

ASBURY SEMINARY
1093052674



Abstract
Harmonizing Role Expectations
of the Church Board
and Pastor

by
Stephen Evans Gladding

Most groups experience problems arising from expectational differences. That includes the church board and pastor at South Bend First Church of the Nazarene. When the pastor recognized a problem, he attempted resolution by writing a team manual. The Manual purposed to clarify roles and strengthen accountability.

This dissertation is a case study which evaluates the problem experience at SBF from the perspective of the leadership team, the church board and pastor. It finds two issues affecting the problem: the nature of leadership in the church and shared responsibility among leaders. The paper compares a review of literature on these issues with the Manual to measure its effectiveness. Books written by Larry Richardson and James Means serve as primary sources for the research.

The research concludes that the church is both organization and organism. As such, leadership in this church can model the Good Shepherd and be incarnational. Role expectations form out of this type of behavior. Research supports the concept of a manual that fosters collegial ministry and accountability. Evaluation of the

Manual written by the team at SBF shows it ineffective at teaching the nature of leadership roles in the church, but more effective at equipping leadership for roles of shared responsibility. A key insight in the entire problem experience was the value of situations which evoke leaders to find resolution.

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled
HARMONIZING ROLE EXPECTATIONS
OF THE CHURCH BOARD
AND PASTOR

presented by

Stephen Evans Gladding

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the
DOCTOR OF MINISTRY degree of
Asbury Theological Seminary
Wilmore, Kentucky

5-20-93

Date

Donald C. Boyd
Mentor

5-20-93

Date

James L. Lanning
Internal Reader

5-20-93

Date

Leslie A. Andrews
Director of D.Min. Dept.

HARMONIZING ROLE EXPECTATIONS
OF THE CHURCH BOARD
AND PASTOR

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
Asbury Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Ministry

by
Stephen Evans Gladding

May 1993

©1993

Stephen Evans Gladding

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapter	
1. Overview	1
Introduction	1
Context	3
Problem	11
2. Analysis	28
The Cause of Conflict	28
The Response of Participants	31
The Concepts Used in the Problem Resolution	39
The Dominant Issues Arising from the Problem	45
3. Literature	48
Clarification of Terms	48
The Leadership Nature of the Church	52
Shared Responsibility in the Church	74
Chapter Summary	90
4. Evaluations	93
Principle One	93
Principle Two	94
Principle Three	101
Chapter Summary	107
5. Implications	109

Appendices

A. Manual	121
B. Tables	181
C. Time Line	189
Works Cited	191

Acknowledgements

Fortitude and endurance are not my innate qualities. It is the existence of these attributes in my friends that has enabled completion of this project. To these I extend my fullest measure of gratitude.

Thanks to Donald Boyd, my faculty advisor, and Donald Demaray, my faculty reader. They kept seeing beyond the blur of ink on paper and asked for the extra effort. Thanks to Dr. Alvin Hohl, my field advisor, and Dr. John Wright, my parishioner. Both of these shepherds shared with me their precious time and valued insights. Thanks to Laura Fries, the church office secretary, who offered much clerical help in the compilation of materials. Thanks to the flock of missionaries at South Bend First who gave me opportunity to study. I appreciate most of all their gracious support through five arduous years.

I thank my best friend and wife, Patricia Gladding, for putting our common dreams on hold so that I might complete this personal learning experience. Her confidence and love gave me courage.

An indebtedness such as I owe can never be reimbursed. These, my friends, must go a step farther and forgive what is due them. For their gracious gifts of love I am deeply grateful.

Stephen Evans Gladding

CHAPTER 1

Overview

This research examines the conflict of expectations between church board leadership and pastoral leadership. Two primary aspects of this conflict are the leadership nature of the church and shared responsibility within that leadership. The research into this conflict uses the case study method.

Introduction

In 1988 the pastor at South Bend First Church of the Nazarene became aware of some philosophical conflict in expectations between himself and the church board members. They differed in their perception of ministry and the role each of them played. The pastor's reaction to this conflict was to develop a manual for team ministry.

This manual project was important to the church. Conflict in expectations slows down spiritual and numerical growth. It very soon affects the personal and congregant life of a church community.

The scope of this paper includes a review of the initial pastor-board incident in 1988. It also considers several other experiences which reveal the conflict of expectations. Further elements of the problem appear in (1) a brief historical review of the congregation, (2) the pastor's own personal perspectives, (3) contributing sociological factors, and (4) a description of the board team serving

at that time. The research contains an in-depth analysis of the problem; it contains a review of literature which impacts the problem. The paper concludes with an evaluation of the entire experience and suggestions for the future.

Several factors limit this research. First, the problem and accompanying analysis relates only to the church board and not to the congregation. Second, time played a role in limiting the participation of the church board. At the monthly meeting the board spent ten to fifteen minutes critiquing the material produced by the Congregational Reflection Group. A third limitation of the Manual was the aim to make it a workbook, not a textbook. As such it did not include much explanatory or background material. The Manual contained only instructional information. Several preconceptions on the part of the pastor also limited the objectivity of the project. These were a strong bias for the team concept and the good shepherd model of John 10. One final limiting factor was the decision to deal only with experiences occurring in the church setting. Multitudes of experiences outside the church also change how we respond to leadership in the church.

Within the pages of this paper appear some terms that might be confusing if not clarified. For example, the word *manual* appears frequently. MANUAL in capital letters identifies a book explaining history, constitution, and government for the Church of the Nazarene. On the other hand,

Manual in lower case letters represents the project at South Bend First Church of the Nazarene. The initials SBF used throughout the body of the paper refer to South Bend First. Another set of initials, CRG, indicates the Congregational Reflection Group mentioned earlier. In addition, the phrase "church board team" refers to the twelve elected members, three departmental leaders, paid staff, church secretary, church treasurer, and the pastor.

Finally, all Scripture quotations in the paper come from the New King James version, unless otherwise noted.

Context

Expectational problems receive impact from many different sources. Some of the factors that played upon the problem at SBF were the background of the congregation, the personal perspective of the pastor, the sociological considerations influencing life at SBF, and the general makeup of the administrative board.

The Background of the Congregation

The organization of South Bend First Nazarene Church came in 1919. The Nazarene denomination was eleven years old. By then the general church aggressively promoted the start of new units. Born in the obscurity and insecurity of a tent meeting, the baby South Bend congregation struggled for survival. In the first thirty years the congregation moved six times under the leadership of eight ministers.

In 1947 Rev. K.V. Bateman accepted a call to work at

South Bend First as pastor. Bateman provided strong classical leadership. Aided by two or three faithful laypersons, he personally constructed a new building to house the developing congregation. Over the next thirty years considerable growth resulted in a membership of about 200.

In 1978, Rev. Bateman retired. Retirement opened the door to change of program and personnel. The church chose to drop its bus ministry. Bussing loads of children from unchurched families caused constant complications. As expected, attendance plummeted. Morale dropped because of Bateman's retirement and the program adjustment.

In September of 1983, I accepted the call of the church. I became the fourth pastor in five years. My own non-directive style of leadership contrasted radically with the authoritarian style experienced with previous leaders. The contrast grossly confused the expectations of the board and congregation. They began asking questions. Upon whose shoulders did the responsibility of leadership lay? What leadership style was best?

Experience in the Church of the Nazarene teaches congregations to expect authority to come from the pastor. Traditionally, Nazarenes believe God, the denomination, and the local church call the pastor. The MANUAL of the Nazarene Church suggests that leadership qualifications grow out of the call and ordination of the Church.

An elder is a minister whose call of God to preach, gifts, and usefulness have been demon-

strated and enhanced by proper training and experience, and who has been separated to the service of Christ through His church by the vote of a district assembly and by the solemn act of ordination, and thus has been fully invested to perform all functions of the Christian ministry.
(MANUAL 179)

The MANUAL bestows leadership of all groups upon the pastor.

Over seven years effective ministry happened simply because of servant hearts and divine supervision. The Church set goals and moved toward their achievement in spite of conflicting role expectations and unclear organizational structures. It realized God's blessing and direction. Adult attendance grew and plans for relocation developed. The pastor felt well received by the kind congregation, although he brought to them a different leadership style.

In February of 1990 the congregation moved from downtown South Bend, and a largely medical neighborhood, to a suburban, residential location. They left a traditional 50's building with long stairs and multiple floors, an oblong sanctuary, a small fellowship and education area, and parking for forty cars. They moved to a ground level facility with many classrooms, a circular sanctuary, a family life gymnasium, and parking for 165 cars.

The Personal Perspective of the Pastor

After graduation from Olivet College in 1964, the pastor worked with service personnel in Frankfort, Germany, for thirteen months. He travelled back to the States in August of 1965 and enrolled in the Nazarene Seminary in

Kansas City, Missouri. Between the first and second year, his lifestyle changed as he married a schoolmate. Seminary graduation came in 1968 and they moved to Virden, Illinois, to their first church. During this pastorate, the pastor received his ordination. He remembers thinking of ordination as the laurel wreath awarded at the conclusion of a long race to ministry and God's will for his life. In ordination he saw the church affirm his spirit and training for pastoral ministry.

Two years later they moved to Easton, Pennsylvania, to pastor the Nazarene Church of that city. After four years, they journeyed back to their home state of Indiana to pastor in the farming community of Winamac. In 1983 they moved seventy miles north to South Bend.

For many years the pastor thought God would grow a church through him if he just loved the people. During these years of ministry some people found new life and grew in the grace of God. However, impressive numerical growth never happened. He attributed this lack of numerical growth to poor leadership skills.

He strongly believed that Christian ministry in an individualistic, pluralistic culture required specialized organizational skills. Hoping to learn new skills, he enrolled in seminary to work toward a doctor of ministry degree in church administration.

The Sociological Considerations at SBF

The late 50's, with a strong community orientation, rolled into the 60's with major attention given to the individual. Therapy sessions and search for the true self became common. Individualism swept across the nation, largely resulting in utilitarian attitudes and "a sense of fragmentariness" (Bellah et al. 277). The Moral Majority marched across the church platform in the 70's and advocated the strength of the Christian Right. A 1978 Gallup poll found 80 percent of Americans agreed that an individual should arrive at his or her own religious beliefs independent of any churches or synagogues (Hoge 167). In the 80's the privatistic teachings of the New Age Movement and the Baby Boomer generation crept across the land.

On June 28, 1990 the *South Bend Tribune* carried an article from the *New York Times* News Service. In it Michael Oreskes cited the indifference of young people, aged 18 to 29, to public affairs: "Young people themselves mention the weakness of their civics education, and they talk incessantly of stress - their preoccupation with getting jobs or grades and their concern about personal threats like AIDS and drugs" (Oreskes 1).

American television is a leading conditioner of society, including the Church. Television lays emphasis upon individual feelings as opposed to cognitive thinking. "Soaps" teach reliance upon the inner authority of self

rather than the external Lordship of Christ. Todd Gitlin describes television's subtle influence upon American culture:

[T]elevision's world is relentlessly upbeat, clean and materialistic. Even more sweepingly, with few exceptions prime time gives us people preoccupied with personal ambition. If not utterly consumed by ambition and the fear of ending up as losers, these characters take both the ambition and the fear for granted. If not surrounded by middle-class arrays of consumer goods, they themselves are glamorous incarnations of desire. The happiness they long for is private, not public; they make few demands on society as a whole, and even when troubled they seem content with the existing institutional order. Personal ambition and consumerism are the driving forces of their lives. The sumptuous and brightly lit settings of most series amount to advertisements for a consumption-centered version of the good life, and this doesn't even take into consideration the incessant commercials, which convey the idea that human aspirations for liberty, pleasure, accomplishment and status can be fulfilled in the realm of consumption. The relentless background hum of prime time is the packaged good life. (268-269)

A related condition in American society is what Martin Marty calls "bewildering pluralism" (18). Pluralism offers a multiplicity of beliefs and practices from which to choose. Pluralism leads individuals to choose religious beliefs and practices on the basis of personal interest and desire. Family tradition and the authority of the Church no longer affect choices as they once did. Because of these circumstances, John Naismith calls America the "multiple-option society" (239). A noted characteristic of the "baby boomer" generation, those born from 1946 to 1964, is their attendance at multiple churches.

Today the South Bend First congregation typifies this American potpourri. The responsibility list totals about 400 names. To get half of this number at one service is difficult. Probably thirty percent of the adults at South Bend First Nazarene fall into the 18-29 age bracket identified by Michael Oreskes (1).

Most of the women work outside the home. Many of the men and women labor in service-oriented jobs. Two vocational roles appear more commonly: school teachers and insurance salespersons.

From a sociological perspective, the University of Notre Dame strongly influences the lifestyles and attitudes of South Bend Nazarenes. South Bend has been the home of Notre Dame University since 1842. As the largest employer in the county, Notre Dame conditions the lives of many Nazarene families. At present, one board member is a Notre Dame graduate while the church treasurer is a Notre Dame employee. Others in the congregation fill teaching and laboring positions at Notre Dame.

The Makeup of the Administrative Board

At South Bend First, the church board consists of twelve elected members, three departmental officers, and the pastor. Employed ministry staff members also attend board meetings.

Before 1988, the church elected board members to serve one year. Many sat on the board consecutive terms. In 1988

a new policy called for the election of six board members to serve two year terms and six members to serve one year terms. In subsequent years the membership elected only six church board members annually. This two years on and one year off rule provided some fresh, but untrained, leadership at the administrative board level.

During the year of this thesis project, the board consisted of ten men and six women. The pastor's evaluation of the board reveals the following characteristics:

8 - under forty	8 - over forty years
5 - progressive (accept change)	11 - conservative (resist change)
7 - aggressive (speak out)	9 - passive (listen)
9 - grew up Nazarene	7 - other denominations Wesleyan (3) unchurched (2) independent (1) U.C.C. (1).

Three of the members had been in South Bend First all their lives. One of these, the son of Rev. K.V. Bateman, held the minister of music position for many years.

In review, the problem under consideration occurred in the context of these influences: program adjustment, new leadership, different management styles, changing cultural and sociological influences, Catholic setting, board term

changes, and new board level personalities.

Problem

The problem itself came into focus through several precipitating events, two magazine articles, and the process of developing the Manual.

Precipitating Events

The pastor first recognized a personal ministry crisis in April, 1988 during the monthly church board meeting. At that time he asked members of the board to rank six functions of pastoral ministry: preaching, visitation, counseling, administration, devotional life, zone and district leadership. At his request, they next rated these same categories as seen in him. Finally, he compared the two lists to his own prioritization (See page 12). The divergence of these lists stimulated painful realizations. Neither the board's prioritization nor their perception of the pastor's ministry priorities correlated with his appraisal. What was the reason for the disparity? It appeared that for effective ministry to develop at this leadership level, expectations had to unify.

Another occurrence in June of 1989 called attention to the problem. The General Assembly of the Church of the Nazarene did away with the pastoral recall vote. Laying aside any judgment of this policy, to drop it completely meant doing away with a primary accountability tool. The Nazarene church had used the recall vote for decades. A

RANKING OF MINISTRY FUNCTIONS		
I PRIORITIES OF THE CHURCH BOARD	II PRIORITIES OF THE PASTOR AS PERCEIVED BY THE CHURCH BOARD	III PRIORITIES OF THE PASTOR
Preaching Visitation Counseling Administration Devotional life Zone/district leadership	Devotional life Preaching Visitation Zone/district leadership Counseling Administration	Preaching Administration Visitation Devotional life Zone/district leadership Counseling

pastor knew that many votes against him at the annual meeting meant one thing for certain...something wasn't right. That annual vote was the yardstick by which Nazarene pastors measured effective ministry.

In April 1990 a third experience nurtured the pastor's searching and questioning. At a pastor and wife retreat sponsored by the Northwest Indiana District Church of the Nazarene, Rev. Gladding conducted an informal survey. He

asked fellow pastors to state "the greatest leadership need in the Nazarene Church today." The first and most often mentioned need was accountability. Others were vision, training, long-range planning, and motivation. The expressed concern dealt not only with the pastor's accountability to the church, but the church's accountability to him. Again, the importance of expectations became apparent.

More recently (May, 1990), the problem of uncommon expectations appeared again in a Sunday School class of middle age adults. The discussion moved to functions performed by the pastor and the people. First, the class identified these functions for the pastor:

1. lead the flock,
2. hold the Church together,
3. remind us to live the Word,
4. serve as chief administrator,
5. counsel the people,
6. be an example,
7. work as an employee of the Church.

Then, they proceeded to list these functions for the people:

1. spread the Word,
2. practice evangelism.

Immediately, these expectations disturbed the pastor. They portrayed him as chief executive officer (CEO), with most of the responsibility and accountability falling upon

his shoulders. He struggled with the expectations which called the pastor to remind the people, be their example, be their employee. He also found the expectations of the people too general and too few. The class response left him with the impression that the people held the pastor alone accountable. In his thinking, the pastor and people shared the responsibility for ministry through the church. His reaction embarrassed him. He sensed the feeling of an unshared ministry and failure. Disagreement about expectations and objectives suggested ultimate failure in doing the work of the kingdom.

One other occurrence brought awareness of a problem. In 1989-90 SBF planned a relocation from Colfax Avenue, near downtown South Bend, to Ironwood Drive, at the northern city limits. During negotiations to sell the Colfax building, the board-appointed negotiations committee asked the pastor to represent them at the negotiations table. The pastor held preconceived expectations for that assignment. Unknown to him, not all committee members shared those expectations. When he did not perform as anticipated, the difference of expectations resulted in open conflict. He did not intend to do it his way and lead by office, what one critic calls "the halo error" (Bass 449). He sincerely wanted to work in unison with the committee, not in a power play over them. The church exists "for service, not for subordination" (Fishburn 193). Godly leader teams sharing ministry togeth-

er avoid any suggestion of preeminence. The team simply did not work from the same expectations.

Contributing Articles

At this time two articles helped to focus on the crisis of differing expectations. The first was a Leadership interview with Peter Drucker for an article released in the Spring Quarter, 1989. In it Drucker states "the successful leaders are those who know their job is to build an effective team that will outlast them" (Drucker 18). Three phrases from this sentence inspire consideration: "successful leaders," "know their job," and "effective team." One measure of success in ministry depends on the numerical and spiritual growth of the congregation. Judging by the measure of numerical growth, the pastor did not feel very successful. He questioned his abilities to lead.

The second influencing article came from LeBron Fairbanks, president of Mount Vernon Nazarene College, entitled, "Servant Leadership for a Servant Community." In this paper Fairbanks wrote that a shared ministry represents the ideal of pastor and people. He pictured leadership as "serving and supporting each other using Holy Spirit given gifts to stimulate personal and corporate growth and reconciliation in both the church and the world" (Fairbanks 39). Fairbanks' thesis develops from what he identifies as a "fundamental question" before the Christian leader: "How can we live together as Christians so that our relationships are

redemptive and a witness to unbelievers of the reconciling word of God in Christ?" This concept of shared ministry intrigued the pastor. He believed everyone in the church carried responsibility for outreach, but felt the pastor held the leadership obligations. Shared ministry picks up on the idea that others in the church might participate in leadership responsibility and accountability.

Manual Development

In a class on dissertation writing (January, 1990), the pastor consulted with Professor David Bundy at Asbury Theological Seminary. With his guidance the pastor decided to develop and evaluate a manual for effective team ministry between pastor and church board at South Bend First Church of the Nazarene.

The first step involved selection of a field supervisor, someone who would serve as a resource and guide for this project. Dr. Al Hohl accepted this task. Dr. Hohl served a United Church of Christ congregation as senior pastor. Like South Bend First, that congregation numbered about 400. Dr. Hohl had completed a Doctor of Ministry degree two years before the pastor's enrollment at Asbury. The men agreed to meet monthly through the completion of the project and dissertation drafting.

Next, the pastor selected five members of the congregation to help determine some controlling principles for the Manual. The character of this group proved valuable to the

entire project. They used the title of Congregational Reflection Group. Included in the group were a former pastor who served this congregation for thirty years, an engineer skilled in quality control, an insurance salesman and representative of the church board team, an elementary school teacher who brought clarity and candor to the project, and a secondary school teacher trained in analytical thinking. The pastor desired for these persons to complement his own strengths and weaknesses. He perceived himself as traditional, visionary, goal-oriented, passive, not given to detailed work.

From January until July, 1990, he read everything he could find which shed light on the problem. Bennis, Bellah, Means, Richards, Hendrix, and Shawchuck were some of the writers read. Much of the material for the Manual surfaced during this intensive period of inquiry. Some of the insights gained in this study were:

- the need for a superlative model for ministry;
- the need for clear, precise, written expectations;
- the need for a permanent record or manual;
- the need for accountability to the model and the expectations.

