
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“Everything rises and fall on leadership”
(Maxwell 1993:INTRODUCTION).

Introduction

Leadership is a crucial factor that influences both the health of individual congregations as well as the expansion of the Church in the world (Kuhl 2005:4). “As goes the church’s leadership, so goes the church” (Helfers 2000:55). If the Church is to successfully carry out its mandate to reach the world and at the same time maintain its health and the integrity of gains already won, then the issue of its leadership continues to be an important issue that needs attention. Bill Hybels maintains that in the Church, the issue of leadership is a significant one:

“the church is the most leadership-intensive enterprise in society ... To mobilize an utterly volunteer organization requires the highest kind of leadership” (2007: no page number).

Reggie McNeal maintains leaders play a formative role in shaping and guiding the Church:

“Throughout church history, leaders have shaped the character of the Christian movement. At crucial moments, leaders like Augustine, Luther, and Calvin have redefined the church” (McNeal 1995:12).

As important as the subject of leadership is, attempts to make meaningful contributions to leadership development are not easy. This is because the area of leadership is a diverse area covering a wide range of issues. Therefore, in order for this thesis to make a meaningful contribution to the subject of leadership, one particular aspect of leadership has been selected as an area of focus. This area is the area of leadership paradigms.

Leadership paradigms can be effective or ineffective. They can promote growth or inhibit growth, and can be empowering or inhibiting (Ogden 2003:171, 175). David Watson mentions that the wrong kind of leadership “makes growth and maturity virtually impossible” (1989:246). Regarding the importance of the leadership paradigms employed in the Church, he says:

“It is probably here, more than in any other area of the Church’s life, that we need to look with fresh understanding and re-examine, critically and biblically the traditional patterns that have been passed down to us over the centuries” (Watson 1989:245).

In a similar vein, Eddie Gibbs says that the Church needs to re-examine its approach to leadership in the light of the extent and radical nature of global changes taking place in the twenty-first century (2005:41). He says:

“Leadership styles must change in the light of fresh challenges the church faces ... What we need is not new leaders, but *different kinds* of leaders” (Gibbs 2005:41, *italics in the original*).

This thesis proposes an Equipping approach to Christian leadership. An Equipping approach is one in which leaders understand that their main priority is the Equipping of believers for the ministry to which they have been called. The Asia-Pacific Institute of Biblical Studies maintain:

“The role of the pastor-teacher is clearly taught in EPH 4:12 ... the pastor's role is to equip and prepare the members ‘for the work of the ministry, for the building up of each member of the church.’ His main role is to help every member to discover his spiritual gifts, develop them to effectively serve with their gifts, deploy them to the ministry to which they are called and delegate authority to them in their ministry ... The pastor is not a doer of ministries but is an equipper” (2001: no page numbers).

Reggie McNeal also accentuates the importance of a leader's equipping function when he says:

“The most effective church leaders of the future will make ... development a priority of their ministry. The future of the church is at stake, rising or falling on the quality of its leadership” (1995:13).

1.1. Definitions

In order to avoid confusion between the terminology used, the following definitions have been specified to explain terms which are subject to confusion or misunderstanding:

- “Congregation”: The term “congregation” is used to define “an organized body of believers in a particular locality”; the members of a local Christian assembly or a *local* church (Merriam-Webster 2011: no page numbers).
- “The body of Christ”: Unless otherwise specified, the term “the body of Christ” will be used in wider sense than the term “congregation”, as a reference to “a group of believers” or the “universal church” *in all spheres of society* as defined in the New Concise Bible Dictionary (Douglas no date:68).
- “The Church”: The reference to this phrase will be used as a proper noun to refer to “The collective body of Christians”, “the whole body of Christian believers” in general, without distinction of denomination (Dictionary.Com 2011: no page numbers).
- “Christian leader” and “pastor”: The terms “Christian leader” and “pastor” are used as interchangeable synonyms today (Kuhl 2005:5), and are also used in this way in most instances in this thesis. This does not negate the fact that in technical terms, distinctions can be made between the Biblical

understanding of what it means to be a “pastor” and the contemporary understanding of what it means to be a Christian leader. The use of these terms as synonyms serves to acknowledge that the term “pastor” is often used as “an adjective to describe leadership” (Kuhl 2005:5). It is also the most common reference term used to describe Christian leaders, whether they serve as leaders in local congregations or in other Christian ministries (Van Rheenen 2003: no page numbers). However, in this thesis, the terms are distinguished from each other when their usage requires this. The context in which each term occurs will determine if the reference is to Christian leaders in general, or to leaders of local churches more specifically (i.e. to “pastors”). The terms are used as synonyms to avoid repetitive and pedantic delineation between Christian leaders who serve within local congregations and those Christian leaders whose sphere of leadership may reach beyond congregations.

