblical Paradigm

An Equipping paradigm for leadership is a paradigm that finds its roots in Scripture. In the past, leadership paradigms assumed that it was the pastor's job to do all the spiritual work (Young 1988:50). Young says, "This, is of course, wrong. We have in recent years rediscovered Eph. 4:11-12" (1988:50).

Ephesians 4:7-16 makes a unique contribution to ecclesiology and to an understanding of Christian leadership. While the passage cannot be seen as a comprehensive theological statement, "it does contribute much to a theology of ministry" (Snodgrass 1996:212; also Stott 1979:167). The emphasis on the doctrine of the church (Foulkes 1980:16) and the functional relationships of believers within an organic unity is unique in Ephesians (Richards and Hoeldtke 1980:36). Ephesians introduces a new emphasis, one in which the church is seen as a missionary vehicle and as a Bible Institute (Wuest 1940:37). Ephesians 4:7 reveals that ministry has been given to every believer (Snodgrass 1996:200). Hendrikson says:

> "The meaning of Ephesians 4:11, 12 is ... that it is the task of the officers of the church to equip the church for these [ministry] tasks" (1976:198; also Neighbour 1990:47; Watson 1989:257).

Hendrikson says that the verses teach "the important lesson" that "the entire church should be engaged in spiritual labour", and that "during the week ... every member should equip himself to be engaged in a definite 'ministry' " (1976:198). A correct interpretation of Ephesians 4:11 indicates that "the whole church is taken into Christ's service and given missionary substance, purpose and structure" (Barth 1981:479; also Loscalzo 1988:690). On the basis of this passage, equipping others for ministry is considered to have been a "primary" function of overseers in the New Testament (Pohlman 2003:122; Virgo 2003:133; Yount 1996:18)

3.5.2. Equipping as a Strategic Leadership Function

It has been shown that an Equipping leadership paradigm is a "Strategic" or "Missional" leadership paradigm (3.1.2.2. above). The two main strategic actions that the paradigm focuses upon is the equipping and mobilisation of believers for ministry and the raising up and training of additional leaders.

3.5.2.1. Equip To Engage All Believers in Ministry

One of the two central tasks of Christian leaders is to "empower" (Storey 1995:73) or to "prepare other members for ministry" (Richards and Hoeldtke 1980:37; also Keener 1993:548; Loscalzo 1988:689; McClung 2008:97; Mitton 1989:151; Snodgrass 1996:203; Thomas 2003:115; Turaki 2006:1433; Wagner, et al 2000:30). Young quotes Elton Trueblood as saying,

> "the older idea was that the lay members were the pastor's helpers, the new and vital idea is that the pastor is the helper of the ordinary lay members in the performance of their daily ministry in the midst of secular life" (1988:50).

Similarly Loscalzo says:

> "The work of ministry, be it pastoral care, administration, evangelism, or the vast array of ministries available to a particular local church, is the work and responsibility of each member of the church in the fulfilment of his or her calling into God's kingdom" (Loscalzo 1988:690).

The common mission for *all leaders* is therefore an equipping one (Richards and Hoeldtke 1980:92; *italics added*) so as to ensure that ministry is shared (Watson 1989:264). The ministry of Christian leaders does not find its fulfilment in their own existence but in the activity of preparing others to minister (Best 1997:173). Leaders must facilitate the functioning of the body of Christ (Richards and Hoeldtke 1980:39). Leaders "do not form a special class, rank, or caste in the church. They are enlisted for the purposes of 'equipping' all the saints" (Barth 1981:481). This function requires that leaders view all believers as co-labourers and peers. Leaders are to enable others to themselves become ministers in their own right (Briscoe 1978:98; Mitton 1989:151). Barth says that leaders are, as it were, "ministers to ministers" (1981:481). Ogden says that unless leaders become Equippers who empower God's people for service, the Church will not become a ministering community (1990:85).