As the pastor shared insights with the committee, they reacted with their input. The engineer contributed most. The committee served primarily to support or edit what the pastor identified.

The Congregational Reflection Group set up five primary guidelines for the Manual:

- the subject, team ministry;
- the objective, a workbook, not a textbook;
- the goal, collective growth;
- the design, simplicity and clarity;
- the use, an organizational leadership tool.

In his presentation of material to the CRG, the pastor intentionally patterned three perspectives: theological, administrative, and practical. On several occasions the pastor stated, "What we believe, we are." He felt the theology of the leadership team shaped the expectations. An administrative perspective called for structure to support this theology and guide the operation of the team. The pastor wanted them to incorporate their shared expectations into this structure.

From the beginning of the project the pastor held some preconceived ideas. Most of these ideas came out of his study and preparation, although at least one of them, the Manual, typified an approach to problem solving which he learned during seminary days. He believed that written materials offer better guidance and provide a common base of operation.

Several months of reading resulted in the discovery of four concepts helpful in reducing expectational conflict. The first concept stated the need for a common paradigm by

which to pattern expectations. Based on this paradigm, concept two called for the outlining of expectations from both parties. Concept three dealt with a permanent written record to allow continual reference. The final concept notes the need for tools that provide accountability to these expectations.

The key in this set of concepts is the paradigm. Paradigms cause people to think in specific concepts and patterns. For example, the word "cowboy" evokes certain impressions. Associated with the word "cowboy" is the idea of someone who rides a horse, controls cattle, and wears boots. The primary paradigm employed in the Manual is that of shepherd. The shepherd paradigm invokes relational ideas of selfless caring, leadership, commitment, personal sacrifice.

The field advisor and two church board members challenged the use of the shepherd paradigm. The field advisor wanted to let the team choose while the board members thought it was overworked in the Manual. In spite of their input, the pastor stubbornly stayed with the shepherd paradigm.

The committee worked for the next eight months. Immediately following each CRG meeting, the committee presented the results of their work to the church board team. The team then followed through with the worksheet and further suggestions. Here is the calendar which they followed:

- March, 1990 - explained project proposal and defined "team ministry;"
- April - worked on identifying Manual contents and creation of a time line for its development;
- May - worked on the Manual format with two objectives: provide easy accessibility (loose leaf notebook) and reason for frequent reference (worksheets);
- June - selected the format of explanation, sample, worksheet for each section; began critique of models, philosophy of ministry, statement of mission, and helps;
- July - critiqued evaluation and expectation sheets;
- August - continued expectations review; began consideration of planning section;
- September - worked on planning section and completed a Manual evaluation form;
- October - shared a final survey of material including the covenant section.

At a 1990 Fall church board planning seminar, the administrative pastor of Fairview Village Church of the Nazarene led the South Bend First Nazarene board team in creating a mission statement. Because of his training and ex-

perience in business administration, this layman patiently guided the input and responses for two days. When the mission statement came together, a vocal exclamation of praise issued from one of the team members. Others affirmed his opinion by a consensus of praise. That became both an emotional and intellectual achievement of large proportions for the entire church family. From that time the church board has made earnest effort to weigh every action and program in the light of that statement.

Manual Format. Initially, the Manual project tried to answer the basic question, "What is team ministry?" All the material in the workbook hinged on the response to this question. For the purpose of the Manual, team ministry indicates the following actions.

1. Team ministry comprises pastor and church board joining minds, hearts and hands to operate as a team to nurture growth in God's kingdom through the church.
2. Team ministry accepts as the primary task the development of congregational identity. All must know who we are, where we are going, and why we do what we do.
3. Team ministry manifests itself by way of leaders who see the church as a living organism, the Bride of the Lamb, the object of their leadership in the Spirit of God.

4. Team ministry happens when leaders pray, dream, explore, discern, plan, implement, and evaluate for spiritual and numerical growth within the body of the flock.
5. Team ministry recognizes the gifts of pastor and board as divinely anointed. Effective ministry requires all of them to function together for the glory of Christ who is the head of the church.
6. Team ministry requires each member to learn leadership skills, be informed and inform other leaders, develop his or her personal inner life, practice integrity, assume responsibility, and accept accountability.
7. Team ministry requires that leaders agree to make several basic commitments that serve them in their guidance of the church.

These statements presented by James E. Means became a part of the Manual:

1. Leaders are committed to the Scripture and the documents adopted by the congregation.
2. Leaders are committed to assist the church or group in decision making; they are enablers, not commanders. They do not usurp the responsibilities of the church or group in making major decisions that affect the entire body. Leaders work with and for the group in decision making; the group does not work for the leaders.
3. Leaders are committed to group process, to the encouragement of debate, and to the involvement of members as much as possible and as is feasible in decision making.

4. Leaders are committed to achieving consensus, not mere majority vote. Consensus is revealed in the degree of commitment to the decision after it has evolved through discussion and compromise.

5. Leaders are committed to discouraging premature voting, and they understand that some matters should never be voted upon by the church. Voting is a division of the body and often destroys group cohesiveness.

6. Leaders are committed to negotiate and accept compromise on sensitive issues for which there is no clear biblical mandate.

7. Leaders are committed to a careful evaluation of both objective facts and subjective feelings. Poor church leaders are unbalanced in favor of objectivity or subjectivity, facts or feelings. (Means 152)

From this point forward the Manual divided into four sections or divisions, each building naturally upon the preceding one. Section One sought to build team ministry by creating a collective philosophy of ministry and a mission or purpose statement. With these in tact, Section Two dealt with team planning and member roles within the plans. Much of this portion contained leadership functions of assessing strengths and weaknesses, setting goals and objectives, finding acceptable expectations, and writing job descriptions that fulfill these expectations. Section Three focused on leadership integrity and the development of tools by which team leaders hold themselves accountable. The final section simply supplied resources to empower the action of the team. In summary, the Manual offered a premise for team ministry, tools of team ministry, accountability to that

ministry, and helps for implementation.

Manual Contents. Section One, Biblical Premise for Team Ministry, contained three subsections: models, philosophy, mission. This section laid a base for additional planning. One anticipated value of Section One was that it would help in offsetting experience and training that hinders growth. Through application of the workbook, leaders retrain team participants, pastor and laity. Old attitudes and learned actions could strengthen or change to carry out the current mission of the congregation. Through prayer and Bible study, review of local church history, and consideration of contemporary community spiritual needs, leaders could write a mission statement that clarified their reason for existence.

Section Two, largest of the four, dealt with planning as a tool for ministry. It aimed at assessing strengths and weaknesses of the church board team by way of their God-given gifts and abilities. It identified objectives and goals upon which the team chose to focus. Another part of section two offered guidance in preparing roles and job descriptions for team members.

The most pivotal of all was Section Three which dealt with leadership and integrity. The position of the Manual was that no team ministry thrived without integrity. Integrity meant to be whole or complete; upright, honest, sincere. For a team to operate, each member had to know the

other members well. Dependable attitudes and actions had to characterize them. They needed to know who to count on at any moment. All had to perceive that the other member did his or her part in the total task.

Two examples of tools that built integrity were evaluations and covenants. The team needed to develop evaluations by which it could measure performance. These evaluations could be group or individual. Covenants strengthened evaluations by allowing team members opportunity to pledge faithfulness. Both evaluations and covenants required conscious awareness of expectations. As team members met the expectations of the team, objectives would be achieved.

The last of the four sections was the "Helps" material. These were single pages containing suggestions for improving aspects of team ministry such as writing the mission statement or conducting the team meeting. No special order governed this portion nor did it serve any direct connection with the preceding sections beyond providing ideas and tools for better implementation.

The committee's vision for the Manual saw it placed in the hands of each board member for help in routine administrative tasks. They saw its inclusion as an annual training tool for new members and an equipping tool for annual church planning.

Eventual Outcome

The church board placed a copy of the Manual in their handbook of policies and job descriptions. By this time, October, 1990, all board members had journeyed through the preparation of the Manual and were familiar with it. In June, 1991, six new members came on the board. They possessed no knowledge of the material. The pastor informed them of the Manual's inclusion in their handbook and urged them to read it.

Soon after completion of the Manual, the pastor came to three hard realizations. One, the Manual offered no easy answer for the problems of leadership. The Manual in hand did not mean immediate and automatic use. Since little training on the use of the Manual took place, its introduction brought only minor change. A second realization dealt with the board's perception of the Manual. The board saw it as the pastor's project for seminary, not a tool for the church. Kindly, they adopted it into their policy handbook to please someone they loved and respected. However, they only turned to it for reference when directed to do so. The third realization concerned omissions. Almost immediately upon completion of the Manual, the pastor recognized need for a section on spiritual gifts that would influence expectations and job assignments. This omission left the Manual incomplete. Later work with the Manual manifested the need for a section on vision to embody the mission statement.

Frequent conversations at the board meetings mentioned ideas, principles, or worksheets from the Manual. One commonly heard reference to the mission statement. Awareness of the Manual surfaced in discussions at board committee meetings. The expectations, job descriptions, evaluations within the Manual routinely entered into the work of the board. Conversations also suggested the additional need in the Manual for sections on vision and spiritual gifts.

Many questions surface out of a project such as this. Does the Manual really deal with the issues of the problem? Are the theories employed to resolve the problem on target? What accomplishments result from the Manual? What shortcomings? Are other issues introduced which require future research? The project analysis of Chapter Two further identifies the critical issues of this case study.

CHAPTER 2

Analysis

Expectational problems commonly occur between pastors and church boards in churches of all sizes and theological backgrounds. The previous chapter described the problem of divergent expectations as well as the Manual written to resolve the problem. Chapter Two seeks to analyze the problem from a leadership perspective.

Four questions direct the analysis. What caused the problem of unshared expectations? How did the participants in this administrative incident respond? What organizational impact did the four basic concepts of the Manual make? What leadership issues spring out of this interchange? The key issues identified by these questions will direct the study of literature in Chapter Three.

The Cause of Conflict

Conflict is a basic human condition caused by differences, or perceived differences, between people's expectations. As noted in Chapter One, the pastor's perception of his role differed measurably from the church board's perception of his role (12). A radical expectational difference also existed between the pastor and the Sunday School class (Chapter One 13). Conflict grew out of their contrasting opinions.

What caused these differences? Some of the factors at SBF were personnel, culture, philosophy, organization,

religion. Personnel changes introduced new focuses and programs that required considerable attitudinal adjustments (Chapter One 4). Growth in young adult population brought on philosophical shifts characteristic of society. Individualism and pluralism lessened the strength of the corporate body at SBF. Philosophical conflicts between the autocratic blue collar members and the market-oriented Baby Boomer members increased expectational differences (Chapter One 7-9).

After thirty years of strong, classical, authoritarian leadership, SBF called several men as pastors who practiced a more non-directive style. The resultant clash of leadership styles caused the congregation to struggle. Organizational conflict increased with the hiring of paid staff. The policy change from annual elections for board positions to an election for two years on and one year off introduced new and younger leadership (Chapter One 10). Other influences also affected expectations. The stalwart regimen and autocratic leadership of Notre Dame University made the conflict of leadership styles and structures more intense (Chapter One 9). The combination of these influences conditioned formidable expectations in the minds of the people at SBF.

Various paradigms also caused differences of opinion and philosophical clashes on the leadership team. Study of the problem at SBF revealed a chief executive officer para-

digm molding the thinking and actions of the board. This perception appears most clear in the account of the Sunday School class related in Chapter One (13). Many of the people at SBF work in factory settings where the CEO paradigm is familiar. The pastor serving them thirty years typified the CEO paradigm by his autocratic leadership. His position paralleled the General Church's emphasis on leadership in the church. When the congregation constructed their building on Colfax Avenue in the early 1940's, he served as job foreman overseeing everything done. In fact, he did most of the work himself.

On the other hand, the present pastor perceives himself as a shepherd. His paradigm for ministry developed from the "Good Shepherd" model of John 10. He sees himself as part of a flock, serving with other board members as undershepherds.

The Church's desire for an administrative pastor and the pastor's longing to share ministry brought conflict. While never overt, the conflict did exist in the perceptions of each party. Different paradigms evoked contrasting responses to the pastoral role at SBF.

Summary of Causes of Conflict

The conflicts identified in this section resulted largely from personnel and societal influences. Different educational, vocational, cultural, and religious backgrounds within the Church evoked contrasting perceptions for the

role of leadership.

Two key issues come out of this material.

1. How can leadership in the church harmonize divergent role perceptions?
2. What paradigm portrays best the nature of church leadership?

The Response of Participants

Expectational differences between clergy and lay leaders often elicit dissimilar responses to given situations. A careful study of participant responses to the problem may offer help in harmonizing expectations. The case study of SBF focuses on two primary responders, the pastor and the administrative board.

The Pastor

Pastors at SBF after 1978 faced tenure risk because of leadership role conflicts.¹ Four pastors served the congregation over a five year period (Chapter One 4). In 1986 the present pastor recognized the problem and reacted in three ways. Initially, he questioned why the expectations of the Church board for the pastor were so different from his own expectations. A sense of overall failure in leadership ministry stimulated him to start reading leadership

¹ Dr. Leslie Parrott, consultant to church boards, supports the idea that pastoral role conflicts endanger ministerial assignments. In April, 1991, at a Northwest Indiana Nazarene district seminar he remarked that generally two factors influence a move on the part of a pastor - running out of sermons and/or running into trouble with the board.

materials. Based on his studies of leadership philosophies and practices, he wrote a manual aimed at harmonizing the expectations of the Church board and himself.

Questionings. The questions of the pastor dealt with expectational differences. Why were his training and experience not enabling numerical growth? Why did some members of the Church board and the adult Sunday School class not share his expectations? Why did so much difference of opinion exist among the Church board leadership?

These questionings led the pastor to perceive that like the society in which it existed, some of the church leadership held to a marketing paradigm. Numerical increase indicated growth. General and district programming supported this idea. While Nazarene numbers in other world areas burgeoned, numerical growth in the USA declined. As a result Nazarene leadership at a general level programmed for increased numbers in attendance and membership.² The pressure of this thrust extended down through district leadership, often at the expense of leadership nurture and development.³

² The 1988 General Assembly set a goal to break the one million number in church membership during the next quinquennium. One tool for this achievement, the "Thrust to the Cities" emphasis, calls for the start-up of many new church units in metropolitan areas.

³ While new churches start in metropolitan areas, other churches die by poor pastoral shepherding. Based on the district minutes of Northwest Indiana District from 1988 to 1991, three new churches were started and four closed.

The pastor's questionings also helped him to understand how SBF struggled with sociological shifts. Forty percent of SBF fit within the Baby Boomer group marked by strong expectations for immediate achievements.

As a result of his questioning, the pastor recognized another critical condition. The changes taking place throughout society and the Church were resulting in a lessening of accountability. The privatistic, independent attitudes of society produce individualism and a reduction of responsibility to others (Chapter One 7). These dramatic attitude changes significantly interfere with the traditional emphasis in the Church on corporate care and love. His questionings helped the pastor to see that SBF patterned societal practice when it moved to the suburbs. SBF dropped ministry to the more impoverished inner city in order to focus on needs of the middle to upper level income families.

Other accountability problems came to light through the pastor's questionings. Structural changes within the Church of the Nazarene encouraged the lessening of accountability. In July, 1989, the General Assembly voted to drop the traditional pastoral recall vote (Chapter One 11). Instead of a recall vote every other year, the district superintendent now conducts a pastoral review with the Church board every four years. This procedural change aimed at lengthening the years of pastoral ministry in a single setting. Now, when the Church needs increased accountability, it lacks the

instrument for it. To relieve a foreboding sensation of failure resulting from his questionings, the pastor began reading leadership materials.

Readings. Believing that contemporary books and magazines provide a source of help for the problems of leadership, the pastor searched secular and Christian leadership materials. Initially, help came from articles written by Drucker and Fairbanks (Chapter One 15). Later, writings by Bennis, Bellah, Means, Richards, Hendrix, and Shawchuck provided foundational principles and tools (Chapter One 17).⁴

Pastor's reading from Bellah's research helped to shed light on sociological shifts in American society that altered the spectrum of church leadership. According to Bellah, one of these sociological shifts was the Baby Boomer generation, those born between 1946-1964. Baby Boomers typify the behavioral traits and values of personal ambition and consumerism. Under these conditions traditional mind-sets or paradigms faced strong attack. Most white, middle-class Americans born before 1945 and interviewed by the compilers of Habits of the Heart sought to transcend the limitations of a self-centered life (Bellah et al. 290).

These readings inspired the pastor to produce a tool, a

⁴ Some of these principles and tools deal with sociological influences, paradigms, the team concept, organic versus organizational leadership, aspects of classical administration.

Manual, to incorporate some of the concepts into the leadership training at SBF. He genuinely believed that expectations of the board team could harmonize around such a Manual.

Writings. The Manual's objective was the development of team ministry at SBF. The pastor wrote the Manual to explain the philosophy and purpose of the Church; to map an organizational procedure; and, to provide an instrument of accountability.

In review, the questionings of the pastor bring focus to aspects of the problem. Some of these are administrative tensions, sociological influences, and lessening accountability. The pastor's readings probe the need for organizational tools to instill concepts and define corporate actions. His writings seek to harmonize differences through the use of an accountability instrument.

The Administrative Board

The second participant responding to the problem of unshared expectations was the administrative board. Far too often the administrative board at SBF ignored developing problems by using the "leave-it-alone-and-it-will-go-away" approach. The continual change of church locations and pastors during early years is indicative of dealing with symptoms, but ignoring issues (Chapter One 3-4). At other times they associated problems with personnel, usually someone other than them (Chapter One 13). Instead of chang-

ing the working structure or providing training in the use of the existing program, they released or changed the assignments of elected leaders (Chapter One 10). Attitudes of ignoring the problem, changing the personnel, and pragmatism, "whatever works," typified the board's response to conflict.

Ignorance. The conflict of expectations, as perceived by the pastor, never became a conscious awareness in the thinking of the church board. They remained ignorant of the conflict. They extended their faith to the pastor by accepting his desire to enroll in a Doctor of Ministry program. When the pastor presented the project, they again displayed support by receiving it. Their faith extended to him, but not his endeavors. This was a learned behavior (Chapter One 26). They extended the same graciousness to the present pastor as they had to others.

Change. One common response to the problem was to change personnel. Before 1988, church board members served multiple years without change. This provided continuity. In 1988 the Church adopted a new policy for board membership (Chapter One 10). The policy started the election of board members to serve two years. After the two years, they were required to lay off at least one year. Change became the pattern with six leaving every year.

The impact of this change was crucial. Long-time board members moved off the board by virtue of the new policy.

Some of these refused to allow their names to come up for election the next year. In many cases the young ideas clashed with traditional concepts. As a result, the board lost valued experience and obstructed desirable relationships. While new personalities instilled fresh ideas and energy to the board team, they also brought inexperience. They did not know the pastor's strengths and weaknesses nor understand the functioning of the board. The responsibility of multiple hard decisions relating to the planned relocation fell onto the shoulders of inexperienced leaders.

The institution of younger, inexperienced leadership nurtured a new and unexpected problem. The time needed to orient inexperienced leaders resulted in the demise of quality time in board sessions. Quality time means opportunity to deal directly with the needs of the Church.⁵ Younger leaders on the board struggled to learn and equip themselves for quality service. At the same time, the older members battled with strange ideas and concepts. Neither focused directly on the issues and needs.

Nineteen and eighty-eight was not the year for major change. Relocation demanded research and courageous decisions. A better plan would have been to do restructuring and relocation at different times. Both required a dedicated and efficient leadership team. With so much change in

⁵ In April, 1991, I attended a seminar featuring George Barna. He stated that the need for quality time was a primary need of the Baby Boomer generation.

personnel, the board tried to avoid expectational differences rather than solve them.

Pragmatism. When the people did not realize or understand the character of the problem, they bypassed it and focused on other desirable subjects. This pragmatic approach to the situation started out of ignorance.

Without attempting to define the problem of conflicting expectations, the SBF Church board focused on pragmatic solutions to the Church's need for growth. Their emphasis turned to objective aspects of building a congregation. The realistic need of numbers to fill and pay for the larger building consumed the thinking of some team members. They called for better administration on the part of the pastor to make this happen. Instead of theoretical approaches to dealing with their dilemma, they advocated clearer job descriptions. Committees asked for the pastor's presence and help in meetings. They frequently called for prayer to enjoin the Holy Spirit's aid in bringing clear and specific resolution. The Holy Spirit became an avoidance technique for dealing with crucial expectational problems. The pragmatic approach on the part of the Church board actually avoided the hard, but necessary, leadership task of dealing with the problem.