1.2. Problem Statement

There is a sense in which leadership in the Church will always require attention. Reggie McNeal says:

“Leadership is the greatest need in the church. That has always been the case” (1995:12).

Despite this, calls have arisen for the issue of leadership in the Church to be revisited. George Davis says that there is currently “a crisis in leadership ... in Christian organizations” (1995:14). Norman Helfers says that the issue of Church leadership “is one of the most pressing issues confronting the Christian community” (2000:55).

One area of leadership that has been identified as being in need of attention is the question of the stereotypical leadership paradigms with which the Church is working. Major changes are taking place in society to such a degree that a revision of Christian leadership paradigms is necessary to respond effectively

to these changes. The nature of the changes taking place in society and the extent to which these changes are taking place are rendering existing leadership paradigms ineffective to the point of rendering some leadership models obsolete.

Not only must cognizance of societal changes elicit paradigm changes in the Church leadership, but the interpretation of key Biblical texts also needs to be revised in the light of expanding theories of Christian leadership. Ephesians 4:11-12 is one key text related to Christian leadership paradigms and to Christian ministry in general. However, “Traditional” interpretations of this text have only served to endorse the self-same stereotypical leadership paradigms which require revision. In order for the revision of Christian leadership paradigms to take place, the interpretation of this very important text must also take place.

1.2.1. Major Changes in Taking Place in Society That Require the Revision of Christian Leadership Paradigms

Major changes are taking place in society, all of which bring with them new or different role expectations of leaders. It is for this reason that the Church needs to reconsider its leadership paradigms in order to respond effectively to these changes. Although leadership paradigms must always be changing to respond effectively to societal changes (Pohlmann 2006:90), the nature and degree of societal change taking place requires *fundamental* changes to leadership paradigms. Moderate adjustments to leadership paradigms will not suffice. Two major changes precipitating the revision of leadership paradigms are the *nature* of the change taking place in society (“Discontinuous” change) and the impact upon society of the transition from modernism to postmodernism.

1.2.1.1. The Advent of “Discontinuous” Change

Changes in society are taking place on a global scale and have been described as being “Discontinuous Change” (Roxburgh and Romanuk

2006:6). Roxburgh and Romanuk describe the degree to which change is taking place as follows:

“Continuous change develops out of what has gone before and therefore can be expected, anticipated and managed ... We can anticipate the stages and learn from those who have gone before us to navigate the changes. We have stock experience and resources to address this developmental change; it is continuous with the experience of many others. This kind of change involves such things as improvements on what is already taking place and whether the change can be managed with existing skills and expertise.

Discontinuous change is disruptive and unanticipated; it creates situations that challenge our assumptions. The skills we have learned aren't helpful in this kind of change Discontinuous change is dominant in periods of history that transform a culture forever, tipping it into something new” (2006:7).

The nature and level at which “transformation” change is taking place in society requires the same degree of change in leadership paradigms. While attempts have been made to adjust stereotypical leadership paradigms in response to societal changes, most revised models of leadership use new language to “repackage” old paradigms (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:4). The following assertions by Alan Roxburgh and Fred Romanuk reveal some of the ramifications of discontinuous change for Christian leadership paradigms:

“In a period of discontinuous change, leaders suddenly find that the skills in which they were trained are of little use in addressing a new situation and environment” (2006:9).

“The skills and capacities that shaped church leadership for much of the twentieth century were the right ones for that context. We are not critiquing these skills and capacities. Our point is that the world has

changed. Discontinuous change means that many rules and assumptions about leadership now need to be reexamined and rewritten” (2006:10).

“The classic skills of pastoral leadership in which most pastors were trained were not wrong, but the level of discontinuous change renders many of them insufficient and unhelpful at this point” (2006:11).