3.5.2.2. Equip To Raises More Leaders

The second of the central equipping functions of Christian leaders is the development of additional leaders (George 1994:27). The principle of raising successors is a fundamental leadership principle. It is not enough for leaders to lead followers, leaders must also develop more leaders (Maxwell [b] No Date:2). The lack of leaders often hinders organisational growth, and additional leaders are required in any church or organisation if it is to continually expand and develop (George 1994:47). New leaders also introduce new life into churches and

organisations (Brooks 2002:180) and help share the ministry load, which is often too large for one individual to carry (Watson 1989: 272). Segler sees the church as the chief nurturer of servant leaders who are raised to render service in the world and impact society (1987:14).

In developing more leaders, existing leaders need to focus on two areas. Firstly, leaders must develop other leaders who will form a ministry team (Fernando 2002:131; Maxwell [b] No Date:2). This will facilitate a shared leadership style, also known as a "participative" or "consultative" approach to leadership (Leer 1989:105). Secondly, leaders must also raise up other leaders who will become key individual influencers in their own right (Maxwell [c] No Date:201). Leaders are to therefore multiply leaders and thereby multiply themselves (George 1994:314). Jesus himself did not only lead followers, he also raised up other leaders (Matt. 19:28). Scripture also encourages those who minister to train up others who would be competent to minister alongside them, thereby ensuring the growth and continuity of ministry (2 Tim. 2:2). Furthermore, Ephesians 4:11-13 assumes that leaders will serve apprenticeships under other "coaches" until such time as they are ready for ministry (Broocks 2002:173-174).

3.5.3. Equipping and the "New Protestant Reformation"

Although it is an integral part of the theology of the priesthood of all believers, the application of an Equipping leadership paradigm in ministry has been lacking among Protestants (Young 1988:54). The great impetus of the Reformation was the discovery, or rather the re-discovery of the ministry of the "laity". The Reformation however, fell short of the implementation of this discovery (Young 1988:54) because the implications of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers were neither fully understood, nor loyally followed (Elton Trueblood in Beckham 1995:15). One major reason for this was that because the

Reformers retained an institutional definition of the church, they did not make a clean break with a hierarchical "top-down" conception of ministry or church structures (Ogden 1990:45, 52; also Watson 1989:253). They also continued to conceive of leadership as functioning in mediatorial and representative roles. These are roles in which the clergy ministered the word of God and the sacraments to other believers (Ogden 1990:52). The result was the creation of "a priesthood within a priesthood" (Ogden 1990:52). The priesthood of all believers was therefore "affirmed in theory, but denied in practice" (Ogden 1990:52).

Snyder says that four centuries after the Reformation, the full implications of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers have yet to be worked out (1977:94). Virgo says:

> "Evangelicals have rejected doctrines that represent the priest as mediator, but often the pastor is still regarded as the professional – he will lead our meeting, he is the employed, isolated man of God – instead of seeing that the goal of all ministries is to raise up a functioning, many-membered body" (2003:111).

Young also argues that:

> "The *implications* of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers are relatively new to evangelical Christianity in America" (1988:46; *italics added*).

Greg Ogden says that when the practical implications of the Reformation doctrine of the priesthood of all believers *are* implemented, it will bring about a "New Reformation", one in which ministry is returned to the people of God (Ogden 1990:25; also Beckham 1995:9). Lay-empowered ministry, staff teams replacing individual leaders, and the "flattening of hierarchical ecclesiastical structures" are further signs of this "New Reformation" (Gibbs and Coffey 2001:75).

However Ogden says, "For ministry to be returned to the people of God, we must have a bottom-up view of the church" (1990:54). Leaders must no longer view themselves as the Church's primary conduits of ministry, nor must they view other believers as passive recipients and supporters of their ministry. Instead they should embrace their new identity as servant leaders who equip the body of Christ for their ministry (Ogden 1990:137). Once this happens and the whole priesthood minister alongside each other as partners and peers, then the "unfinished business of the Reformation" will be completed (Ogden 1990:25; Beckham 2000:12).