Summary of the Response

of Participants

This section considers the responses of the pastor and

the administrative board to the problem of unshared expectations. The pastor responded by questioning the experience, reading for leadership insight, and writing a Manual to incorporate the insights. Since the Manual became the pastor's solution to the problem, issues center upon the value of a manual.

1. Can a manual counter cultural influences upon leadership roles and expectations?
2. What value is a manual in dealing with leadership conflict and a sense of personal failure?
3. In what way can a manual help the administrative board to face shared responsibility and accountability?

Concepts in the Manual Used for Problem Resolution

One approach to analysis of the problem comes by way of the four concepts written into the Manual. These concepts are the shepherd paradigm to pattern thinking, the team structure to delegate leadership, the administrative handbook to clarify expectations, and evaluation instruments to measure actions.

When the pastor sought resolution of the problem of conflicting expectations by writing a Manual, he used concepts that grew out of his experience and education. Of what significance were these concepts?

Concept One: The Shepherd Paradigm

The shepherd paradigm models mutual accountability. The pastor saw Christians patterning this paradigm by

answering to one another and to Christ, the Good Shepherd. Avoiding responsibility does not work. One individual cannot lay his or her accountability upon another. Personal responsibility arises from the fact of shared redemption through the blood of the Good Shepherd. Before God, all serve as a community of redeemed undershepherds. Responsibilities may vary by church election or by team assignment, but accountability remains. The pastor believed that as leadership in the church patterned the shepherd paradigm, the expectations of the congregation would conform to that pattern.

This concept received criticism from both the Church board team at SBF and the pastor's field advisor (Chapter One 19). Several members on the board thought that the Manual overemphasized the shepherd paradigm. They expressed a feeling that the paradigm was not contemporary, not realistic. Paradigms, being conceptual, require direct association between thinking and doing. Most team members did not connect the shepherd paradigm with the management approach of the Manual. Some viewed the paradigm as inactive, leaving an imbalance on the organization side. Others conceived of the pastor as shepherd and could not broaden that personal application to include themselves.

The field supervisor critiqued the Manual for its exclusive use of the shepherd paradigm. In his thinking the Bible offered several other appropriate paradigms. The

field supervisor contended that the board deserved the opportunity to choose for themselves. He challenged the pastor to know why he felt so strongly about the shepherd paradigm.

The pastor recognized the ownership value of the board choosing. The Old and New Testaments herald the value of personal choice.⁶ However, the pastor feared the board might not choose the shepherd paradigm. In his thinking, no other paradigm matched the Biblical one of shepherd. Christ proposed it. Therefore, the pastor felt responsible to lead the board team to the shepherd paradigm based on Biblical example and the privilege of choice (Appendix A 127).⁷

The Manual defined four expectations implied by the shepherd paradigm: (1)growing in reverent submission to Christ; (2)accepting His Word as authority; (3)placing strong emphasis upon forgiving love; and (4)using individual gifts and responsibilities (Appendix A 131). Later review of these expectations revealed their individual context. A group context would have increased their value to the team.

Nevertheless, the board team proved good accountability to the first three expectations. Prayer requests at team meetings, participation in altar prayer times, and testi-

⁶ Joshua 24:15; Psalm 25:12; Isaiah 7:15-16; John 1:12; Ephesians 3:14; I John 1:12.

⁷ The section under "Team Ministry defines the commitments of shepherd-leaders. These statements add to the appropriateness of the paradigm.

monies of lessons God was teaching them gave evidence of their discipleship. To measure the total extent of their submission to Christ was impossible.⁸ Team members practiced expectations two and three before the project ever began. To this extent the paradigm of shepherd held significant merit.

The fourth expectation never lived because the board team overlooked the natural and spiritual gifts of its members. No gift assessments happened. Responsibilities never were given to team members based on their gifts. Leadership remained too task-oriented and neglected the gifts of the team members; a gross error (Young 78).⁹

This concept of shepherd paradigm showed general appropriateness by the functioning and initiative of team members. Some of them fulfilled their responsibilities on their own initiative. By its stress upon accountability, the shepherd paradigm also filled the void noted by the district pastors interviewed at Pastors and Wives Retreat (Chapter One 12-13).

Concept Two: Team

One of the concerns mentioned in Chapter One described the lack of harmony between the expectations of pastor and

⁸ Submission or self-surrender lies at the very heart of faith in the holiness movement. This experience impacts expectations, but supersedes human evaluation.

⁹ He notes that like a business or the government, "We (the Church) are task-oriented, not gift-oriented."

people (13). In writing the Manual, the pastor defined team and equipped team members with distinct expectations. Imbalance diminished, appropriately strengthening and unifying the expectations of pastor and team members. Even with this growth in harmony, the team concept suffered by the lack of total team identity with it (Chapter One 26).

Concept Three: Operations Manual

An operations manual improved the effort of the Church board leadership team by providing an empirical record of expectations. Every board team member carried a copy of the Manual in their board workbook. Frequent mention of it revealed their awareness and interest in what it said (Chapter One 26). Role sections of the Manual served as helpful reference to both new and experienced members. Recognized roles were pastor, board members, team. The roles and expectations portion of the Manual countered the problem mentioned in Chapter One about the function priorities of the pastor (12). By providing hard copy of the team member roles, Concept Three improved the trust between members. All on the board knew what everyone else expected from them. That knowledge built confidence. The concept of a manual received strong affirmation from the board team (Chapter One 28).

Concept Four: Evaluation Tools

This concept of evaluation tools proved to be most helpful. Church board members realized the need for accoun-

tability at the leadership level. Evaluation of leadership behavior enabled the feedback necessary to improve accountability.¹⁰ Use of evaluation tools in the Manual worked to offset the need for pastoral accountability created by the General Assembly of 1989 (Chapter One 11).

Summary of the Concepts in the

Manual Used for Problem

Resolution

This section looks at the four concepts used in the Manual to resolve the problem of unshared expectations on the church board. These concepts were: shepherd paradigm, team, operations manual, evaluation tools. Issues growing out of this section deal with evaluation of the concepts and ways to improve them.

1. The pastor projected four reasons the board and field supervisor struggled with owning the shepherd paradigm. What others might have influenced the poor reception of this concept?

2. How might the pastor handle the shepherd paradigm more objectively to nurture its acceptance as well as acceptance of the Manual?

3. What happens when someone follows a paradigm other than shepherd?

4. In what ways does the shepherd paradigm and the

¹⁰ On an annual basis the board now evaluates the pastor through the leadership integrity section of the Manual. Also, the board team evaluates itself annually.

team concept detract from sharing common expectations and responsibilities?

5. In addition to behavior evaluations, what other tools condition expectations and accountability to them?

DOMINANT ISSUES ARISING FROM THE PROBLEM

Based on this analysis, the heart of the problem deals with unshared expectations. Team role perceptions and expectations differed because of variant cultural and social influences.

The pastor attempted solution of the problem by writing a working manual. Unfortunately, the Manual only perpetuated the problem. Both pastor and board cared about the Manual, but did not share it. The SBF board worked kindly with their pastor. They attempted to add to the work of a fellow team member, the pastor. He, in turn, operated from somewhat the same attitude of "I'll do this for you."

Within the Manual the pastor advocated the shepherd paradigm, thinking it patterned shared responsibility and accountability. In spite of the team's differing opinions about the shepherd paradigm, the pastor chose to incorporate it.

Like a CEO, the pastor handed the Manual to the team expecting them to put it to work. Little effort went into correcting the behavior of the team. Little time went into teaching the team how to use the Manual.

A summary of this analysis pinpoints several issues.

1. How does a church share responsibility for harmonizing different cultural and social role perceptions to obtain its objectives?
2. What value is a manual in facing these conflicts and enabling accountability among the leadership of the church?
3. Is the paradigm a proper leadership concept and, if so, what paradigm works best to harmonize expectational conflict?
4. How does a group claim ownership of printed material?
5. How does proper training in the use of the Manual change the problem of expectations and shared responsibilities?
6. How does one prepare leadership in the church to share responsibility for the church's needs?

Societal influences, a manual, paradigms, team ownership of ideas and materials, are integral parts in a resolution of expectational differences. In this case, however, they were largely symptomatic. The core issue goes deeper than the Manual and its proper usage. Cultural trends toward individualism were conditioning the team members to avoid responsibility for the leadership of the Church. To resolve the problem, church doctrine and ecclesiology must define the nature of its leadership. The church must research biblical and secular theories dealing with shared

responsibility. It must find tools that promote shared responsibility, like manuals and paradigms. Consequently, among the issues raised by this analysis, the two most dominant are the leadership nature of the church and shared responsibility.

CHAPTER 3

Literature

According to Larry Richards, most people look upon the church conceptually either as an organism or an organization (Richards and Hoeldtke 208). As an organism, it is a living, viable, dynamic body. As an organization, it is a controlled structure within which a dynamic body functions. What is the nature of the church operating within this spectrum? How does the body share responsibility both as organization and organism?

This chapter reviews Christian and secular literature from the last thirty years. Of special interest is literature dealing with the nature of leadership, shared responsibility, and expectations. The literature comes from five categories: administration, organizational leadership, pastoral leadership, church growth, and human psychology.

Clarification of Terms

To begin the review a consideration of terms is helpful. Some terms become ambiguous as writers interchange their usage. Mission and vision, management and leadership, administration and ministry, model and paradigm all lose distinct meaning with general use. The following definitions serve the academic purposes of this paper.

Mission implies focused thinking upon the highest objectives of a community. Vision suggests a specific mental image of that community (Jones 205). Mission pre-

cedes vision in that it depicts the reason for the existence of an organization. Vision offers "a mental image of a preferable future" for that organization (Barna Seminar).

George Barna offers a comparison of mission and vision:

MISSION

philosophic

general

definition of ministry

similar for many churches

VISION

strategic

specific

direction for ministry

unique to each church

(Barna Seminar).

For this paper, Barna's comparison serves to distinguish mission and vision.

Common interchange in the use of the words management and leadership causes major confusion. Leslie Parrott sees management as maintaining the machinery and keeping the organization running as smoothly as possible (Parrot Paper). In this usage it follows the directives of leadership which Vance Packard defines as "the art of getting others to want to do something that you are convinced should be done" (Packard 201). Another writer, Olan Hendrix, finds management to be an all-encompassing word with leadership just a part of it (14). Lindgren and Shawchuck share this position. They identify three tasks for pastors as church managers:

- a. to clarify the specific purpose and mission of the church;
- b. to involve persons in ways that will facilitate mission and promote personal growth;

c. to consider the social impacts and responsibilities of church actions. (Management 140)

These references illustrate the confusion in understanding management and leadership. One sees management as the broader term while others give that position to leadership.

Means favors the view of leadership as more encompassing than management. He supports his position by the following delineation:

- a leader has greater vision than a manager;
- leaders are more creative, innovative, and transforming than managers;
- leaders are people oriented; managers tend to be product and program oriented. (61-62)

Ted Engstrom offers eight distinctions between leadership and management.

1. Leadership is a quality; management is a science and an art.
2. Leadership provides vision; management supplies realistic perspectives.
3. Leadership deals with concepts; management relates to function.
4. Leadership exercises faith; management has to do with fact.
5. Leadership seeks for effectiveness; management strives for efficiency.
6. Leadership is an influence for good among potential resources; management is the coordination of available resources organized for maximum accomplishment.
7. Leadership provides direction; management is concerned about control.
8. Leadership thrives on finding opportunity; management succeeds on accomplishment. (23)

Parrott effectively sums up the issue when he concludes that leadership asks questions while management implements answers; leadership sets direction and management puts the programs in place; leadership keeps the perspective and

management, the flow; leadership is difficult while management is easily learned (Paper). Simply stated, leadership seeks to do the right things while management seeks to do things right. This will be the understanding of these terms for the purposes of this study.

Administration and ministry also need clarification. Administration means the management of institutional affairs where ministry means the act of serving (Dictionary 19 and 938). Ordway Tread defines administration as "the process and agency which is responsible for the determination of the aims for which an organization and its management are to strive, which establishes broad policies under which they are to operate, and which gives general oversight to the continued effectiveness of the operation" (Tread 101) Judging by this definition, administration happens in an organizational setting. Lawrence Richards counters by defining the task of the church to be Christian ministry, not just institutional administration (194). He quotes Steven B. Clark, a Catholic writer, who clearly defines the responsibility for ministry:

A Christian leader has to be able to draw people to Christ and to help them grow in their relationship with Christ; he has to be able to help people come together to form community based on Christ; he has to be able to organize the community in such a way that people get all the help they need to be good Christians - in that order of importance. In order to be a good community dynamically developing, a leader has to do these three things. (qtd. in Richards 194)

Both Shawchuck and Richards imply that ministry encom-

passes administration. Glenda Hope cautions that ministry can suffer when a pastor gets intensely involved in administration (109). Ministry shows broad involvement in the affairs of the organism while administration refers to responsibility for the organization.

One final distinction involves the terms paradigm and model. A paradigm is a mental idea or picture that conditions thinking. Organizational literature popularizes the paradigm (Bennis and Nanus 13). Paradigms differ from models in that models offer the real life examples of what the paradigm patterns.¹

THE LEADERSHIP NATURE OF THE CHURCH

Clarification of the preceding terms aids research into how literature portrays the leadership nature of the church. James Means states "leadership is under the headship of Christ and exists for the express purpose of serving the church, equipping the saints, and enabling their ministry to the world" (46). Larry Richards defends a similar position. He contends that the leadership of the church must see itself in relationship to Jesus. Both men make reference to Colossians 1:15-18:

He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born over all creation. For by him all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or power or rulers or authorities; all things were created by him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together. And he is the head

¹ See Bruce Jones for models of leadership style.

of the body, the church.

This orthodox position prepares us for a look at church leadership from the two perspectives: the church as organization and the church as organism.

The Church As Organization

It is the interplay of several parts that shapes the church as organization. These parts include the structure of the organization, its mission, its theory of participant interaction, and the leadership models that develop from them.

Organizational Structure. The church as organization exists within a structure often managed by leadership at different levels. In the Church of the Nazarene there is general, district, and local leadership. The interplay of factors affecting organizational structure makes clear description difficult. Avery Dulles compares the structure of the church to "a dark continent, ready-made and waiting to be mapped" (205). Whatever form it takes, when this structure models Christ within the culture and environment of its people, it becomes incarnational. David L. McKenna describes it as "an interactive process in which the character of Jesus engages His environment" (22).

Most organizational church structures receive definition through leadership styles and models. Dulles identifies several church models (205). Roles and functions of leaders also determine the structure of the church. Some

examples of roles or functions include chief executive officer, manager, facilitator.

Bruce Jones speaks of structural management through administrative and ministry functions (141-156). Research identifies structural management as a crucial part within the organization. Elmer Towns refers to churches "which reach a level of growth and proceed no further" (143). He believes that this growth problem develops in many churches that appear to have similarities in their organizational structures. Jones finds structural management "the primary problem" of growing churches (141). He advocates exploration of the dimensions of management as one of four essentials for growth that may make a difference in the size of the church (Jones 141).

Structural management in denominational churches is more difficult than in independent churches. All churches in the Nazarene denomination look alike from an administrative perspective. The MANUAL defines positions, numbers, and functions for church leadership. It structures for an autocratic leadership style.

Larry Richards supports the exception to the theory that church structure forms out of leader styles and models. He contends the only leader is Christ and all organizational structures and leadership functions vary significantly from other kinds of organizations, including Old Testament groups

(17). The "Body of Christ" provides the only structure for the church. This exclusive position of a strictly supernatural and unilateral relationship denies the church an incarnational character as defined above by McKenna.

As stated in Chapter Two, the change made by the Church of the Nazarene International dropping the pastoral recall vote, exemplifies structural management. Present structure via the MANUAL calls for the district superintendent to take initiative in pastoral accountability (75). Lyle Schaller affirms that the two most serious deficiencies in church structure today are an inadequate system of evaluation and a third-rate system of accountability (Decision 196).

Organizational Mission. Statements of mission also reveal the leadership nature of the church as an organization. Mission demands focused thinking upon the highest objectives. It is the first responsibility of the leadership (Jones 205). It indicates the ultimate, the most sublime task (Bennis 89). Reuben Harris suggests "the best leaders are passionate about mission" (qtd. in Jones 206-207). Mission inspires objectives and goals for the church as organization. These objectives and goals then become tools that serve in management and control, the process of assuring that actions line up with mission. Church management must evaluate, and correct standards that develop from the stated mission (Hendrix 40).

A statement of mission may appear in public as a few

chosen words like, "We are the church that cares." More often it consists of a few dozen well-chosen words that identify the market and the mission of that organization (Jones 205). According to the Institute for American Church Growth there are five necessary components for a good statement of mission:

1. A biblical understanding of what you believe is God's special mission for your church;
2. A geographic area for ministry;
3. A target audience of people you intend to focus on;
4. A list of activities you plan for outreach;
5. The expected results (Jones 206-207).

Ideally, the mission of the church helps to mold the theory behind its organization.

Organizational Theory. The organizational theory of the congregation conditions the nature of the church. "These are theories of how an organization should be structured and managed, how people should relate to one another within the organization, and what constitutes appropriate leadership behavior" (Management 20). Many churches carry out their responsibilities intuitively. Most, however, lean toward one of five basic theories: traditional, charismatic, human relations, classical (bureaucratic), and systems. Lindgren and Shawchuck provide us a brief description of each theory.

TRADITIONAL. The leader's main function is to transmit the heritage and participate in ceremonial affairs.

CHARISMATIC. The charismatic leader theory focuses on an intuition, a vision, or a call. It is

the leader's main function to interpret and proclaim this message. He inspires the people to join forces in rejecting the existing condition and pursuing the organization's mission.

HUMAN RELATIONS. The human relations theory focuses on the need for persons to experience growth and to achieve their own personal goals in the organization. The leader's main function is to create an atmosphere conducive to open expression and democratic participation for all persons.

CLASSICAL. The classical theory (more commonly called bureaucratic) focuses on the achievement of organizational goals. The theory views the leader's function to maintain control by enforcing the rules and handing down decisions from the top.

SYSTEMS. The systems theory features continuous adaptation to the changing environment of the organization. The leader's work centers on clarifying goals, interpreting environment, and monitoring change (Management 20).

Of the five theories, the relational theory compares best with contemporary organizational leadership. Lindgren and Shawchuck favor the systems approach to church organization, although they note that few individuals or churches purely practice any of these theories. Most often aspects of several theories appear in an organization (Management 26). Lindgren and Shawchuck question that the church has ever developed "a uniquely ecclesiastical organizational structure" (Management 136). In their judgement the church always borrows organizational patterns from its secular environment.

Consider this observation, however. These organizational theories all come from the perspective of a single leader. This poses a problem when today's leadership focus

is upon groups or teams of leaders, not individuals.

Organizational Models. Materials from pastoral leadership and church growth often refer to organizational models. Organizational theory likewise nurtures leadership models. Paul Hersey points out that opinions vary about the ideal model (Situational 27). Bennis and Nanus note the importance of models for instilling values and stability (13).

It needs to be noted that while administrative and organizational leadership materials mention models often, only a small number call attention to paradigms. Pastoral leadership and church growth resources even less frequently mention paradigms. Many writers fail to make the distinction between paradigm and model. Thomas Oden confuses the two in his listing of "Biblical models" (35-40) as does Jones (203-206).

The multiplicity of models creates confusion. Some authorities refuse to chose one model over others saying that different needs or perspectives demand distinctive models. From a behavioral perspective social architects find three common models: personalistic (laissez-faire), collegial (participative), formalistic (authoritative) (Jones 116). From a historical perspective, four basic patterns appear: Episcopal, Congregational, Presbyterian, and Charismatic (Jones 120-127).²

² Jones defines the four historical church models:

EPISCOPAL - In the episcopal system, a bishop heads a diocese, a priest heads a local parish, and deacons, or

A recent administrative perspective portrays three leadership models (White 546-557). From the post-World War II era comes the Organization Man model characterized by the security-over-success attitude, climbing the company ladder loyalty. From this model Lawrence Peter and Raymond Hull developed the well known "Peter Principle" wherein employees rise to the level of incompetence. White sites the Southern Baptism Convention as a group trapped in the leadership by organization syndrome. Every idea, program, person receives attention based on how well it measures up to the organization's conditions.

A second model emerges from the chief executive officer image (CEO) developing most strongly during the 1970's. Michael Maccoby conceived the CEO Model in his 1976 book, The Gamesman: The New Corporate Leaders. The dominating feature of this model is the drive to win at any cost. Compare this with the leadership by office model popular within the megachurch philosophy of the 1980's (Rountree

laymen, assist the priests in their work.

CONGREGATIONAL - The congregation is given authority to select its own leaders, disciplines its own members, and exercise its own ministry.