The level of societal change taking place requires a concordant degree of change to Christian leadership paradigms. Adjustments to existing stereotypical leadership paradigms have only temporarily shielded the Church from experiencing the full impact of societal change. Far greater fundamental paradigmatic change is required of Christian leadership paradigms if the Church is to keep pace with global changes.

1.2.1.2. The Transition from Modernism to Postmodernism

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to examine in depth the complexity of the emerging phenomenon of postmodernism. However, the impact of the transition of Western society in particular to postmodernism is illustrative of the degree to which “discontinuous” societal change is taking place. The emergence of postmodernism is traced to the period following the First World War (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:28). George Cladis explains the scope of the impact of postmodernism:

“Scholars in different fields of study agree that Western society is moving through a major cultural change from modernism to postmodernism ... postmodern culture is a complex set of societal variables that reflect a recent shift in the way people in Western society think, and this paradigm change is having dramatic effects on the life of the church as an organization” (Cladis 1999:xi).

Postmodernism is characterized by a distrust in all institutions, including the Church (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:28). Cladis quotes Walter Truett Anderson as saying that Postmodernism “is a major transition in human history, a time of

rebuilding all the foundations of civilization, and the world is going to be occupied with it for a long time to come” (1999:19). Postmodernism represents “seismic shifts that will bring about changes that are “deep-rooted, comprehensive, complex, unpredictable and global” (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:24).

The effect of postmodernism on the Church is that the Church has been increasingly marginalized to the fringes of society’s cultural center (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:31). The trend of the marginalization of the Church started with modernism’s emphasis on the secularization of life into public and private spheres (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:25, 27). Moynagh comments on this marginalization as follows:

“It is not hard to imagine church in the West sprawled like a beached whale, eventually dying because it has been cut off from society” (2003:66).

1.2.1.3. The Effect of These Changes: The Redundancy of Stereotypical Leadership Paradigms

Prior to the advent of postmodernism the Church was afforded a privileged place in society and Christian leaders held positions of respect and influence (Roxburgh and Romanuk 2006:8; Gibbs and Coffey 2001:96). Efforts to evangelize society were attractive since society embraced a Judeo-Christian worldview. Churches focused on maintenance, with corresponding models of Christian leadership which focused on the tasks of the spiritual growth of believers and the management and administration of congregations.

Stereotypical leadership paradigms emerged during this period, which Alan Hirsch characterizes as the “Christendom period” in Western societies (2008: no page numbers). Although several versions of stereotypical leadership paradigms exist, they all caused leaders to see their roles within the body of Christ as the primary purveyors of ministry (Virgo 2003:111). These paradigms created a dependency mentality in which the “laity” came to depend upon the

“clergy” to minister to them or to minister on their behalf (Foss 2000:31). Stereotypical paradigms are explored in greater depth in this thesis, but the following three paradigms are illustrative of these paradigms:

- Therapeutic leadership models - these models of leadership see Christian leaders as shepherd/pastors and counselors responsible for the nurture, care and spiritual growth of believers (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:31, 73).
- Functional leadership models – these models view leaders as administrators, visionaries and executives (Cunnah 2003:22). They are styled on secular leadership paradigms in which leaders provide leadership and ensure the effective management of their organizations. Christian leadership models fashioned on these secular models approach their roles in churches and Christian ministries in a similar manner to their counterparts in secular organizations.
- Sacramental leadership models – these models are held to mainly by Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches (Cunnah 2003:21-22). They interpret leadership roles in terms of priestly and ministerial functions directed at the body of Christ, and to a limited extent, to society (Cunnah 2003:22).

The effect of stereotypical leadership paradigms is that they restrict the ministry of leaders to the welfare and spiritual growth of Christians and the efficient management of the Church as an organization. Churches and Christian organizations tend to be structured hierarchically with centralized authority vested in leadership. Ministry initiatives that do not originate with leaders are stifled (Snodgrass 1996:223). The cumulative effect of this is not only that believers are “disenfranchised” from playing a significant role in ministry *within* the church, but their ministry outside in the secular world is also restricted (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:89). This preoccupation with internal health results in the missional responsibilities of leaders and the Church to the world being ignored (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:89).

While these leadership paradigms have worked during times when both the Church and Christian leaders enjoyed a privileged status, the degree to which society, particularly in the West, has shifted from its Christian moorings will inevitably render them redundant. In post-Christian societies, Christian leaders trained in pastoral care and organizational management will have to acquire the skills to minister in a “post-Christian, neopagan, pluralistic context” as cross-cultural missionaries (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:41). “Unfortunately most pastors and church leaders have had no missionary training” and may not make the transition to a new leadership paradigm (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:41).

The hierarchical structures and centralized command-and-control procedures used by established denominations may also render them ineffective in a postmodern society which has an aversion to any semblance of bureaucratic control (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:72). Leaders in hierarchical structures see their role as delegating and granting permission using predetermined organizational policies (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:72). Postmodern society favours “flattened”, horizontal, network-based structures in which all role-players are empowered to serve alongside each other as partners in ministry. In hierarchical structures leadership authority and power is static and entrenched by a leader’s position. In postmodern, networked societies leadership is dynamic and functional. Networks are relational partnerships and leadership power is acceded on the basis of the quality and depth of relationships leaders have developed. Power is disseminated to all who participate in ministry and leadership power may be granted temporarily for operational purposes (Gibbs and Coffey 2006:84). Leaders who are accustomed to functioning in paradigms in which control and power is centralized may find that societal changes force them to “unlearn” old skills while simultaneously adopting new ones. Leaders who are steeped in stereotypical paradigms may fail to make the transition to new paradigms.

1.2.2. The Implications of Ephesians 4:11-12 for Christian Leadership
And Ministry

The way in which Ephesians 4:11-12 is interpreted makes a significant impact upon one's theology of Christian leadership (Stott 1989:166; Wright 2007:294). The "Traditional" interpretation of the text applies the ministry described in the passage to the ministry of Christian leaders. It interprets the prepositional phrases in Ephesians 4:12 - "for the equipment of the saints ... for the work of ministry ... for building up the body of Christ" (RSV) - as co-ordinate phrases which describe three separate functions, all of which apply to the "officers" listed in Ephesians 4:11 (Davis 2000:168-169). The "works of service" mentioned in Eph. 4:12 (NIV) is that of the leaders being spoken of in verse 11.

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 (Watson 1989:250; Smitsdorff 2005:13). The "Traditional" interpretation has served to reinforce stereotypical *clerical* paradigms of leadership (Stott 1989:166). In this interpretation Christian leaders are "distinguished from "the (mass of the) saints" as "the (superior class of the) officers of the church" are (Stott 1989: 166).

The "Traditional" interpretation of Ephesians 4:11-12 has also limited the ministry envisioned in the text to being that of "preachers, pastors and teachers" (Schnackenburg 1991:183). This resulted in mainly pastors and teachers being trained as leaders for congregations (Hirsch 2008: no page numbers). Alan Hirsch describes this scenario:

"During Christendom, the centuries when Christianity dominated the culture, the church acquired a fundamentally non-missional posture. So, these two functions were eventually instituted as the leadership offices in the church, and the other three roles listed in Ephesians 4 (apostles,

prophets, and evangelists) faded away as largely unnecessary. The system of church leadership we inherited from Christendom heavily favors maintenance and pastoral care, thus neglecting the church's larger mission and ministry" (2008: no page numbers).

This preoccupation with internal affairs has rendered the Church and its leadership oblivious to the far-reaching changes taking place in society. The fixation on itself has also relegated the Church to the fringe of society, as an institution disconnected from mainstream society and one that has little contribution to make in addressing mainstream societal challenges (Moynagh 2003:71).

An alternative interpretation of Ephesians 4:11-12, the "Revisionist" interpretation has also been proposed (Davis 2000:169). The trend towards a revision of the "Traditional" interpretation has gained momentum since 1946 (Davis 2000:169). This interpretation assigns the leaders mentioned in Eph. 4:11 the responsibility of equipping believers for ministry so that *believers* would engage in "works of service" (NIV) or "the work of ministry" (ESV). It interprets the second prepositional phrase of Eph. 4:12 as being dependent on the first one and the third one as being dependent on the two that preceded it. The result is that the leaders mentioned in Eph. 4:11 are given a new mandate, and that is to equip the body of Christ for its ministry. The NIV translation brings this meaning to the fore:

- "It was he who gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers, ¹²to prepare God's people for works of service so that the body of Christ may be built up." (Ephesians 4:11-12, NIV)

Since the text does not specify where the service or ministry would take place, believers are assigned the responsibility of ministering within churches and in society at large (Davis 2000:167). This interpretation offers the Church an opportunity to respond effectively to major changes taking place in society. It envisages *all* believers, leaders and "non-leaders" alike, working alongside

each other both inside the Church and in the world. Gibbs and Coffey maintain that church leaders often fail to recognize that “the world” is the primary area of calling and ministry of the laity (2001:89).