PRESBYTERIAN - "Ruling elders" (lay members) carry responsibility for government while "teaching elders" preside over "presbytery" meetings but are not allowed "to rule" as other elders do.

CHARISMATIC - This model revolves around the magnetism of a strong personality who exercises a free rein in leadership.

7).³

The third model, the Marketing Model of the 1980's, holds as a priority of leadership, the management of the image. The Lee Iacocoas and Ronald Reagans of the corporate world practice the Marketing Model. Image and appeal make up the primary traits.

White appraises these three models as valid and effective. He also believes most of them own the potential to be "more powerful and effective than ever before" (551). Lindgren and Shawchuck describe a contemporary leader style as "enabling or influencing" persons or groups (People 40). Wright urges an organizational style that builds (people) into a team or community (4). Robert Greenleaf states simply: "If one is to preside over a successful business, one's major talent will need to evolve from being the chief into the builder of the team (72). R. Judson Carlberg, in an article entitled "Is New Leadership Required?" concludes: "The effective leader must know the organizational culture well enough to develop a leadership style which is responsive, compassionate, inspirational, and flexible" (11). Whatever the perspective, most contemporary organizational models typify, what John Naisbitt calls "the facilitator style" (188). He projects that outstanding organizational

³ A Britisher, Paul Clifford Rountree composed a bit of doggerel to caricature this model. "Like a corporation works the Church of God: Brother, we are treading where Henry Ford has trod: We are all mass-minded, one huge body we, planning world salvation through the hierarchy."

modeling of this kind is diminishing. In his Megatrends, he warns: "We have no great captains of industry anymore, no great leaders in the arts, in academia, in civil rights, or in politics" (101).

Summary of Literature on the Leadership Nature of the Church as Organization. This section reviewed the leadership nature of the church as organization based on the elements of structure, mission, theory, and models. From a structural perspective, the review of literature indicates the organized church needs functional leadership. Leadership roles and functions that model Christ, but define and manage church structure in terms of human relationships bear out the incarnational nature of church leadership. The concept of a church structured so all persons function in sharing roles requiring evaluation and accountability matches the image projected by the literature.

This section also indicates that definition of mission and patterning of paradigms and models helps to map the structure of a church. Most materials included something on mission. Leadership in most churches choose to be missionary, not realizing the true nature of that objective. Literature of secular organizational leadership strongly taught that paradigms offer valuable assistance in perceiving the nature of an object. None of the pastoral leadership and church growth materials reviewed mentioned paradigms. Popular models in the literature were those

depicting change, enabling, team building, facilitation. A facilitation model fits the pattern projected by the material reviewed.

Materials abound with information about mission statements and leadership models, but few deal with organizational theory. Of the five basic theories cited, the human relations theory compares best with other elements of contemporary organizational leadership.

The literature review of materials on the leadership nature of the church as organization pictures:

- a functional structure;
- a missionary mindset;
- a relational theory; and
- a facilitating model.

Church As Organism

Richards and Hoeldtke take the position that the church is a living organism and "not an institution" (12). By this understanding, obedience to Christ completes the task of the church. James Means advocates the church is a living organism that requires spiritual shepherds as leaders (40). By this understanding it becomes the task of the church to translate biblical concepts into corresponding leadership forms.

The Organism Form. The form of the church as organism is that of a living body, community, or flock. This concept indicates a group held together by one central purpose and

person. In this relationship members serve together in growing and maturing roles, receiving their vitality through life in the Spirit. "Every member is essential to the wholeness of the being. Members in a body can function only when they are in an intimate relationship with the members next to them" (Means 33).

A second concept important to understanding the church as organism is the principle of headship. Derived from the New Testament, this principle advocates that Jesus Christ functions as head (Richards and Hoeldtke). Human leadership in the church must not intrude into the realm of Jesus' headship or claim His prerogatives. Jesus alone is head of the body (Richards and Hoeldtke 15). Human leadership in an organism helps the functioning of the group under Christ's headship. Discerning and fulfilling the vision of Christ, the head, becomes the major function of the leaders and followers.

Richards holds a legalistic view of leadership in the church as organism. According to him, leadership exists simply to discern the will of the head and carry it out. On the other hand, Means follows a dynamic understanding. Spiritual leaders interact among themselves, as well as with Christ, the head. Means' position compares to Ephesians 4:12-13 which speaks of the church reaching unity and perfection. These attributes show interaction from both vertical (supernatural) and horizontal (human) perspectives.

The Organism Vision. Leadership in the church differs from secular leadership. In the church, leadership expects to have "a faith vision" (Keating 126). Faith vision purposes to know and affect the vision of the head. In a general sense this vision involves growth. Living organisms are dynamic, always in the process of growth and change. Ephesians 4:12-13 speaks of leaders given to the church "for the equipping of the saints for the work of ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ..." Vision in the church as organism takes on specific qualities as the church seeks to know the will of Christ for special settings and needs. Leadership literature offers little help for discerning the will of Christ. The primary source is the Bible. Other help comes from books on Christian living and discipleship. Richards notes two more sources for discerning vision: worship and giftedness (255).

Shared worship nurtures "a common understanding of who God is" (Richards and Hoeldtke 241). The Gospel of John declares that God the Father sends in the name of His son, a helper, the Holy Spirit of Christ, who will guide the church into truth (John 14:26, 16:13). As the members of the church worship in truth, they perceive more clearly the vision God holds forth.

The articulation of vision also improves as leadership identifies the gifts of the community. Churches especially are enabled by this process. The discernment of their God-given gifts provides focus to vision. Vision, in turn, equips them for the stewardship of those gifts. Giftedness and vision further clarify expectations (Segler 23).

Organism Theory. Richards discourages theorizing about the leadership nature of the church as organism (74). According to him, a theoretical approach to the leadership nature of the church robs awareness of the church's supernatural character. Richards' approach to the nature of the church focuses on Scripture's picture of a living organism united to Jesus Christ, who functions as its living head (75).

Our love for Him is not to lead us to take over the body of which He is head. Our love for Him is not to lead us to be managers of the kingdom, seeking to control and protect the work of God. Our love for Jesus is to move us to care for the sheep, to feed and nurture gently and lovingly the flock of God, building them always that they might hear and respond to the voice of Jesus, the "great Shepherd of the sheep." (Richards and Hoeldtke 81)

Some of the contemporary organizational leadership styles recognized in the previous section influence theories about the nature of leadership in the church as organism. For example, styles that feature collaboration or transformation lend a relational attitude.

In all the review of literature, the only materials that compare the church as organism and organization are

those of Larry Richards. As noted earlier in this section (64), Means recognizes the organic nature of the church, but does not contrast that with the organizational nature about which he mostly writes.

Organism Paradigm and Model. Many biblical paradigms of the church as organism exist. Most familiar among these are family, people, bride, servant, temple, building, shepherd, body, elders. From these come biblical models such as "bride of Christ," "temple of God," "God's building," "Good Shepherd," and "body of Christ."

Bruce Jones subscribes to a biblical eldership as the model for church management (130). He bases his model on attributes drawn from I Timothy 3 and I Peter 5 (130). These include (1) maturity ("blameless"), (2) masculinity ("husband of one wife"), (3) ministry ("feed the church"), and (4) management ("take the oversight thereof"). Some students of Christian leadership do not think the first-century elder model applies to the twentieth century (Getz 162). It carries less historical precedent than either previous model and seems to apply to formative needs in the early Grecian-Roman settings where Paul and Peter served. Others argue over whether the eldership is single or plural (Getz 162). Many contemporary churches support an equal eldership model of equal status for the pastor and the board (Getz 130). Jones' model of eldership favors an organizational rather than organismic character. These paradigms

and models are proper, but two paradigms excel. These are the body and shepherd paradigms with their corresponding models.

Lawrence Richards prefers the body paradigm and the "body of Christ" model to the exclusion of all others, especially Old Testament models:

In an organism, each individual part is in intimate connection with the head, and the head sends impulses and commands directly to it. In a sense, the head of an organism is in immediate and personal touch with each member, and each member is in immediate and personal touch with the head. If we are a body and Jesus is our head, then organizational structures and leadership functions should vary significantly from forms and functions appropriate to any other kind of organization - even those institutions ordained by God for His Old Testament people. To grasp the reality on which our understanding of leadership in the church must be based, we must accept the necessity of drawing principles and practices normatively from the New Testament. In the New Testament the people of God are organically related to Jesus as a body is to its head. Principles from the Old Testament, in which the people of God were associated with one another in a national institution or in tribal institutions, hold no normative parallels for our understanding! (17)

Two Scripture passages key the body paradigm: Ephesians 4:12-16 and I Corinthians 12:12-31. Theologically, the phrase means more than just the unity of the Christian community. As a body of functioning members the church inseparably connects with the head, Christ Himself (Richards and Hoeldtke 32). Richards explains this relationship: "(W)hen church leaders set goals, make plans, and design programs, they have ceased to be 'body leaders' and have taken on functions that in a living organism are preroga-

tives of the head" (69).

Richard's title for Christ, "great Shepherd of the sheep," suggests another paradigm and model for the church as organism (81). The shepherd paradigm and "Good Shepherd" model have long existed as a clear and consistent biblical motif in the church. The shepherd and body models share an organic nature, but do not share equal historical perspectives.

As the history of the flock of God is unfolded so the story of its faithful or unfaithful under-shepherds is recorded. Moses lists the essential functions of such men when he asks God for a new leader to succeed him. "May the Lord, the God of the spirits of all mankind, appoint a man over this community, to go out and come in before them, one who will lead them out and bring them in, so that the Lord's people will not be like sheep without a shepherd" (Numbers 27:16-17). (Green-slade 106)

Biblical Precedents. One strength of this paradigm is its foundation in both Old and New Testaments. The Old Testament prophet Ezekiel accused the leaders of his day of being false shepherds. He strongly condemned them as tyrannous, negligent shepherds who grossly abused their office by feeding themselves rather than the sheep (34:2-3). The sheep thereby scatter and become easy prey. Another prophet, Jeremiah, promised the coming of a true Messianic shepherd who would rule, feed, gather, carry, and lead God's people (23:3-5).

Shepherd is one of seven universal symbols the Gospel

of John employs.⁴ Best known as the "I AM" passages, these descriptive statements give us the Master's perception of his own leader relationships and functions.

Jesus often used the shepherd symbol. He referred to Himself as "the good shepherd." Dennis Kinlaw says Christ called Himself good because He gave His life for the sheep. "Human shepherds keep sheep to eat, or to wear, or to sell so somebody else can eat or wear them. Jesus became a shepherd so the sheep could eat and wear Him" (10). Philip Greenslade attributes Christ's goodness to the fact that He knew His sheep, was known by them, and revealed Himself to them. Greenslade lists the secrets of the good shepherd model and gives them leadership application.

1. He goes through the same door as the sheep. Every leader is first a disciple himself.
2. He calls his own sheep by name (John 10:3). He knows when to carry them and when to prod them.
3. He brings them out of the fold (John 10:4). With the rod of spiritual authority and the staff of the Word he may well have to overcome their objections, quell their fears, or stir their lethargy by strong teaching and admonition to get them to move.
4. He leads from the front. He asks people to do only what he is prepared to do.
5. He is trusted for his voice. The authority of

⁴ John 6:35, "bread"
 John 8:12, "light"
 John 10:7, "door"
 John 10:11, "good shepherd"
 John 11:25, "resurrection"
 John 14:6, "way"
 John 15:1, "vine."

the shepherd lies in the authentic Word of God.

6. He guards the entrance to the fold. Any attempt to kill the flock must begin with him.
7. He is not afraid of confrontation. Leadership requires courage.
8. He feeds the sheep. The true shepherd will have a clear aim in feeding his sheep.
9. He cares for the sheep at cost to himself. Leadership requires sacrifice.
10. He is interested in the whole of God's flock. True leaders have a sense of mission and an eye with great vision. (107-109)

The Book of Acts affirms the shepherd paradigm. Acts 20:28 refers to the elders of the early church as overseers or guardians. These were titles coming from the pastoral vocations common at that time. The Greek word for overseer means "to do the work of a shepherd or tend a flock," and, in particular, "to lead a flock to pasture, and so to feed it" (Stott 4). Paul patterns the overseer when he commands, "Imitate me as I imitate Christ" (I Corinthians 11:1 NIV).

Historical Precedents. History records the use by Christian leaders of several biblical models: Clement of Rome chose "The New Israel;" I Clement, "The Body of Christ;" II Clement, "The Bride of Christ" (Oden 35-40). More recent theologians use paradigms such as community and assembly.⁵ Church historians, however, record preference

⁵ Four contemporary theologians refer to the idea of community as a model for the church. One of these, Kuhn, also suggests the idea of assembly. See:

for the shepherd paradigm. Thomas Oden, in Becoming a Minister, documents the use of the shepherd metaphor (42-47). He cites references to the shepherd model that span fifteen centuries. Such Christian leaders as Cyprian, Ignatius of Antioch, John Chrysostom, Menno Simons, Tertullian, Augustine, and Luther all invoked imagery of the minister as shepherd.

This shepherd metaphor appears strange in a twentieth century Western urban culture of few sheep herds and fewer shepherds. Nevertheless, contemporary examples of the "Good Shepherd" model do exist. A seminary text for pastoral leadership bears the title Overseers of the Flock (Williamson). A South Korean Church operates with shepherd groups.

The local church is divided into shepherd groups of ten to twenty people. Each has its appointed shepherd, who conducts the weekly group prayer meeting and who gathers the statistics for each person in his group: services attended, offering given that week in the group meeting, number of chapters of the Bible read that week, number of souls won to Christ that week. The church bulletin insert each week gives this information for each group and the total for the church as a whole. Each shepherd must inform the pastor of anyone ill and any urgent prayer request from his group. (Dewel 139)

Before concluding this section, one further insight is extremely important. John Wesley once presented two com-

Colin O'Grady, The Church in the Theology of Karl Barth (Washington: Corpus Books, 1968), 307.

Hans Kuhn, Infallible? (London: Collins, 1971), 116.

Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Vol III, 1963), 163.

Wolfhart Pannenberg, Theology and the Kingdom of God (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969), 73.

peting models of ministry which combined both organizational and organism approaches. In describing these models he said, "One is biblical, functional and attentive to fruit, while the other is authoritarian, traditional and attentive to credentials" (qtd. in Collins 118). Because of his administrative and ministerial genius, Wesley allowed both models to exist in tension.

Summary of Literature on the Leadership Nature of the Church as Organism. This review of materials seeks to identify the leadership nature of the church as organism based on the elements of form, vision, theory and model. The dynamic form in which leadership in the church interacts with Christ and with fellow Christians in relational functions parallels contemporary trends, as well as with scripture.

The literature review shows visionary leadership in the church as organism comes largely through growth, worship, and individual gifts. A primary source for discerning the vision of the organic church lies in the Scriptures.

Sources on leadership theories for the nature of the church as organism are few. These agree that the nature of leadership in the church as organism features a collaborative and transformational style.

The most common biblical leadership paradigm for the church as organism is shepherd.

The literature reviewed in researching the leadership

nature of the church as organism presents the church as:

- dynamic in form;
- visionary in outlook;
- collaborative and transformational in style; and
- biblical in model, following a shepherd paradigm.

Summary of Literature on
the Leadership Nature
of the Church

The review of literature on the leadership nature of the church as organization pictures leadership with an incarnational structure, a clear, simple statement of mission, a relational theory of leadership, and a facilitating paradigm and model.

The literature reviewed in researching the nature of leadership in the church as organism presents the church living as a body or flock; experiencing vision through growth, worship, and personal gifts; sharing leadership theories with the church as organization; finding its model in the Good Shepherd of John 10.

Wesley's dichotomy of models for ministry provides the pattern for the nature of leadership in the church. The literature reviewed allows both perspectives of organization and organism to exist in tension. Within this format it is the nature of leadership in the church to appear:

- functional and dynamic in structure or form;
- missionary and visionary in outlook;

- relational and collaborational in style; and
- facilitative and biblical in model.

Shared Responsibility in the Church

The idea of sharing responsibility relates closely to the problem of unshared expectations. This section seeks to pinpoint insights from literature on shared responsibility.

As Organization

Nurturing shared responsibility in an organization is a dimension of structural management, as distinguished from social or skills management. As noted earlier, a primary problem in the church is structural management (Chapter Five 57). In literature dealing with the church as organization, four structural management concepts on shared responsibility stand out: (1) team, (2) behavioral management, (3) decentralization, and (4) shared functions.

Concept of Team. Two basic types of organizational structure exist, single-person rule and team rule (Hendrix 84). A team is "a plurality of leaders" consenting together, empowering each other at tasks that one alone would find overwhelming (Means 24). The team concept nurtures images of a group combining their effort to accomplish a goal. Team rule means power sharing.⁶

⁶ Another definition of team explicitly picks up the idea of shared responsibility: "An interdependent group of people working closely together toward a common goal, with agreed upon member responsibilities and standards." John F. Westfall and Bobbie Reed, Let Go (San Diego: Single Adult Ministry Associates, 1990), 40.

Richards never uses such institutional terms as "power sharing." By his position, however, he favors the team concept. He finds that in the New Testament Church the titles for local leaders were interchangeable with no distinction between their tasks (91). The job description for an elder, bishop, pastor, or deacon could be the same. Richards refutes the need for the ordination of some persons to a special function since the early church assigned "teams of men and women" maintenance tasks (283). This understanding of ordination has the church setting persons apart, not so much by function as for full-time service. The non-ordained persons (laity) assume some of the same responsibilities as the ordained. The biblical phrase, "priesthood of all believers," points toward the team concept of ministry (Richards 369).

James Means states: "(C)urrent popular books on ecclesiology argue for multiple spiritual leaders with shared responsibility in the church" (24). He sees these teams of clergy and laity as the answer to the contemporary problem of leadership integrity (24). According to Means, godly teams of shepherds improve the reputation of church leadership (38-40). He records four significant factors contributing to the need for multiple spiritual leaders, both clergy and laity. The laity's increased educational experience removes church leaders from the lofty pedestal they once enjoyed. Where once clergy were the most educated in a

community of faith, now many others share comparable education. By involving these skilled laity teams in church leadership, the integrity of clergy and church are maintained. The "Holy Wars" experienced this past decade cannot exist under this type of leadership. The secularization of the church causes further leadership problems. Materialistic concerns supersede the spiritual. Members of the church often demand statistical impressiveness as the infallible sign of ministerial effectiveness. A fourth factor in the decline of leadership reputation is the feeling of many in the church that they lack genuine shepherding. Where once shepherding was central, now it is a fringe activity. "When church leadership is regarded as bureaucratic management rather than spiritual direction, the credibility of leaders suffers irreparable damage" (Means 41). The ministry team of clergy and laity deal with this problem by restoring the clergy's shepherding responsibility and allowing the laity to oversee the administrative functions.

Many contemporary organizational trends feature the team concept. Such practices as "shared leadership," "consensus," and "mutual ministry" follow naturally in this thinking. Abraham Zaleznik sees the emphasis on team involvement as one of the promising characteristics of leadership: "...the purposes of the group are best served when the leader helps the followers to develop their own initiative, strengthens them in the use of their own judgment,

enables them to grow and to become better contributors" (23). An organizational style that builds (people) into a team or community has strong support (Wright 4).

Where autocratic leadership sees itself as part of a hierarchal system, team leadership sees itself as part of a responsibility sharing system. Team leaders are colleagues, not subordinates. "Participatory leaders view decision making as shared responsibility, especially as issues become increasingly important" (Wright 44). Means strongly challenges the autocratic position of Ted Engstrom. In The Making of a Christian Leader Engstrom states: "When a leader is sure of the will of God and the right course of action, he is able immediately to make a decision regardless of the circumstances" (116). Means contends that in the context of church decisions Engstrom's autocratic position becomes the antithesis of team concept, collegiality in ministry, and group responsibility (142).

Concept of Behavioral Management. A second concept frequently mentioned in relation to shared responsibility is behavioral management. Behavioral management consists of any practice that establishes better relationships and consequently, improves efficiency. According to John Naisbitt, the new leaders model behavioral management through facilitation, rather than order giving (188). Lindgren and Shawchuck describe the contemporary leader's style as "enabling or influencing" persons or groups (People 40). In his

defense of a transforming leadership style, James Burns suggests "leaders throw themselves into a relationship with followers" (41). He urges a relationship where leaders and followers "raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (20). Robert Greenleaf states simply: "(I)f one is to preside over a successful business, one's major talent will need to evolve from being the chief into the builder of the team" (72). R. Judson Carlberg, in an article entitled "Is New Leadership Required?", concludes: "(T)he effective leader must know the organizational culture well enough to develop a leadership style which is responsive, compassionate, inspirational, and flexible" (11).