The revised interpretation of Ephesians 4:11-12 affords an opportunity to correct the clerical bias associated with the “Traditional” interpretation of the text. The ramifications of the “Revisionist” interpretation for Christian leadership paradigms are extensive. It necessitates a re-evaluation of what a Christian leader’s purpose, identity and function is within the body of Christ. It introduces a new central responsibility to Christian leadership paradigms – that of equipping others for ministry. The new central purpose attributed to leaders simultaneously implies that a correction to the relationship between leaders and others in the body of Christ be made. The clergy/laity divide reminiscent of the “Traditional” interpretation can be dispensed of and leaders and others can serve alongside each other as “partners”, “peers” and “creative equals” in ministry (Kouzes and Posner 2003:7; Gibbs and Bolger 2006:208; Drury 1993:30). Ministry can be viewed as “shared ministry” (Ogden 2003:168) with leaders and others serving alongside and supporting each other in their assigned ministries (Wright 2003:134).

1.2.3. Summary: The Need for a Paradigm Change

While there is no shortage of material devoted to the subject of leadership development, it is apparent that merely superficial modifications of Christian leadership paradigms are proving to be ineffective. Discontinuous changes are taking place in society which are transformational and irreversible. These discontinuous changes have already had a tremendous impact upon the Church and its place in society.

The fundamental changes required by the Church to renegotiate its place in society requires that corresponding *fundamental* changes be made to Christian leadership paradigms. For all the mutations of Christian leadership models which exist, the underlying problem of the inherent clericalism in these models has not been eradicated. These models of leadership have entrenched the status

of the Church in society as a defunct institution preoccupied with its own affairs. It is for reasons such as this that calls for “a different type of leadership” have been voiced (Hirsch 2008: no page numbers). Eddie Gibbs says:

“Yesterday’s styles of leadership will not be adequate for the opening decades of the twenty-first century. The future is too unpredictable...”
(2005:29)

Reggie McNeal draws attention to the importance and urgency of resolving the leadership dilemma precipitated by global changes:

“Hardly anyone would deny that we are in a pivotal moment in church history. The directions that church leaders take in the next few years will shape not only the practice of Christian ministry, but the character of the church’s mission expression, into the beginning of the third millennium”
(1995:12).

This thesis proposes that Ephesians 4:11-12 be used to construct a new leadership paradigm, with an equipping function as its organizing center. Snodgrass says that, “This passage offers a blueprint for redesigning the work of the church and its leaders” (Snodgrass 1996:223). The proposal is not for adjustments to be made to existing leadership paradigms. The contention of the thesis is that it is the leadership paradigms themselves which have exacerbated the deterioration of conditions within the Church and Christian ministry. Naiveté may dictate a measure of utopian optimism that the Church’s leadership paradigms can be rescued and reinvented to position the Church for effective ministry in the future. However signposts within and without the Church advise otherwise. Realism urges that the Church takes an honest introspection and assembles the courage required to reposition itself for effective ministry. The matter of its elected leadership paradigms is pivotal to the success thereof.

1.3. Hypothesis and Methodology

As mentioned above, this thesis proposes that the text of Ephesians 4:11-12 be used as a basis to construct a new “Equipping” paradigm of Christian leadership. This Equipping paradigm is one in which leaders see their primary responsibility as being to equip other believers in the body of Christ for ministry. It will be demonstrated that, far from being a subsidiary function of Christian leaders, the equipping of the body of Christ for the work of ministry is a central role that Christian leaders in every sphere of society should be actively engaged in. William Yount maintains that although pastors may engage in several ministry tasks, the pastor’s most fundamental calling is to “equip the saints for works of service” (1996:15). Blomberg also says, Christian leaders’ responsibilities should “center on mobilizing the laity for ‘every member ministry’ ” (1996:349).

Several commentators agree that Ephesians 4:11-12 is a key text that brings a unique understanding to the ministry of both Christian leaders and the rest of the body of Christ. For example, Markus Barth wrote that “Eph. 4:11-13 is a *locus classicus* pointing out the coherence of the church’s origin, order, and destiny” (Barth 1981:478). John Stott says that the expression about equipping God’s people in Ephesians 4:12 has “far-reaching significance for any true understanding of Christian ministry ... Here is incontrovertible evidence that the New Testament envisages ministry not as the prerogative of a clerical elite but as the privileged calling of all the people of God” (1989:167). The text uniquely highlights the equipping purposes of Christian leaders (Davis 2000:167) and raises important issues about “structuring the Church in the modern world” (Snodgrass 1996:213).

Because of the unique insights that Ephesians 4:11-12 offers for leadership and ministry, this thesis will start with an exegesis of the text (Chapter 2). The exegesis will examine critical issues surrounding the interpretation of the text and will also highlight the implications of these interpretations for an Equipping paradigm of Christian leadership. One implication that will be demonstrated throughout the thesis is that an Equipping paradigm necessitates

that the “enormous and comprehensive aberration” of the notion of the clergy/laity divide be done away with (Hoke 1992: no page number).

After the exegesis of Ephesians 4:11-12, existing stereotypical leadership models will be explored. Leadership models will be catalogued and placed into broader categories. The purpose of this will be to explain into which general categories popular leadership models fit. This will also reveal which of the general categories an Equipping approach to leadership fits into. In addition, this exploration will reveal which approaches to leadership are incompatible with an Equipping paradigm of leadership. It is for this reason that an Equipping function cannot be appendaged to existing leadership models. This thesis does not propose that an Equipping function be added as a corrective measure to leadership models. Instead the proposal is that an Equipping paradigm form the organizing center of Christian leadership. Existing models of leadership that are compatible with an Equipping model can then be incorporated into an Equipping paradigm as expressions of the central equipping purpose. An Equipping paradigm of leadership does not seek to displace existing models of leadership. Instead, it reinterprets existing leadership models primarily as leadership *functions, roles* or *responsibilities*. While leaders may continue to fulfill certain stereotypical leadership functions, these functions must be reinterpreted in the light of an Equipping paradigm. The primary responsibility of Christian leaders must be preserved, and that is to equip believers for the ministries to which they have been called.

After the synopsis of existing leadership models is completed, a general critique of leadership models is offered in the same chapter. Special attention is given to the “pastoral” or “shepherding” model of leadership. The reason for this is that this model of leadership is arguably the predominant paradigm for Christian leaders. It is also a model which, when compared to an Equipping paradigm has been shown to be an “inhibiting” model of leadership, whereas an Equipping paradigm is viewed as being an “empowering” approach to leadership (Ogden 2003:171, 175). This critique is complemented by an examination of certain paradigm shifts taking place in society and ministry which reveal that a review of existing approaches to leadership is necessary.

The thesis then proceeds to develop an Equipping paradigm in depth. In preparation for this, the concept of “Relational leadership” is introduced and an overview of the proposed Equipping paradigm is given. The Equipping paradigm is composed of four “Relational Equipping Identities”. When taken together, these Relational Equipping Identities form a holistic Equipping leadership paradigm. The four identities are the “Out-Front”-, “Towards”-, “Over”-, and “Alongside”- Relational Equipping Identities of leaders. The Identities describe various Equipping leadership functions and the attitudinal postures which undergird the functions. A comprehensive explanation of each of the four Equipping Identities is then offered. The development of these four Equipping Identities will occupy the major part of this thesis.

After developing the four Relational Equipping Leadership Identities, certain Principles which undergird an Equipping approach to leadership are discussed. These principles are implied throughout the thesis, but are articulated in a single chapter, so that they can be used as benchmarks against which to assess ideas that could be used to implement an Equipping approach to leadership. The thesis concludes with, among other things, a brief discussion of Ephesians 4:11-12’s bearing on the theology of Christian leadership and on Ecclesiology. The issues of the Curricula used to train others for ministry and the phenomenon of Corporate Culture are also mentioned as issues which could be explored further in the light of the thesis’ proposals.