In Christian leadership, little opposition to behavioral management exists. The application of "behavioral management" to the contemporary church, however, is new. Since Pentecost, the leadership nature of the church focused on people (Lindgren 53). Both secular and Christian literature of the last thirty years reflects this focus on the dynamic, changing character of organizations. Whatever the chosen leadership model, the common element in effective leadership today is the ability to meld all constituents into a sharing, participating partnership. This collaboration of team members is the heart and soul of behavioral leadership.

Another common topic in administrative literature, climate control, also impacts behavioral management. Cli-

mate control deals with building consensus within the team, sharing responsibility and accountability, collaborating with the staff in making group decisions. Climate control serves as the umbrella under which leadership functions. It influences the church community's expectations with task or relational orientations. Lindgren and Shawchuck strongly favor this kind of approach (People 40). They attribute the unique style, belief system, and attitude that characterizes denominations to leadership climate control. John W. Gardner writes about leaders creating a climate of trust throughout the system over which they preside (117). Leaders must create a climate in which people can take the important initiative (Barham and Rassam 112). Jacobsen suggests that leadership determines whether the group climate will be task-centered or social-emotional oriented (141). Jacobsen finds most authorities agree that climate making is the function of leadership (41).

Grace Elliot advocates that effectiveness in group situations directly relates to the use of these behavioral management techniques.

We measure the effectiveness of the leader not in terms of the leadership he exercises, but in terms of the leadership he evokes; not in terms of power over others, but in terms of the power he releases in others; not in terms of the goals he sets up and the directions he gives, but in terms of the goals and plans of action persons work out for themselves with his help; not in terms alone of products and projects completed, but in terms of growth in competence, sense of responsibility, and personal satisfactions among many

participants. Under this kind of leadership it is not always clear at any given moment just who is leading, nor is this very important. (43)

Concept of Decentralization. Another trend in organizational leadership appears to favor smaller leadership groups at the top with authority transferred down the pyramid of administration. Leaders call this action decentralization. Both corporations and denominations show inclinations to entrust greater control of leadership functions to lower level positions. For example, the Presbyterian Church (USA) has proposed replacing the synod level by regional centers (Shawchuck and Olson 19-I). To keep in step with the environment, large corporations today emphasize lateral leadership as much as vertical. They give managers more accountability, freedom, and responsibility (Barham 171). The most qualified person fills the role whether the person is the official leader or not. Leadership collaboration like this places strength upon roles rather than position.

While seminaries cry over the decline in their enrollment, Thomas Stewart recommends they seize the opportunity to decentralize church bureaucracy and increase the role of lay members of the congregations. In his thinking, that is the key to effective church management. He cites two situations in Illinois to support the position (Stewart 120).

Sharing responsibility through decentralization enables broader discernment of expectations. Albanese states: "When people interact in a group decision-making process, the

result is often superior than when those same people offer individual opinions" (372).

One large problem with sharing responsibility through decentralization is accountability. As already recognized, there is a growing problem of accountability in the church. Increasing the number of persons given responsibility increases the need for accountability.

Concept of Shared Functions. Jones advocates a fourth concept called "shared functions." By this title he emphasizes management through splitting the functions of leadership into two aspects, administrative and ministry. Both laity and clergy would participate in these shared responsibilities (141-156). To help them, Jones encourages the development and use of handbooks "that can be changed by those in charge as needed" (154)!

Summary of Literature on Shared Responsibility in the Church as Organization. The issue of shared responsibility in the church as organization prominently appears in the concepts of team, behavioral management, decentralization, and shared functions.

The literature reviewed strongly advocates team leadership because of power sharing and accountability. Team leadership provides broader involvement and a sense of community.

Literature on shared responsibility gives more attention to behavioral management than any other topic. Words

like facilitation, enabling, transformational, and collaboration are prolific throughout writings on the subject. Theories on "climate control" describe leaders creating conditions where people share responsibility by taking the important initiative for their own leadership.

The third concept reviewed in literature on shared responsibility in the organization is decentralization. Secular writers favor it with an emphasis upon role, not position. They see knowledge and understanding of expectations increase, as well as accountability, by pushing authority down through the organization.

Jones stresses the value of shared functions in the organization with a handbook to facilitate them.

Literature on shared responsibility in the church as organization:

- urges team participation;
- stresses transformational climate;
- advocates roles rather than position; and
- encourages the sharing of functions by handbooks.

As Organism

A very interesting parallel exists between organizational and organism leadership in that both stress this principle of shared responsibility. Leaders who see the church as organism encourage shared responsibility through such concepts as modeling supernatural relationship, power sharing, and integrated ministry.

Concept of Modeling. One concept of modeling grows out of scripture. R. H. Lightfoot finds Christ modeling task and relational functions by the shepherd paradigm (167 and 205). Lightfoot's discussion of the shepherd model invokes images of shared responsibility. He points out that a shepherd cannot exist without sheep, to whom he gives himself, nor can the sheep survive without the transforming care of the shepherd. As Jesus said, "...apart from me you can do nothing" (John 15:5 NIV).⁷ The Bible clearly equates ecclesiastical leadership with the modeling objective of bringing people to a mutual accountability in Christ.⁸ All have sinned (Romans 3:23) and all are called (Matthew 9:13), thereby all share accountability to the Good Shepherd.

A major priority in the ministry of the Good Shepherd was modeling what He taught the disciples. Much of His time away from the crowds was given to:

- picking the disciples;
- calling them to share his life;
- showing them how to live;
- involving them in ministry;
- sending them out in pairs;

⁷ John 15:5 (New International Version). The antithesis is true also, without us He is nothing. Bethlehem, Gethsemane, Golgotha lose all meaning without men and women. Ministry requires multiples of people leading together, bearing fruit, and finding unity with Christ.

⁸ John 15:16
 Acts 26:16
 I Corinthians 9:16
 Galatians 1:15
 II Timothy 4:1-5.

- delegating to them His authority;
- checking on their progress. (Greenslade 111-112)

Not all the disciples shared Jesus' teachings. Nevertheless, He modeled the attitudes and commitments that He expected of them.

In a series of leadership training sessions Christ delivered the "I AM" statements in the Gospel of John. Settings varied from hillside to seashore, from large group to small, but always the Master Shepherd gave himself to teach and model the same quality...godly leadership.

In the book Leaders, Bennis and Nanus encourage prospective leaders to find mentors who will pattern or model leadership concepts and theories before them (188).

Concept of Supernatural Relationship. Richards emphasizes the theological implications of the incarnation as a supernatural relationship. He speaks of body leadership as practicing shared responsibility through supernaturalism, release, and ministry (not administration) (74). Many leaders take on responsibilities that are not theirs. Releasing responsibilities back to Christ, as head of the church, frees them for ministry. Richards contrasts the myriad relationships of institutional leadership against the supernatural relationship that all members of a local body share with the incarnate head, Jesus Christ. He speaks of these members as "linked inseparably to the living God" (76). With this concept in place, release and ministry become the role shared by the body with the head - releasing

or affirming Christ as head and giving the burdens of ministry back to him.

David McKenna also advocates a supernatural relationship and the incarnation, however, he differs with Richards in the understanding of incarnation. Richards sees Christ, the head, giving vision and telling the body what to do. McKenna sees Christ empowering the body to do the work of the church (22-25).

Concept of Power Sharing. One tool often mentioned by both organizational and organism leadership materials is power sharing: "The more power you give away, the more you get back" (Bennis 38-39). By enlarging the influence and resources of a team member, you enlarge your own influence and resources. Empowering others on the team turns them into leaders.⁹ This interdependence of shared power prevents the abuse of power and authority given through Christ. According to Kouzes and Posner, four wonderful developments occur when teams share power and responsibility:

1. team members feel significant (not just puppets of an autocratic leader);
2. learning and competence matter (even mistakes give feedback and nurture effectiveness rather than failure);
3. community develops (the team experiences unity);

⁹ Team job descriptions and written expectations provide tools for empowerment. In 1987 The United Methodist Church Board of Higher Education and Ministry authorized the development of such tools. See J. Richard Yeager, ed. "A Manual for the Administrative Board on Developing and Evaluating an Effective Ministry."

4. ministry is exciting (pulling together is better than being pushed). (18)

Bill Yaeger of Modesto, California fashions this concept of empowering others in the phrase "umbrella man." By this he depicts a leader who "gives himself to the ministry of Christ so that he equips believers and provides abundant opportunities for them to serve" (55).

Grace Elliot describes power sharing when she says the team leader's responsibility

...is not primarily to provide directives but to maintain the evocative situation. Though he may be relatively conspicuous, he need not dominate. His role is crucial in keeping the goal in sight, creating a warm and permissive atmosphere for participation, recognizing consensus, helping persons find their parts in cooperative effort, keeping deliberations on the track toward decision. (42)

Richard's book merits consideration for in it he deals with power sharing from several directions. He insists upon providing ministry, as opposed to administration (Chapter Five 54). He recognizes a supernatural aspect of ministry found in dedicated leaders. His theory on the headship of Jesus, however, counters power sharing. According to Richards, policy-making, goal-setting, decision-making, and other leadership roles belong to Christ as head of the body. From another perspective, the headship of Christ is empowering to the body. Rather than take away initiative for leadership, headship encourages it. Christ taught the empowerment of his followers through His use of parables,

His references to models such as the Good Shepherd model, His non-directive approach to problems like the incident of the woman accused of immoral behavior, His open conflict with Pharisaical positions. He pushed power sharing by permitting followers to make choices.

Concept of Integrated Ministry. Through the sharing of responsibility the church also experiences integrated ministry. The leader multiplies opportunities for life-changing ministry when he frees team members to strive for common goals (Taylor 136). Nouwen notes of Christ, "He makes it clear that ministry is a communal and mutual experience" (Name 40). Phrases describing this relational role abound: "colleagues in ministry," "God's fellow workers," "mutual ministry," "shared ministries," joint enterprise," "reciprocal ministry," and "team ministry." The beauty and strength of the integrated ministry mirrors the "unity in diversity" of the ministering team (Segler 16). Knowing who we are, and how we fit the membership of the team enables us to make ministry real.

As an interesting parallel to this concept of integrated ministry, Jones cites a thesis by Dean Kelley that conservative churches grow because of strong demands on their disciples (75). A shared or integrated ministry produces growth.

Summary of Literature on Shared Responsibility in the Church as Organism. This unit considers shared leadership

responsibility from the perspective of the church as organism. Concepts discovered in the literature were modeling, supernatural relationship, power sharing, and integrated ministry.

Pastoral leadership materials see modeling as a biblical concept centered upon the example of Christ as shepherd. In comparison, secular literature urges the use of mentors. The model of both biblical and historical preference is the Good Shepherd.

A second concept of shared responsibility in the church is that of a supernatural relationship. Several writers select the incarnation of Christ as the pattern for this concept. While writers understand incarnation differently, they agree upon the need for a link with God.

Literature praises the concept of power sharing. It enlarges the influence and resources of the team and nurtures effectiveness. Situations that share power by evoking action from team members strengthen the concept.

A final concept, integrated ministry, receives support by unity in diversity, growth, and valuable relational experiences.

The literature review of materials on the subject of shared responsibility in the church as an organism advocates:

- patterning the biblical model of the Good Shepherd;
- leading in an incarnational relationship with Jesus

Christ;

- sharing power through evocative situations; and
- growing as relational leaders through integrated or mutual ministry.

Summary of Literature on
Shared Responsibility
in the Church

The review of literature on the second dominant issue of shared responsibility in the church reveals insights familiar to both organization or organism. Literature shows the importance of situations and roles that evoke and empower others to lead. Both perspectives stress the value of relational, behavioral factors like teams, transformation, and integrated ministry.

The review is not without some contrast. Shared responsibility in the church as organism emphasizes the additional need of biblical modeling and incarnational relationships with team leadership.

A major concern develops from this review. Whether with organizational leadership's decentralization of authority or the organism lifestyle of modeling, accountability enters the picture. While shared responsibility increases the need for accountability, not much material appeared on the subject. Aside from the work of Means, the literature reviewed contains little mention of accountability.

Here are some insights from this section that posi-

tively impact the case study.

1. Team leadership requires much accountability.
2. Situations that evoke leadership from others, clarify expectations.
3. Emphasis on roles clarifies expectations more than emphasis upon position.
4. Handbooks make explicit the functions and expectations of the team.
5. The Good Shepherd model illustrates relational expectations for leadership in the church.
6. A supernatural, incarnational relationship empowers the leaders in the church to find and share expectations.
7. Power sharing increases leader effectiveness.
8. Shared or integrated ministry nurtures growth.

Chapter Summary

This literature review chapter seeks help in dealing with the problem of unshared expectations among church leaders. It focuses upon two dominant issues, the leadership nature of the church and shared responsibility. Two perspectives guide the research, that of organization and that of organism. The material provides considerable support to the theory that the church can simultaneously be an organization and an organism.

The chapter finds the leadership nature of the church as organization is functional in structure with a strong

emphasis upon mission. Relational theories of operation are advocated. Materials reviewed introduce the facilitator model for leadership to pattern.

Literature research also looks into the nature of leadership in the church as organism. This position depicts the church in the form of a dynamic group realizing vision through growth, worship, and gifts. Leadership in the church as organism features collaborative theories and leadership styles patterned by a shepherd paradigm.

One common thread visible in the church as organization and organism is shared responsibility. Literature on the church as organization champions shared responsibility by a team concept that features transforming leader styles. It focuses upon roles, rather than position. It encourages the use of a handbook to clarify the roles. On the other hand, literature on the church as organism stresses the Good Shepherd model for leaders. It repeatedly calls for an incarnational climate. It urges power sharing through transforming and evocative experiences. Another concept frequently mentioned is shared responsibility through integrated or collegial ministry.

The following principles emerge from this literature review on the two dominant leadership issues.

1. The church is simultaneously an organization and an organism when it maintains an essential link with God.
2. To meet the spiritual needs of a contemporary

society, it must be the nature of leadership in the church to:

- provide both functional structure and dynamic form;
- think in missionary and visionary mindsets;
- operate in relational and collaborative theories or styles.
- model facilitative concepts and the shepherd paradigm.

3. Likewise, for the church to share responsibility it must:

- envision itself as a team patterning the model of the Good Shepherd;
- seek a transforming and incarnational climate;
- define roles and evoke power sharing; and
- function by use of a handbook and practice collegial ministry.

CHAPTER FOUR

Evaluations

By way of review, the problem considered in Chapter One relates to unshared expectations. In a project aimed at resolving the problem, the pastor developed a manual. The analysis of the problem in Chapter Two pin-pointed two dominant issues. One issue was the lack of a clear perception of the leadership nature of the Church. The second was the need for shared responsibility within the Church. Chapter Three judged literature sources that presented insights on these dominant issues. This chapter offers an evaluation of the Manual, using as criteria the three principles emerging from the literature review.

Principle One

"The Church is simultaneously an organization and an organism when it maintains an essential link with God."

No direct recognition of this principle appears in the Manual. The Manual makes no connection or distinction between the Church as organization and as organism. In fact, the Manual fails to define the Church. A Manual definition of the Church may have prevented some of the omissions and criticism occurring later.

By its stated purpose, the Manual is designed as a workbook on team ministry, not a textbook on church leadership (Appendix A 124). So, the focus aimed at application instead of explanation. In the application, the Manual

indirectly supports Principle One by the way it defines team ministry in both spiritual and institutional terms (Appendix A 125). The "essential link with God" readily appears in the Introduction, Premise, and Mission sections.

The Manual bridges a very real gap between Christian literature that views the Church as an organism and secular materials that view it as an organization. Most Christian literature deals with tools that concentrate on group needs rather than materials on leadership concepts (Chapter Five 67). Secular writers are better prepared to deal with the latter.¹ The Manual provides both approaches making it an exceptional tool.

Principle Two

"To meet the spiritual needs of a contemporary society, it must be the nature of leadership in the Church to:

- provide both functional structure and dynamic form;
- think in missionary and visionary mindsets;
- operate in relational and collaborational theories or styles; and
- model the shepherd paradigm and facilitative concepts."

What Is the Functional Structure

and Dynamic Form Provided

By the Manual?

¹ Chapter Five, p. 63. Burns, Greenleaf, Carlberg, and Naisbitt evidence a focus upon leadership needs.

The Manual provides functional structure through use of models, roles, functions, job descriptions, expectations, and evaluations. The Premise section of the Manual introduces several examples of models that shape the nature of leadership. Some of these are: "the fold of God" model, Moses' delegator model, Paul's elder model, and Christ's Good Shepherd model (Appendix A 130). The Leadership Skills section supports the definition of roles and functions. It offers examples of job descriptions and expectations. Another strong emphasis in the Manual is evaluation. Evaluation tools based on job descriptions and expectations enable the accountability necessary to maintain organization. A Christian leader who fulfills his or her structural positions and expectations becomes the incarnational model of Christ.

Because of its focus upon the local organization, the Manual omits structural control coming through general and district leadership. That control exists in the MANUAL of the Church of the Nazarene. Both tools must be compatible for the organizational structure to function effectively.

Leadership literature calls for organizations to provide functional structures that encourage change and growth (Chapter Three 54). The Manual opens the chance to change the structure of the board, not by size or authority, but by ministry and administrative functions. Team members can add structure by writing their own functions in the Manual

workbook.

The Manual offers dynamic form to the organism church, largely by application of the team ministry concept. The Manual defines team ministry as "Pastor and church board joining minds, hearts, and hands to operate as a team to nurture growth in God's kingdom through the Church" (Appendix A 125). This dynamic form is incarnational! Team ministry models the scriptural concepts of "headship" and "body life." It allows contemporary leaders to use modern gifts for uplifting the eternal Christ.

Describe the Missionary and
Visionary Mindsets Depicted
in the Manual

Mission and the missionary mindset surfaces in the worksheets on mission, team member roles, and covenants. The Premise section spotlights mission, especially in the worksheet for constructing a mission statement (Appendix A 136). Examples of a missionary mindset show up in the team member roles worksheet and the covenant worksheet (Appendix A 154, 170). In the Manual's definition of team ministry lies a statement about the divinely anointed gifts of the pastor and board. One attribute of an organism functioning in Christ is giftedness.

Unfortunately, the adopted mission statement of SBF lacks focus. When the statement lacks focus, the team and the church lose sight of their highest objectives. Accord-

ing to the literature review, mission objectives inspire goals and guide the management of the organization (Chapter Three 55). The initial excitement seen when the team hammered out a mission statement is short-lived. People hold back when they fail to see clearly where they are going.

The Institute for American Church Growth cites five parts to a mission statement (Chapter Three 56). A measurement of the SBF mission against these five components shows the SBF statement lacking in three of them:

<u>Five Components</u>	<u>SBF Statement</u>
Biblical basis	None given
Geographical area	None given
Target focus	Christ and people
Activities	Glorify Christ
	Disciple and equip people
Expected results	None given. ²

As to vision and a visionary mindset, the Manual offers nothing except a statement in the philosophy of ministry section about vision for souls. The Manual ignores vision. This omission became clear soon after completion of the Manual (Chapter One 26). Review of literature shows that worship and giftedness help to discern the vision of the head. Both topics are absent from the Manual. It becomes difficult to know what to expect of leadership when, in the

² See Appendix A, p. 136 for the SBF statement of mission.

Manual, mission remains unfocused and vision goes unnoticed.

What Relational and Collaborational

Theories or Styles Operated

Within the Manual?

Specific theories and styles that give definition to the nature of leadership, are absent from the Manual. The Manual encourages relational and collaborational functions such as the team concept, power sharing, and collegial ministry, but not theories or styles. Indirectly, the Manual encourages a relational style. The Good Shepherd model patterns a relational style for leadership in the Church. This model supplies the supernatural element advocated by Richards (Chapter Three 55). Diverse team leadership skills and styles fit well into the concept of a flock following the shepherd.

Cite the Manual's Usage of
the Shepherd Paradigm and
Facilitative Concepts

Contemporary organizational literature abounds in paradigms and models. One way the Manual deals with the issue of leadership in the Church is through a strong use of the shepherd paradigm and the Good Shepherd model (Appendix A 133). Three paradigms appear in the Manual: shepherd, servant, and team.³ While emphasizing a choice of models,

³ The servant paradigm is mentioned, but not used. The shepherd and team paradigms play an important role in the Manual.

the Manual shows preference for the Good Shepherd model over the delegator and elder models (Appendix A 133). The Good Shepherd model is chosen for its dominant use by biblical and historical leadership (Chapter Three 88).

The pastor's choice of the shepherd paradigm and the Good Shepherd model causes conflict. Many paradigms and models exist, coming from both secular and religious backgrounds. Because of their different backgrounds and experiences, members of the board team challenged the pastor's choice (Chapter Two 40). This experience affirms the opinion expressed in the review of literature that too many paradigms and models create confusion (Chapter Three 58). It is not the purpose of this evaluation to critique other church leadership paradigms and models. Rather, this evaluation seeks to affirm the value of the shepherd paradigm and the Good Shepherd model.

A primary strength of shepherd leadership is the extension of authority to "godly teams of shepherds" (Chapter Three 76). Secular organizational theory refers to this action as decentralization (Chapter Five 82). The Manual disperses information and enables decentralization through the evaluation of strengths, weaknesses, and priorities (Appendix A 143). By means of expectations and roles the Manual provides specific functions and responsibilities for pastor and board team.

Another way the Manual deals with the nature of leader-

ship in the Church is to advocate team leadership. In its definition of team ministry, the Manual clearly advocates a participatory style of leadership (Appendix A 125). Means' advocacy of team leader commitments serves the Manual well. His position corresponds with that of the SBF pastor who favors a participative ministry.

A second value in participative team ministry is the way it takes advantage of individual gifts and education. Unlike past generations, clergy and laity today share comparable educational experiences (Chapter Three 76). Pastor's educational experiences center on biblical and theological knowledge. Many of the lay team members are trained in organization and administration. When pastor and laity participate as a team, their education can complement their needs.

Differing educational experiences also cause conflict. Conflict appears in the comparison of team member leadership expectations with Greenslade's Good Shepherd Model (Chapter Three 69). The Good Shepherd sacrificial model counters the team members' expectations of an administrative pastor (Chapter Two 32).

This consideration of shepherd and team touches on the core problem of this research, expectational differences. A common model helps to harmonize expectations. Nevertheless, differences may still exist, such as expectational differences between laity and clergy. Laity trained in adminis-

tration easily find focus on materialistic concerns like attendance and offering. Clergy trained in Bible and theology, more readily look to subjective aspects of ministry like evangelism and shepherding. The Manual helps to identify these different foci and assign responsibility for them. The Church of the Nazarene also assigns responsibility by differentiating between ordination of clergy and deacons.⁴

Principle Three

"Likewise, for the Church to share responsibility it must:

- envision itself as a team patterning the model of the Good Shepherd;
- seek a transforming and incarnational climate;
- define roles and evoke power sharing; and
- function by use of a handbook and practice collegial ministry."

How Did the Manual Equip Team

Members to Pattern the Good

Shepherd Model?

The Good Shepherd model in the Manual comes from the shepherd paradigm. The Good Shepherd model portrays teamwork through the flock of sheep concept. It promotes the facilitation and behavioral management taught by Burns. He

⁴ See Chapter Two, p. 7 for the pastor's personal view of ordination.

speaks of shepherd leaders who "throw themselves into a relationship with followers" (Chapter Three 78). The Good Shepherd model creates the climate of trust advocated by John Gardner, allowing the followers and overseers to "take the important initiative" (Chapter Three 79).

The Manual teaches team members to practice the Good Shepherd model through the basic commitments of shepherd-leaders (Appendix A 126). Use of the Manual worksheets on roles and job descriptions further prepares team leaders to share power. No where does the Manual hold team members accountable to this model. The Manual provides examples from which the team may choose. Patterning the Good Shepherd model is a choice.

Describe the Way in Which the Manual

Nurtured a Transforming and

Incarnational Climate

The Manual is much stronger on shared responsibilities than on the nature of church leadership. It makes the team members aware of tools and circumstances by which people share responsibility. With transformational techniques such as expectation lists, evaluations, and covenants, the Manual creates a climate in which team members take the necessary initiative. Elliot calls this condition "the evocative situation" (Chapter Three 86).

The Manual nurtures an incarnational climate in two ways. First, it describes the dynamic nature of team minis-

try in the church as organism. Second, it employs organizational instruments like "Philosophy of Ministry" and "Mission Statement," (Appendix A 132, 136). This is more in line with McKenna's thinking than Richards'. McKenna allows for human inspiration and creativity in ministry; Richards emphasizes an almost military obedience. McKenna is collaborative; Richards is autocratic. McKenna sees Christ empowering ministry; Richards sees Christ defining ministry. For McKenna, incarnation implies a volitional linkage; for Richards, it implies a mandatory linkage. From the perspective of McKenna and the Manual, incarnational leadership has a Wesleyan perspective (Chapter Three 55).

Show How the Manual Defined Roles
and Evoked Power Sharing

The Manual defines roles and evokes power sharing through its skills and integrity sections. It accomplishes this with such instruments as team planning, role expectations, evaluations, and covenants (Appendix A 142, 151, 164, 172). The literature review points out that sharing responsibility and power among church leadership increases the need for accountability (Chapter Three 89). Schaller calls accountability one of the two "most serious deficiencies" in the Church (Chapter Three 55). Expectations and accountability increase through decentralization (Chapter Three 82). The Manual requires accountability by listing expectations for all members on the board team. That

includes the pastor. It also enables accountability by providing for regular evaluations of all team members (Appendix A 164).

Roles carry more importance in the Manual than position. According to the Manual every team member assumes the role of "assisting wherever and whenever needs arise" (Appendix A 154). Emphasis on position negates this type of action. Team members make choices within the parameters of their job description and the approval of the team.

Assigning roles and expectations by the Manual enables the leadership team to share power. Chapter Two finds that distinct expectations for team members provide a strengthening and unifying effect (43). This result falls in line with Kouzes' research (Chapter Three 86). The Manual calls for team leaders to assess strengths and weaknesses, as well as set goals. Power sharing in this manner still allows the "headship" of Christ, although Richards would not agree. It encourages initiative and leadership as it magnifies Christ (Chapter Three 87).

Explain the Manual's Relationship
to the Concepts of Handbook and
Collegial Ministry

Jones supports the idea of a handbook for sharing the responsibilities and functions of the team (Chapter Three 82). As a workbook, not a textbook, the Manual nurtures shared functions by requiring the team to write its own job

descriptions and expectations. These exercises help team members to know who they are and what place they fill in the team. This is collegial, shared, mutual, integrated ministry.

Some General Evaluations

Several omissions limit the effectiveness of the Manual. The neglect of vision and gift sections impedes an understanding of the nature of leadership in the Church. Vision statements nurture the development of objectives and goals that sharpen awareness of leadership. Gifts help to discern strengths and opportunities that suggest the direction for ministry.

Three other weaknesses in the Manual hinder comprehension of the two dominant leadership issues. One, the team planning section of the Manual reverses the popular definitions for objectives and goals. This lack of clarity creates confusion. Two, the use of the Manual by the team tends to increase dependency on the Manual rather than on the Good Shepherd. This problem exists with the use of any manual, but needs to be called to the attention of the team. Third, while the Manual tries to set up accountability through the integrity section, the need for accountability remains hidden. The Manual needs to alert leadership to the value of being accountable, especially with an emphasis upon decentralized authority and shared responsibility.

This entire research project deals directly with the

problem of expectational differences in relation to the church board team. It finds five general causes for unshared expectations: sociological, philosophical, personnel, organizational, and religion. It discovers that the best way to clarify expectations is to nurture evocative situations that require everyone involved to operate from the same basic criteria. This may be the key lesson of the research.

By involving the team in defining philosophy, mission, and models, the Manual provides collaboration and a common biblical basis for all expectations. The research points out four basic concepts that give structure and control to expectations: shepherd paradigm, team leadership, organizational handbook, and evaluation tools. Structure develops using mission statements, a philosophy of ministry, paradigms, and models. Structural management happens in relational behavior by means of teams, climate control, roles, and shared functions.

The two critical issues for harmonizing expectations are the nature of leadership in the Church and shared responsibility. Evaluation finds the Manual weak in defining the nature of leadership and strong in providing shared responsibility. The evaluation determines that expectations harmonize when leadership is Wesleyan and incarnational. To be Wesleyan, it must exist as both an organization and an organism. To be incarnational, it must exist as a dynamic

body functioning under the headship of Christ.

Chapter Summary

In the evaluation of the three principles growing out of the literature review, the Manual fails in the first one. It partially achieves in the second, based on a forceful treatment of facilitation concepts and the shepherd paradigm. It excels in the third principle by the team concept, the Good Shepherd model, and the definition of roles and leadership integrity.

Indirectly, the Manual gives minor support for Principle One by the definition of team ministry in both spiritual and secular perspectives. The Manual bridges the gap between secular organizational concepts, such as behavioral management, and Christian literature tools like philosophy and mission statements.

Principle Two mostly deals with the nature of leadership in the Church. The team emphasis in the Manual outlines structure and form for leadership. By including a section on mission and neglecting another section on vision, the Manual halfway deals with mindsets for ministry. The Manual offers little as far as theories or styles except as might informally come from the Manual's attempt to be relational and collaborative. The strength for Principle Two comes from the Manual treatment of facilitative concepts and the shepherd paradigm.

By in large, the Manual's strengths lie with the issue

of shared responsibility rather than leadership nature. Principle Three speaks to this issue. The climate control that the shepherd and team paradigms provide exceeds all other Manual topics related to shared responsibility. The Good Shepherd model clearly evokes a desirable leadership climate of transformation and collegiality.

This chapter also touches on the omissions of vision and gift sections in the Manual. It calls attention to the need to define correctly the objectives and goals. It stresses dependance upon the Good Shepherd when using the handbook. This chapter warns of the need for accountability by church leadership.

CHAPTER FIVE

Implications

This chapter focuses upon implications that are born out of the preceding problem analysis, the literature review, and the evaluation. What changes are necessary? What issues or concepts need greater stress and affirmation? Where is more study needed? What advice would help a pastor struggling with some of these same problems and issues? On personal introspection, what unexpected lessons for the pastor and the church grow out of the experience? So, where do we go from here?

Needed Changes

Two kinds of changes need consideration. First, the Manual requires some correction of errors and omissions to continue its effectiveness. The last chapter mentioned the improper definitions of objectives and goals in the Manual (Appendix A 145). The reversal of these definitions is a must. The definitions of Lyle Pointer do not agree with other definitions, including the Webster dictionary.

An additional correction involves the omission of sections on gifts and on vision. The personal gifts of a leadership team influence the vision of the team. Gifts provide the opportunity or the means for achieving vision. Without a vision, leadership teams do nothing. Vision enables identification of objectives and goals. It holds

forth an end or objective to be achieved. This change requires addition of two new sections to the Manual, one on gifts and the other on vision.

A third correction might be to drop the use of different paradigms in the Manual. The review of literature shows many good paradigms (Chapter Three 71). Since paradigms condition thinking, selection of a single paradigm to compliment the nature of leadership desired would add to the Manual's effectiveness. As the nature of leadership changes, the paradigm could change also.

Another kind of change might come through a different approach to the Manual. The stated approach of the Manual is for it to be a workbook on team ministry. A different approach might make it a training manual with an introductory portion teaching specific criteria valuable to nurturing church leadership. These criteria are identified in the summary of Chapter Three.

A second approach to the Manual would allow more time for editing and training. Initially, the Manual development did not allow enough time to design and fill-in the worksheets (Chapter One 22). Training for use of the Manual occurred at an annual session with the board team, with a brief mention of the Manual and its contents. Since time presents such a hurdle, it would conserve time to lead the ministry team through the Manual during a regularly scheduled service. Involving others beside the board team

would help to train future team members. The midweek equipping service would be a good time.

Greater Emphases

As a result of research for this case study, five subjects show need of a greater emphasis. These topics exist in the Manual, but are not explicit. They are the incarnational nature of church leadership, the value of paradigms, the power of a missionary mindset, the character of evocative situations, and the immense need for accountability.

The incarnational nature of church leadership, with paradigms and missionary mindsets, falls into a common class dealing with leadership concepts. The incarnational nature of the church spans the gap between the church as organization and the church as organism (Chapter Three 99). Leaders in the church really need to perceive this. Not only does it show the Good Shepherd living in us, but it shows Him living with us, a source of help for leadership. Paradigms and mission condition the focus of this leadership.

Quibbling over the selection of a certain paradigm or its frequent use ceases with the knowledge that paradigms condition thinking for special purposes and manage behavior toward specific objectives (Chapter One 21). An interesting study for the board team might be to list all the known biblical paradigms. From this list the team might note the

thinking and behavior patterns conditioned by the individual paradigms. Third, the team might describe specific situations where a particular paradigm would serve best. For example, the research already finds the shepherd paradigm to nurture the extension of authority (Chapter Four 100). A church needing more involvement from the membership might find the shepherd paradigm useful for patterning a shared leadership.

Missionary mindsets, like paradigms, control thinking and behavior. Church leaders need to see that the adopted mission can determine results. It is of extreme importance that church leaders see how priorities are set by mission statements. The Manual included a mission statement and the rationale for it (Appendix A 135). This rationale for mission needs greater emphasis.

Leadership models also influence priorities. Unlike many contemporary groups, leadership in the church does not favor a consumer model or a market model (Chapter Three 94). An excellent model for the church is a missionary model.

Team members also need to hear greater emphasis on the value of situations that evoke leadership. One potential powerhouse of change in the literature review was the "evocative situation" (Chapter Three 94). It helps church leaders who dare to allow it to happen.¹ A leader alert to

¹ A recent experience affirmed this fact. A January pastoral evaluation by the church board team revealed a lower rating in the area of pastor's administrative rela-

the needs of the church can watch for critical situations to appear. It might be an occurrence like the resignation of an effective and influential committee chairperson.

Realizing that crisis can mean growth instead of death, the leader can intentionally use this incident to train additional leadership.

Poor accountability by church leadership is the fifth topic that needs greater attention. Schaller calls it one of the two most serious deficiencies in the church today (Chapter Three 60). Nowhere does the Manual state the value of accountability. The Manual requires accountability by way of the integrity tools, but does not stress its importance. While accountability is not a dominant issue in this case study, it is a hidden issue. It enters the total

tionship with the church standing committees. This proved traumatic for the pastor. The previous year he planned a committee leaders workshop. He scheduled monthly meetings with committee chairpersons to discuss their upcoming meetings on the following week. After all this, these same persons gave him a poor evaluation. At the next committee chairpersons meeting, the pastor confronted them with these facts. They responded that they evaluated him low because he never attended their meetings. The pastor explained that usually, all committees meet at the same time. He could not get to them all, so he did not attend any. Also, he explained that when he did attend meetings, committee members always asked what he thought and often refused to discuss any differences of opinion until he left. Then the leaders said they wanted him to attend some of their meetings. This was an "evocative situation." In spite of differences, the two parties put their heads together to find a solution. The pastor agreed to attend some committee meetings when he could without attempt to attend them all. Committee leaders agreed to let him know when his presence might be of help to them.

picture from various perspectives in the literature review.² Chapter Four alerts leadership to the importance of being accountable (109).

Of particular importance is the problem of leadership accountability to the Good Shepherd model. This matter is very personal and subjective. Manual evaluations focus on accountability to human leadership more than accountability to supernatural leadership. How can church leadership enhance supernatural accountability? Team members could serve as spiritual mentors for one another. By recording experiences and insights in a journal, they would recognize a greater accountability to the Good Shepherd. The covenant section of the Manual can bring about greater accountability to God. In the covenant the team might define aspects of supernatural accountability expected of each team member. Their signature on the covenant would show their intent to work at greater accountability. Leadership in the church does well to recognize the altar as an accountability tool. Not only do sinners find forgiveness there, but disciples and undershepherds affirm their supernatural accountability at the altar. When we share responsibility in shepherding as "the priesthood of believers," all members give accountability to God.

² The word "accountability" appeared sixteen times in the literature review.

Further Study

Lack of proper study preliminary to writing the Manual is one reason for the needed corrections and changes. Further study in six areas would increase the Manual's value: paradigms, vision, incarnational leadership, training, social role perceptions, and ownership. The need for study in these first three areas came up in the "Needed Changes" and "Greater Emphases" sections already considered. A brief consideration of the latter three follows.

Christ modeled the need for training by his teaching of the "I AM" statements in John's Gospel (Chapter Three 91). A written training program incorporating all the sections of the Manual and the literature review of dominant issues in this case study would be valuable. Monthly or quarterly training sessions for the church board team might serve to increase the effectiveness of the Manual.

Chapter One called attention to the sociological and cultural conditions in which the problem of this case study developed (8-10)³. A study aimed at reducing the divisive impact of cultural and social role perceptions would offer much help to church leaders. It might help the study to reduce the focus down to a specific set of cultural and social role perceptions. For example, the study might target the impact of the Roman Catholic Notre Dame community

³ A friend suggested this study should include anthropology: the study of origins, races, characteristics, and relationships of man.

upon leadership in the Nazarene Church of South Bend. While this study is a major undertaking, careful research would reveal a connection between sociological conditions and the dominant issues of the case study.

A third topic for further study might be how to increase ownership of concepts, materials, and programs. The analysis of Chapter Two pointed out that board team members perceived the Manual as belonging to the pastor (44). They accepted principles and worksheets out of kindness to him. Somehow, team leaders need to own the leadership resources at their disposal. Team leaders need to recognize the value of these resources to help their own leadership. Using the present Manual, the board team could edit or update it annually and find ownership in that action.

Collegial Advice

Most case studies plant the seeds for many opinions and theories. This one is not the exception. After much reflection upon the experience, three primary opinions or theories stand out among others.

A pastor struggling with the problem of unshared expectations at the leadership level of his church needs to know to allow time: time to listen, time to learn, time to teach. The problem of this case study spanned forty years, from the time Rev. Bateman came to pastor SBF (Chapter One 4). This in no way suggests he was the problem. It simply

indicates that period sets the parameters in which the leadership attitudes and mindsets of SBF developed. The present pastor also was building attitudes and mindsets during many of these years. Circumstances in the year 1988 allowed them to interact. Change never comes quickly. Attitudes and opinions do not turn around over night. It takes time to compensate for sociological change. It takes time to develop a new approach. Genuine ministry takes time.

Second, a pastor struggling with the problem of unshared expectations at the leadership level of his church, needs to know the proper tools for dealing with the problem. To change the way people think requires tools like paradigms, models, mission and vision statements, and handbooks. These tools define and portray the nature of leadership. They map the very structure of the church (Chapter Three 66).

A pastor struggling with the problem of unshared expectations at the leadership level of his church needs a third realization. He needs to accept evocative situations (Chapter Three 94). All crises are not bad. Some provide the atmosphere for participation, consensus, cooperation, and growth. Expectations clarify and harmonize when people find their place in a cooperative effort (112).

Personal Introspection

This entire project experience leaves the pastor and

leadership team with the hard task of accountability. They find themselves accountable to God and to one another. With this understanding, they come to see themselves. They see that complete accountability requires them to undergo further change.

The board team realizes they are the leaders and they fear that responsibility. Stress levels increase. With the pastor, they discern that functional changes are necessary. They must take greater responsibility for church growth. Instead of being only spectators and critics, they must participate in ministry. Their fear stems from a lack of training. The team needs training in the use of the Manual. They need leadership training. The team needs a school for church leadership with classes available to all persons on a quarterly basis. Initially, the content might come from the Manual and the summary of Chapter Three. Another source of material might be the Christian Lay Training program of the Nazarene Church.

Before they train, the board team must identify who they are, what they must become, and what kind of team leader can help them most. They need a biblical paradigm and a contemporary model upon which to pattern their ministry.

The Church of the Nazarene needs to find a proper paradigm and model. A renewed emphasis upon the shepherd paradigm supported by a contemporary facilitative model

would serve. In this information age a model drawn from the computer field would be valuable. The search, save, and merge functions of a computer program parallel functions needed in the church. Cho's church in Korea patterns these.

From all of this comes one unexpected learning for the pastor. It deals with the meaning and value of ordination. Before this research, the pastor viewed ordination as the church investing him with a position of authority and a specific, full-time function of preaching the Word. In his thinking, the Church acknowledges a call of God to preach, approves preparation and training, and grants authority to perform the rites of the Church by means of ordination. Deep into the research he came to believe that ordination denotes more than performing a specific function on a full-time basis. It identifies the essential purpose or mission of the individual, the nature of his or her leadership. Many lay persons serve Christ full-time while working at secular vocations. The "priesthood of all believers" concept suggests a divine calling for every Christian to model Christ and minister in His name.

The organized church needs to look again at ordination. By ordaining clergy and deacons, the Church of the Nazarene recognizes a full-time call for only those who preach and those who serve in the institutional church. Anyone dedicated to glorify and serve God all the time merits ordination. Not only do they serve a godly institution, but

they minister as part of a dynamic organism. From this perspective ordination magnifies the incarnational nature of the church.

To carry out this concept of ordination, the local church would need to begin ordaining all dedicated persons as shepherds, elders, disciples, or whatever title they choose. Sharing responsibility with this new order would magnify accountability within the Church.

This case study concludes with this vision of a massive army of ordained leadership representing both the institutional church and the church as organism. If the vision helps to reproduce the character of Jesus, who gave Himself to teach and model Godly leadership, this case study and research will have been worth the endeavor.

TEAM MINISTRY MANUAL

MANUAL CONTENT

Introduction

Manual Objectives
What is Team Ministry

I. Biblical Premise for Team Ministry

Models
Philosophy
Mission

II. Building Team Ministry through Leadership Skills

Team Planning Assessment
Team Planning Goals and Objectives
Team Member Role Expectations
Team Member Role Job Descriptions

III. Team Ministry Leadership and Integrity

Evaluations
Covenant

IV. Helps for Team Ministry

Effective Teamwork
Developing Mission Statements
Planning
Problem Solving
Better Meetings

INTRODUCTION

MANUAL OBJECTIVES

1. The topic of this manual is Team Ministry as defined on the next page.
2. It is intended to be a workbook, not a textbook.
3. Material included in the Manual offers basic but not conclusive guidelines.
4. Simplicity and clarity in every detail is a primary goal.
5. Convenience and versatility are the aim in formatting the materials: easy to carry; contents quickly discernible; material readily accessible for addition or deletion.

WHAT IS TEAM MINISTRY?

Team Ministry is pastor and church board joining minds, hearts, and hands to operate as a team in order to nurture growth in God's kingdom through the church. They are the shepherd-leaders of the congregation.

Team Ministry accepts as the primary task the development of congregational identity. We all must know who we are, where we are going, and why.

Team Ministry manifests itself by way of shepherd-leaders who see the church as a living organism, the Bride of the Lamb, the object of their leadership in the Spirit of God.

Team Ministry happens when shepherd-leaders join minds, hearts, hands to pray, dream, explore, discern, plan, implement, and evaluate for spiritual and numerical growth within the body of the flock.

Team Ministry recognizes the gifts of pastor and board are divinely anointed and that effective ministry requires all of them to function together for the glory of Christ who is the head of the church.

Team Ministry requires each member to learn leadership skills, be informed and inform other shepherd-leaders, develop his or her personal inner life, practice integrity, assume responsibility, and accept accountability.

Team Ministry requires that shepherd-leaders agree to make a number of basic commitments that serve them in their guidance of the church.

Here are some suggestions:

1. Leaders are committed to the scripture and the documents adopted by the congregation.
2. Leaders are committed to assist the church or group in decision-making; they are enablers, not commanders. They do not usurp the responsibilities of the church or group in making major decisions that affect the entire body. Leaders work with and for the group in decision making; the group does not work for the leaders.
3. Leaders are committed to group process, to the encouragement of debate, and to the involvement of members as much as is possible and feasible in decision-making.
4. Leaders are committed to achieving consensus. Consensus is revealed in the degree of commitment to the decision after it has evolved through discussion and compromise.
5. Leaders are committed to discouraging premature voting, and they understand that some matters should never be voted upon by the church. Voting is a division of the body and often destroys group cohesiveness.
6. Leaders are committed to negotiate and accept compromise on sensitive issues for which there is no clear biblical mandate.
7. Leaders are committed to a careful evaluation of both objective facts and subjective feelings. Poor church leaders are unbalanced in favor of objectivity or subjectivity, facts or feelings.

(These commitment suggestions come from James E. Means' book, Leadership in Christian Ministry, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989.)

BIBLICAL PREMISE FOR TEAM
MINISTRY

BIBLICAL PREMISE FOR TEAM MINISTRY

The one foundation upon which everything done in, by, and through the church must be the Word of God. Therein are found the models, philosophies, and principles from which team ministry grows. Chief among these is the shepherding-servant example of Christ whose incarnational purpose of nurturing the fold of God becomes the biblical premise for team ministry.

MODELS

BIBLICAL PREMISE FOR TEAM MINISTRY
(Models)

Moses

Moses and Jethro present a foundational teamwork model which calls attention to the expectation of distributing both responsibility and authority to participating members. With Jethro's help Moses delegates responsibility to others. J. Oswald Sanders calls this "shared responsibility." By organizing a team to share the work, Moses gains clear advantage in several aspects:

1. conserves energy,
2. speeds up the process,
3. allows for concentration on higher responsibilities,
4. discovers latent and unsuspected talent,
5. stifles discontent,
6. provides for future leadership.

(J. Oswald Sanders, Spiritual Leadership, Chicago: Moody Press, 1967.)

Paul

The concept of team ministry grows from strong biblical roots under the leadership of the apostle Paul. Paul taught a plurality of leaders. Paul and Barnabas ordained elders (in the plural) in every church (Acts 14:23). The elders (plural) of the church at Ephesus were called to meet with Paul (Acts 20:17) and Titus was instructed to appoint elders (plural) in the churches (Titus 1:5). More than evangelism, Paul taught followers that the "basic qualification for spiritual leaders is that they be living demonstrations of the reality of all that they teach!" For Paul leadership was not so much public activity as it was character. Look at the character traits which Paul establishes for team leaders described in Titus 1:5-9, I Timothy 3:1-7, and I Peter 5:1-4.

Christ

In the Gospel of John seven universal symbols are employed to give Christ's perception of His own leader relationships and functions. These passages, often referred to as "I AM" statements, depict the Master's task and relational functions. At least three of these suggest the collective nature of his ministry. In perhaps the favorite symbol Christ poses himself as the "good" shepherd, the leader of the flock of God. It is as undershepherds that we share responsibility for the fold. In this regard the shepherd paradigm offers team ministry the strong expectation of mutual accountability.

PHILOSOPHY

PHILOSOPHY OF MINISTRY

(Explanation)

DEFINITION: Philosophy of ministry is a particular system of principles and values which undergird every mission, plan, goal, and program in the church.

- RATIONALE:
1. This is the foundation on which the structure of the church is built.
 2. Here are the values which guide growth.
 3. Without a biblical philosophy the church becomes a fallen leaf blowing in the wind.

PHILOSOPHY OF MINISTRY

(Illustration)

A caring church surrounded by unchurched individuals and families who need radical spiritual change in their lives, must field many cooperative undershepherds with a vision for souls.

By the nature of their heritage Nazarene Christians own a Shepherd-anointed task of carrying out the Great Commission through patterning and teaching the Shepherd's sinless life.

The Good Shepherd model suggests for the sheep:

- growing in reverent submission to Him;
- accepting His Word as authority;
- placing strong emphasis upon forgiving love;
- using individual gifts and responsibilities.

Christ informs us regarding relationships to him: "I am the Good Shepherd; and I know my sheep, and am known by my own. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me" (John 10:14,27).

PHILOSOPHY OF MINISTRY

(Application)

Steps to developing a philosophy of ministry:

- A. Name three biblical directives you value.

- B. Site three biblical models you would emulate.

- C. List three historical distinctives of your church.

- D. Integrate these principles into two or three paragraphs as a philosophy of ministry.

MISSION

MISSION STATEMENT

(Explanation)

DEFINITION: A Mission Statement provides clear and concise explanation for the existence of the Church, giving identity and purpose to the ministry.

- RATIONALE:
1. It gives identity to the group.
 2. It offers a purpose for existence.
 3. It unifies the outlook of the people.
 4. It supplies a basis for planning priorities.
 5. It prevents waste of time.
 6. It heightens probability of success.
 7. It improves morale.
 8. It focuses ministry.

MISSION STATEMENT

(Illustration)

Skyline Wesleyan Church
Lemon Grove, CA.

"As a dynamic church proclaiming the Word of God we purpose to make disciples of Christ by:

- exalting God
- encouraging Christians toward spiritual maturity
- equipping Christians for ministry
- evangelizing the world for Christ."

Church of the Nazarene
Fairview Village, PA.

"To lift up Christ so that the lost sinner will be saved, the believer sanctified through and through and the people of God disciplined and equipped to do the work of the ministry."

First Church of the Nazarene
Pasadena, CA.

"We are a caring community endeavoring to know Christ, and to make Him known...in our neighborhood and to all the world through teaching, worship, and fellowship -- by the power of the Holy Spirit."

First Church of the Nazarene
South Bend, IN.

Our Mission:

- (1) to glorify Christ in worship, prayer, and faith;
- (2) to disciple people in holiness of heart and life;
- (3) to equip His people for ministry to spiritual needs in the church, the community, and the world.

MISSION STATEMENT

(Application)

Steps to Developing a Mission Statement:

- A. Study some biblical injunctives which give direction to the Church.
 - 1. Matthew 28:19-21
 - 2. Acts 1:8
 - 3. Ephesians 2:1-9
 - 4. Luke 14:12-23

- B. What should be one of the main functions of our congregation at this location?

- C. What philosophy of ministry empowers us?

- D. In light of these premises, write a statement of approximately twenty-five words which accurately describes the mission of our church.

BUILDING TEAM MINISTRY
THROUGH
LEADERSHIP SKILLS

BUILDING TEAM MINISTRY
THROUGH
LEADERSHIP SKILLS

Two critical tools implement the development of leadership skills for team ministry. These are (1) role descriptions for team members and (2) a planning process for growth.

An initial requirement for team ministry is the establishment of expectations for the team members. What does the pastor expect of the board? What desires does the board hold for the pastor? What do they foresee from their own action as a team? From these expectations, job descriptions can be generated.

With team identity in order the process of planning begins. First is the functional type of planning which includes a philosophy of ministry, a mission statement, and an assessment of strengths. As these are clarified, strategic planning of goals and objectives follows.

TEAM PLANNING: ASSESSMENT

TEAM PLANNING

(Assessment Explanation)

DEFINITION: Team planning consists of identifying an overall purpose, assessing present abilities and needs, defining the activities to be performed, carrying them out, and evaluating the results.

An assessment measures the present strengths, opportunities, obstacles, and priorities of the team.

RATIONALE: Team ministry builds on planning with God-given strengths and opportunities. Priorities are prayerfully set in light of that knowledge.

TEAM PLANNING

(Assessment Illustration)

STRENGTHS

Beliefs
Desire to reach out
Good/friendly people
Varied age groups
New building

OPPORTUNITIES

New location
Full service church
New ministries
Teamwork
Win new people

OBSTACLES

Too many on fringe
Not dynamic enough
No plan
Time
Finding agreement
Self-esteem
Comfort zone
Finances
Too much to do

PRIORITIES

Total involvement
Better organization
Holiness message
Scripture-based (#1)
Nurturing (#3)
Youth
Needs of people (#2)
Winning people
Attracting people

TEAM PLANNING

(Assessment Application)

STRENGTHS

OPPORTUNITIES

OBSTACLES

PRIORITIES

TEAM PLANNING:
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

TEAM PLANNING

(Goals and Objectives Explanation)

DEFINITION: A goal is a positive statement, usually beginning with "To" which accomplishes the need expressed. An objective is more specific than a goal and always measurable. It is a task to be done as a step toward the attainment of the goal. Usually it takes several objectives to fulfill a goal.

RATIONALE: Planning with goals and objectives provides

1. a sense of purpose;
2. relevancy to the world;
3. unity of concern;
4. increased motivation;
5. stewardship of resources;
6. goal achievement;
7. sound organization;
8. accurate evaluation.¹

¹ Lyle B. Pointer, "Pastor As Planner," Fashioning Leadership Authority for Mission Engagement, (Distributed by the Department of Pastoral Ministries, Church of the Nazarene).

TEAM PLANNING

(Goals and Objectives Illustration)

GOAL ONE: To establish a scripture-base for everything done in the church from administration to programming.

OBJECTIVE: Prepare a sermon which offers biblical reasons for new programming and present it prior to the initiation of that program.

OBJECTIVE: Put together a manual for use by the church ministry team which gives the scriptural basis for ministry.

OBJECTIVE: Require each program leader to develop a written statement of the biblical models for that program.

GOAL TWO: To plan ministry oriented to meet specific spiritual, social and physical needs.

OBJECTIVE: Ask the Outreach committee to list specific needs characteristic of families within the target area.

OBJECTIVE: Design a ministry request sheet which specifies the target group, the need to be met, the biblical basis for the ministry, and the plan for meeting the need including calendar projections.

TEAM PLANNING

(Goals and Objectives Application)

STEP ONE Identification of Needs

In light of the mission statement, identify two needs which must be met in order to fulfill the purpose:

- 1.
- 2.

STEP TWO Formulation of Goals

Write two goals whose fulfillment will enable the resolution of the needs listed:

- 1.
- 2.

STEP THREE Establishing Objectives

List several measurable objectives for each of the given goals:

GOAL ONE -

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

GOAL TWO -

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

NAME _____

DATE _____

TEAM MEMBER ROLES:
EXPECTATIONS

TEAM MEMBER ROLES

(Expectations Explanation)

DEFINITION: Expectations are what others think persons with a given responsibility will do. Expectations vary person to person. Clarity and unity of expectations is absolutely necessary both for job performance and evaluation.

RATIONALE: Experience serves as the primary shaper of expectations. What one see in others, one often expects from oneself. Past service on boards affects expectations of present board participation. Previous pastors prepare a church to expect a particular behavior from the current pastoral leadership. This may be good or bad. Hopefully, the greatest influence will come from the person of Christ. What does He expect of the ministry team? Scripture provides a filter for identifying Christ's expectations and for measuring personal ones. Likewise, the Holy Spirit serves as a counselor for the development of expectations for church leadership.

TEAM MEMBER ROLES

(Expectations Illustrated)

CHURCH OF TEAM

To be role models in attendance, attitude, godliness.

To adhere to the stated mission and goals of the church.

To give strong leadership through broad representation, responsible stewardship, thorough planning, solid resource management and competent performance.

To make a firm commitment to the congregation by way of consistent communication, denominational cooperation, development of adequate policies and guide lines.

To practice integrity evidenced by support of board decisions, respect for the work of committees, confidence in work and intelligence of associates on the board.

To exhibit a team spirit marked with cooperation, trust, willingness to work, and encouragement.

BOARD OF PASTOR

To conduct his/her personal life in an exemplary fashion as manifested by dress in public, loving nurture for family, and appropriate use of time.

To preach evangelistic messages from Old and New Testaments which reveal careful preparation as well as proper presentation.

To lead warm, welcoming worship services by means of exciting music, carefully planned bulletins, different personnel, uplifting prayer, and appropriate scripture.

To provide pastoral care through visitation and counseling in a willing, resourceful, loving, scriptural manner.

To work for church growth by teaching and practicing sound growth principles and requiring the same of staff.

To provide leadership in administrative and outreach areas at both local and district levels.

To encourage team ministry at the church board level exemplified by regular and total participation, mutual trust, individual support, which results in confidence and God-fearing action.

PASTOR OF BOARD

To display the Fruits of the Spirit: "Love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, self-control. and walking in the Spirit."

To be sanctified and filled with the Holy Spirit.

To attend all meetings of the Board and be on time.

To be faithful in attendance at the regular services of the church.

To be spiritual leaders and model a consistent daily devotional life, maintain and uphold the standards of the church, and assist during altar appeal with seekers.

To practice storehouse tithing.

To maintain the integrity of the board by respecting confidential business and supporting actions of the board.

To exhibit a team spirit through participation in Board discussions, voting on all issues, working together to carry out the decisions of the ministry team.

TEAM MEMBER ROLES

(Expectations Application)

With careful thought and prayer, write on the worksheet some basic expectations for each category. At the next board session these will be compiled and evaluated in order to create a list of expectations for the leadership team.

I. What does the church have a right to expect of the leadership team?

II. What does the church board have a right to expect from the pastor?

III. What does the pastor have a right to expect from the church board?

TEAM MEMBER ROLES :
JOB DESCRIPTIONS

TEAM MEMBER ROLES

(Job Description Explanation)

DEFINITION: Roles grow out of expectations. The roles of team members include specific assignments for which that individual is responsible and held accountable.

RATIONALE: Some duties are very clear and when delegated to one individual can be discharged from the concerns of all other leadership personnel. Team member job descriptions serve to define given duties but are not comprehensive. One role every team member assumes is that of assisting wherever and whenever needs arise.

TEAM MEMBER ROLES

(Job Description Illustration for Church Board Team Member)

PRINCIPLE FUNCTION:

- to secure support staff other than the pastor;
- to supervise the expenditure of the approved current congregational budget;
- to prepare the proposed budget;
- to appoint an audit committee annually;
- to review annually the salary of the pastor(s);
- to be responsible for the upkeep of the buildings and premises of the parish;
- to supervise the work and meetings of the standing committees;
- to exercise congregational discipline in accordance with the constitution;
- to review and evaluate the total work and mission of the congregation;
- to choose or elect delegates to meetings and appoint representatives to related groups or bodies.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

A. The church board team coordinates the work and planning of the various committees and task forces with the congregation.

B. The church board team deliberates on the strengths and weaknesses of various proposals and weighs the merits of various programs that carry out the mission of the local congregation.

C. The church board team manages the resources of the congregation and exercises good stewardship of financial assets, as well as of people and talents.

D. The church board team plans for the current year and is attentive to long-range planning for the well-being of the congregation and its effectiveness in mission.

E. The church board team leads in taking bold steps for the sake of the gospel and strives to be a pioneer church in staking out new territory for exciting ventures of faith active in love.

The call to serve as a church board team leader is a call to excellence. Be assured that the Holy Spirit empowers God-pleasing ministries and adventures in mission that take the gospel into the world and build up the body of Christ.²

² Adapted. Paul S. Fransen, Effective Church Councils: Leadership Styles and Decision-making in the Church, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985) 18.

TEAM MEMBER ROLES

(Job Description Illustration for Pastor)

PRINCIPLE FUNCTION:

- to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ;
- to teach the biblical truths;
- to engage in pastoral care of the congregation;
- to provide administrative leadership in all areas of church life;
- to act as administrator of the paid staff.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Oversee the programs of Sunday School, Morning Worship, Sunday Evening service, and Wednesday service.
2. Lead the church in an effective program of witnessing and in a caring ministry for persons in the church and community.
3. Visit members and prospects.
4. Provide counseling sessions as needed, perform wedding ceremonies, conduct funerals.
5. Serve as chairman of the church board team, leading them in planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and evaluating the total program of the church.
6. Serve as ex-officio member of all committees with the intent of giving support, training, and accountability to them.
7. Cooperate with local, district, and denominational leaders in matters of mutual interest and concern; keep the church informed of action in these areas, and represent the church in civic matters.
8. Further responsibilities as required by the Church of the Nazarene are described in the MANUAL, paragraphs 114-133.

REMUNERATION:

1. The pastor's weekly salary and benefits package shall be _____ . All expenses shall be drawn from this amount including housing, insurance for the family, and social security. Health and accident insurance are provided through the district.
2. Vacation time shall be granted in line with the district recommendation provided in the district journal and approved by the local church board team.
3. A personal day off is to be taken on a regular weekly basis.
4. One revival week per year will be granted.
5. Time away for one seminar will be granted (not to include Sunday).

TEAM MEMBER ROLES

(Job Description Application)

Two job descriptions are required for team ministry - one for the church board team member and one for the pastor team member. Each of these should follow the same format of principle function and responsibilities. For the paid team member(s) a remuneration section is necessary.

PRINCIPLE FUNCTION:

Church Board Team Member

Pastor Team Member

RESPONSIBILITIES:

Church Board Team Member

Pastor Team Member

REMUNERATION:

Pastor Team Member

TEAM MINISTRY
LEADERSHIP AND INTEGRITY

TEAM MINISTRY
LEADERSHIP AND INTEGRITY

Team ministry effectiveness can happen only as the integrity of the members appears with clarity and distinction. Evaluations and covenants prove the trustworthiness of the team participants. As the team establishes mutual trust and respect among its members, it takes on a firm identity before the congregation. Confidence increases and leadership occurs.

EVALUATIONS

EVALUATIONS

(Explanation)

DEFINITION: An evaluation serves as a candid and precise tool for measuring the effectiveness of a person, plan, or instrument.

RATIONALE: Evaluation is essential to all planning. When based upon the expectations and job descriptions, evaluations determine whether or not one fulfills his/her role and/or if that role description is adequate or needs to be changed. Team Ministry especially benefits by the evaluation of the Manual and the participant team members.

EVALUATIONS

(Illustration)

CHURCH BOARD TEAM EVALUATION

Circle the number at the right which best measures the degree of excellence you find in the descriptive phrase or statement concerning the Church Board Team.

- 1 - Poor
- 3 - Average
- 5 - Exceptional

I. ROLE MODELS

- A. Attends meetings faithfully. 1 2 3 4 5
- B. Evidences personal spiritual growth. 1 2 3 4 5
- C. Leads the way in bold faith ventures. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

II. DEPENDABILITY

- A. Supports denominational ideals. 1 2 3 4 5
- B. Adheres to stated local mission goals. 1 2 3 4 5
- C. Represents the congregation. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

III. LEADERSHIP

- A. Plans conceptually, functionally, and strategically. 1 2 3 4 5
- B. Builds on congregational strengths. 1 2 3 4 5
- C. Manages resources carefully. 1 2 3 4 5
- D. Works to develop strong team skills. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

IV. COMMITMENT

- A. To congregational communication. 1 2 3 4 5
- B. To biblical understanding and salvation. 1 2 3 4 5
- C. To team unity and cooperation. 1 2 3 4 5
- D. To follow through on policies/programs. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

V. INTEGRITY

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Respects individual positions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. | Keeps confidentiality of private issues. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. | Accepts final decisions of the team. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. | Holds committees accountable. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. | Nurtures individual roles and gifts of
team members. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

COMMENTS:

VI. TEAM SPIRIT

- | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. | Cooperative. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. | Trustworthy. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. | Willing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. | Encouraging. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

COMMENTS:

NAME: _____

DATE: _____

EVALUATOR: _____

EVALUATIONS

(Illustration)

Circle the number at the right which best measures the degree of excellence you find in the descriptive phrase or statement concerning the Pastor.

PASTORAL EVALUATION FORM

1 - Poor 3 - Average 5 - Exceptional

I. PERSONAL LIFE

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. Proper in conduct in public. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. Presentable in dress and conversation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. Punctual for commitments. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. Exemplary in devotional life. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. Loving toward family. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. Disciplined in time usage. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

COMMENTS:

II. PREACHING

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. Maintains spiritual quality. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. Shows considerable preparation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. Preaches from variety of texts and styles. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. Preaches evangelistically. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. Uses both Old and New Testaments. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. Enunciates clearly and projects strongly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

COMMENTS:

III. WORSHIP

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. Worship services lift up Christ. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. Services show warmth and welcome. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. Music is used well. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. Bulletin is carefully planned. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. Different people involved in services. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. Prayer and Scripture appropriately used. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

COMMENTS:

IV. PASTORAL CARE

- | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. Regular visitor. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. Available for counsel. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. Willing to listen. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. Resourceful in preparation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. Caring toward troubled persons. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. Scriptural in dealing with issues. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

COMMENTS:

V. CHURCH GROWTH

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. Teaches growth principles. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. Uses tools by which to measure growth. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. Identifies objectives and goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. Keeps abreast of trends and procedures. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. Requires staff to practice growth laws. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. Seeks quality as well as quantity. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

COMMENTS:

VI. ADMINISTRATION

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. Management of the church office. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| B. Supervision over staff members. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| C. Involvement in district and zone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| D. Leadership on boards and committees. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| E. Fulfillment of responsibilities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| F. Careful and thorough in work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

COMMENTS:

NAME: _____

DATE: _____

EVALUATOR: _____

EVALUATIONS

(Illustration)

TEAM MANUAL EVALUATION FORM

Circle the number at the right which best measures the degree of excellence you find in the descriptive phrase or statement concerning the Manual.

1 - Poor 3 - Average 5 - Exceptional

- | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. | It maintains the focus of team ministry. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| II. | It is more a team training workbook than textbook. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| III. | It presents material simply and clearly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| IV. | The Manual looseleaf format is easy to use. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| V. | The 8 1/2 x 11 format is adequate. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| VI. | The contents are quickly identifiable. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| VII. | The sections are easily accessible. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| VIII. | The notebook is readily adaptable to additions and/or deletions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| IX. | The material covers the topic. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| X. | Rate each section based on its relative value to the entire Manual. | | | | | |
| | 1. Introduction | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | 2. Biblical Premis | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | 3. Leadership Skills | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | 4. Integrity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | 5. Helps | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

COMMENTS:

EVALUATOR'S NAME _____

DATE _____

EVALUATIONS

(Applications)

Here are several things to keep in mind as you develop this evaluation tool. Probably, Church Board Team members will complete this form for the purpose of knowing themselves better as a team and in order to identify areas wherein they can operate more effectively. Also, evaluations need a standard against which they can be measured. In this case the standards are the expectations and job description of the Church Board Team.

Select the major areas through which the Team ministers. Break each area into related categories. Various rating scales can be designed: numerical, word completion, multiple choice responses, or comments.

The evaluator's name and the date play a critical part in an evaluation. In knowing the evaluator, some judgement of his/her qualifications to evaluate can be made. The evaluation date gives critical association to a specific time or issue.

COVENANT

COVENANT

(Explanation)

DEFINITION: A covenant exists when two parties agree to serve each other based on given conditions and record the terms of the agreement.

RATIONALE: A mutual commitment of trust provides focus and accountability in the context of a signed covenant. Some advantages are:

- a covenant identifies expectations and priorities;
- a covenant clearly communicates the terms;
- a covenant establishes a unique relationship;
- a covenant offers two-way participation;
- a covenant increases commitment;
- a covenant improves accountability.

COVENANT

(Illustration)

A covenant document between members of the church board team at South Bend First Church of the Nazarene.

PRESENTER

The congregation of people named South Bend First Church of the Nazarene, having called and elected you to serve as the Church Board Leadership Team, ask all of you to covenant together for effective, life-changing ministry to the community in which you serve. Carefully read and sign the following agreement for the church year 1990-91.

COVENANT

I. We, the Church Board Leadership Team, in obedience to Christ's Great Commission and to the call and election of South Bend First Church of the Nazarene, do agree to pursue the following mission mandate:

1. to glorify Christ in worship, prayer, and faith;
2. to disciple people in holiness of heart and life;
3. to equip God's people for ministry to spiritual needs in the church, the community, and the world.

II. We also give public acknowledgement of our commitment to live as servant-shepherds under the guidance of the Good Shepherd by:

- submitting to His leadership;
- accepting His Word as authority;
- emphasizing forgiving love;
- using individual gifts.

III. God helping us, our specific focus for this current church year will be the following priorities:

1. To base every plan and program upon the scripture, especially as it speaks to us about living holy lives.
2. To direct attention to the spiritual, physical, and mental needs of persons with whom we minister.
3. To offer spiritual nurture to persons of all ages as we grow together in Christ.

To this end we covenant together.

Pastor Team Member

Board Team Member

COVENANT

(Application)

A COVENANT DOCUMENT BETWEEN

and

PRESENTER

(Carefully read and sign the following agreement for the church year _____.)

COVENANT

I. We, _____

and

do agree to pursue the following mission mandate:

HELPS

HELPS

HELPS FOR THE TEAM

Suggestions for a Better Meeting

Evaluation of Ministry Team Meeting

HELPS FOR PLANNING

Kinds of Planning

Planning Model

HELPS FOR MISSION STATEMENTS

Scripture Passages

HELPS FOR THE TEAM

(Suggestions for a Better Meeting)

1. ATTENDANCE

- a) We have a responsibility to the church who elected us to represent them at every meeting.
- b) We owe it to our team to be faithful to them at every session. One absentee and the team is incomplete.
- c) We train others regarding the importance of Christ and His church when we allow it a place of priority in our lives.

2. PHILOSOPHY

The church exists for the salvation and sanctification of sinners. As a church board team we are responsible by all the gifts and skills we possess and the enablement of the Holy Spirit to remove obstacles that prohibit this.

3. OPERATION

- a) We operate from a committee system of five:
Pastoral Staff
Building and Grounds
Church Life
Education
Finance.

Each team member is expected to serve on one of these standing committees.

- b) Each committee reports at monthly meetings along with the secretary, the treasurer, and the three department heads: NYI, NWMS, SS.

- c) Monthly meetings take place on Monday after the first Sunday except when the Sunday occurs early in the month. These will be announced. Meeting time is 6:30 p.m.

- d) With ten reports at every monthly meeting it becomes imperative that they be kept brief. An acceptable goal is ten minutes per report, giving us a meeting length of approximately two hours (includes ten minutes for pastor's team equipping session).

4. MOTIONS

a) Motions come to the church board team by way of recommendations from the pastoral staff or committees.

b) Contents of the motion are extremely important. Each one ought to contain these five elements:

- WHAT action is sought;
- HOW will this action develop (cost, method);
- WHEN will this action be completed;
- WHO is responsible for the action;
- WHERE does the action take place.

5. DISCUSSION

a) Having a say is more important than having your way.

b) People can love and respect each other while still rejecting individual ideas.

c) Never keep silent in a meeting on an issue that won't be kept silent at home.

d) A majority vote is a strong indication of God's will for us at this time.

(Copied from Leadership Magazine)

"YOU CANNOT BECOME WHAT YOU NEED TO BE UNTIL
YOU CHANGE FROM WHAT YOU ARE."

EVALUATION OF THE CHURCH BOARD TEAM MEETING

1. What aspect of our sessions did you find most helpful?
2. What aspect did you find least helpful?
3. How can staff and committee reports be improved?
4. Give suggestions for better usage of meeting time?
5. On critical and sometimes divisive issues, open discussion is encouraged. Give suggestions for involving every team member.
6. Further comments:

NAME _____

HELPS FOR PLANNING

KINDS OF PLANNING

1. Three kinds of planning are commonly identified:
 - a) conceptual - mission/purpose;
 - b) strategic - long range (3-5 years);
 - c) functional - short range (1-2 years).

2. Remember - purpose guides planning;
- planning suggests programs;
- programs motivate people.

PLANNING MODEL

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| LEVEL ONE | - pray, dream, seek God's direction; |
| LEVEL TWO | - explore options, assess opportunities,
set goals; |
| LEVEL THREE | - decide on priorities and programs; |
| LEVEL FOUR | - implement; |
| LEVEL FIVE | - evaluate; |
| LEVEL SIX | - celebrate. |

HELPS FOR MISSION STATEMENTS

SCRIPTURES IMPACTING MISSION

Isaiah 1:1-20	Acts 14:27
Matthew 16	I Corinthians 13
Matthew 18:18-20	Ephesians 1:23; 2:22; 5:25
Matthew 26:26-29	Colossians 1:2,18
Matthew 28	I Thessalonians 2:12
Mark 11:24,26	I Timothy 6:17-19
Mark 16:16	Titus 1:9-13
Luke 4:16-19	Titus 2:14
John 2:21	Titus 3:1, 8, 14
John 20:21-22	Hebrews 9:12
Acts 1:1-14	James 1:17-27
Acts 2:42	I Peter 1:1-25
Acts 12:5,12	I Peter 2:4-10

APPENDIX B

Tables

TABLE ONE: Leadership Types

LEADERSHIP TYPES		
MODELS	CHARACTERISTICS	TITLE
Community	Unity	Minister
Kerygmatic	Proclamation	Preacher
Institutional	Structure	Clergy
Sacramental	Witness	Priest
Servant	Transformation	Pastor

Avery Dulles - "The Church somehow exists, like a dark continent, ready-made and waiting to be mapped."

TABLE TWO: Classical Leadership Styles and Models

CLASSICAL LEADERSHIP STYLES AND MODELS			
STYLES		MODELS	
NAME	DESCRIPTION	SCHALLER	LINDGREN
Autocratic	Directive	Hierarchical	Patrimonial
Bureaucratic	Directive/ participative	Representative	Bureaucratic
Democratic	Participative	Non-directive	Democratic
Laissez- faire	Non-directive	Motivational	Intuitive
	Charismatic		Organic

TABLE THREE: Contingency Leadership Styles and Models

CONTINGENCY LEADERSHIP STYLES AND MODELS			
STYLES		MODELS	
NAME	DESCRIPTION	SWAIN	HERSEY
Directing	Instructive	Sovereign	Telling
Coaching	Participative	Parallel	Selling
Supporting	Facilitative	Semimutual	Participating
Delegating	Subordinative	Mutual	Delegating

TABLE FOUR: Complimentary Leadership Styles and Models

COMPLIMENTARY LEADERSHIP STYLES AND MODELS					
STYLES		MODELS			
NAME	DESCRIPTION	LAHAYE	BOLTON	DALE	DISC
Temperamental	Leadership largely determined by the temperament of the individual	Choleric	Driver	Commander	Dominance
		Sanguine	Expressive	Catalyst	Influencing
		Melancholy	Amiable	Encourager	Steadiness
		Phlegmatic	Analytical	Hermit	Compliance
Psychological	Leadership influenced by the way one relates to circumstances	MYERS-BRIGGS	BARBER	BURNS	*****
		Direct/Indirect	Active/Negative	transforma-	
		Facts/Feeling	Active/Positive		
		Introvert/Extrovert	Passive/Positive	Transaction-	
		Judgment/Perception	Passive/Negative		

TABLE FIVE: Ministry Types

MINISTRY TYPES		
DOMINANT	Commander Pastor	Supportive laity
PASSIVE	Figurehead Pastor	Dominant laity
INTEGRATED	Servant Pastor	Servant laity

TABLE SIX: Resources for Spiritual Gift Inventories

1. Kenneth Cain Kinghorn. Discovering Your Spiritual Gifts. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House. 1981.

2. Modified Houts Questionnaire
Fuller Institute
P.O. Box 989
Pasadena, CA. 91102.

3. Spiritual Gifts Inventory
Church Growth Institute
P.O. Box 4404
Lynchburg, VA. 24502.

4. Personal Profile System
Performax Systems International
12755 State Highway 55
Minneapolis, MN. 55441.

TABLE SEVEN: Committee Responsibilities
 South Bend First Church of the Nazarene

BUILDING AND GROUNDS

Building Repairs
 Maintenance
 Improvements
 Property purchase
 Real Estate
 Furnishing and fixtures
 Equipment
 Grounds maintenance
 Parking lots
 Custodial services
 Remodeling and expansion
 Church office
 Vehicle maintenance

EDUCATION

Policy matters relating to
 Sunday School
 Nazarene Youth
 Nazarene World Mission
 Youth ministry
 Men's/Women's Ministries
 Sports and recreation
 Bible study groups
 Bus ministry
 Nursery
 Children's Church
 Vacation Bible School
 Christian Lay Training
 Audio-visual Aids
 Media center and library
 Adult ministries
 Children ministries
 Home missions
 Visitation

CHURCH LIFE

Staff supervision
Public service
Building and equipment use
Spiritual welfare
Evangelism and revivals
Pulpit supply
Music program
Communion
Ushers and greeters
Advertising
Church social life
Policy
Membership

FINANCE

Staff and employee salaries
Benefits and annuities
Offering counters
Public appeals
Stewardship
Budgets
Authorizations
Auditing
Accounting procedures
Tax records
Insurance

APPENDIX C

Time Line

- 1919 Organization of SBF.
- 1947 Church called Rev. K.V. Bateman to pastor.
- 1964 Rev. Steve Gladding graduated from Olivet College.
- 1968 Rev. Gladding graduated from Nazarene Seminary.
- 1978 Rev. Bateman retired. Church called Rev. Carlton Hanson.
- 1982 Rev. Hanson resigned. Church called Rev. Robert Clark.
- 1983 Rev. Clark resigned. Church called Rev. Steve Gladding.
- 1988 (April) Church board meeting when differences in functional priorities were recognized.
- (June) Rev. Gladding began D.Min program at Asbury Seminary. Began new policy for election of board members, two years on board followed by mandatory one year lay off.
- SBF bought fifteen acres for relocation.
- 1989 (Spring) Rev. Gladding read impressive articles by Drucher and Fairbanks.
- (June) General Assembly of the Church of the Nazarene did away with the biennial pastoral recall vote.
- (Fall) Negotiations for sale of Colfax property.

- 1990 (January) SBF began sharing the Colfax building
1990 with the Unity group who purchased it.
Pastor Gladding began an intensive reading
program in preparation for the Manual
project.
- (March) Rev. Gladding began eight monthly meetings
with the CRG group and the church board team
in order to compile the Manual.
- (April) Rev. Gladding made an informal survey of
pastors at the annual district pastors and
wives retreat. The topic was the greatest
need in the Nazarene church.
- (May) Meeting of the Sunday School class at which
time Rev. Gladding recognized differences in
functional priorities between himself and the
people.
- (October) Planning seminar.
- 1991 (February) SBF moved to new facilities on Ironwood

Works Cited

- "Administration" and "Ministry." Webster's New World Dictionary. College Edition, 1960.
- Albanese, Robert. Managing: Toward Accountability for Performance. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1981.
- Barham, Kevin and Clive Rassam. Shaping the Corporate Future. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Barna, George. "Trends." Grace Theological Seminary. Winona Lake: 24 Oct. 1991.
- . "Who Is Our Target Market?" Grace Theological Seminary. Winona Lake: 24 Oct. 1991.
- Bass, Bernard M. Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960.
- Bellah, Robert N. Habits of the Heart. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Bennis, Warren. "Why Leaders Can't Lead." Training & Development Journal (April 1989): 35-39.
- Bennis, Warren., and Burt Nanus. Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Burns, James MacGregor. Leadership. New York: Harper and Row, 1979.
- Carlberg, R. Judson. "Is New Leadership Required?" Faculty Dialogue. Portland: Institute for Christian Leadership, Fall 1989.
- Church of the Nazarene. Manual. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1989.
- Clark, Steven B. Building Christian Communities. Notre Dame: Ave Maria Press, 1972.
- Collins, Kenneth J. "John Wesley's Concept of the Ministerial Office." Wesleyan Theological Journal, 23 (1988): 118.
- Drucker, Peter. "Managing to Minister." Leadership, (Spring 1989): 14-22.
- Drucker, Peter. The Effective Executive. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

- Duewel, Wesley L. Ablaze For God. Grand Rapids: Francis Asbury Press, 1989.
- Dulles, Avery. Models of the Church. Garden City: Image Books, 1974.
- Elliott, Grace. How to Help Groups Make Decisions. New York: Association, 1959.
- Engstrom, Ted W. The Making of a Christian Leader. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976.
- Fairbanks, LeBron. "Servant Leadership for a Servant Community." The Preacher's Magazine, March/April/May 1990: 39.
- Fishburn, Janet F. and Neill Q. Hamilton. "What Makes--and Sustains--an Effective Ministry?" Quarterly Review, 9, no. 1 (1989): 63-77.
- Fransen, Paul S. Effective Church Councils: Leadership Styles and Decision-making in the Church. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985.
- Gardner, John. The Heart of the Matter: Lear-Constituent Interaction. Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector, 1986.
- Getz, Gene. Sharpening the Focus of the Church. Chicago: Moody Press, 1974.
- Gitlin, Todd. Inside Prime Time. New York: Pantheon, 1983.
- Greenleaf, Robert K. Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.
- Greenslade, Philip. Leadership, Greatness & Servanthood. Minneapolis: Bethany Publishing House, 1984.
- Hendrix, Olan. Management for Christian Leaders. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Hersey, Dr. Paul. The Situational Leader. New York: Warner Books, Inc., 1984.
- Hope, Glenda. "Revisioning Seminary as Ministry-Centered." The Christian Century, 1 Feb. 1989: 109-111.
- Jacobsen, Wally D. Power and Interpersonal Relations. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc. 1972.

- Jones, Bruce W. Ministerial Leadership in a Managerial World. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1988.
- Keating, Charles J. The Leadership Book. New York: Paulist Press, 1978.
- Kinlaw, Dennis F. "Pictures of Servanthood." Asbury Herald, Summer 1990: 10.
- Kouzes, James M. and Barry Z. Posner. "The Leadership Challenge." The Toastmaster, April 1990: 16-18.
- Kuhn, Hans. Infallible? London: Collins, 1971.
- Lightfoot, R.H. St. John's Gospel. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Lindgren, Alvin J. Foundations For Purposeful Church Administration. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- Lindgren, Alvin J. and Norman Shawchuck. Let My People Go. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1980.
- . Management for Your Church. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1977.
- McKenna, David L. Power to Follow, Grace to Lead. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1989.
- Means, James E. Leadership in Christian Ministry. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989.
- Naisbitt, John. Megatrends. New York: Warner Books, 1982.
- Nouwen, Henri J.M. Creative Ministry. Los Angeles: Doubleday, 1972.
- . In the Name of Jesus. New York: Crossroad, 1989.
- Oden, Thomas C. Becoming a Minister. New York: Crossroads, 1987.
- O'Grady, Colin. The Church in the Theology of Karl Barth. Washington: Corpus Boods, 1968.
- Oreskes, Michael. "Is Youthful Indifference Careless or Care Less?" South Bend Tribune, 28 June 1990: 1.
- Packard, Vance. Hidden Persuaders. New York: David McKay, 1957.

- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. Theology and the Kingdom of God. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969.
- Parrott, Leslie. "How Church Size Impacts Organizational Structure and Management." Remarks presented April 3, 1989.
- Pointer, Lyle B. "Pastor As Planner." Fashioning Leadership Authority for Mission Engagement. (Distributed by the Department of Pastoral Ministries, Church of the Nazarene.)
- Richards, Lawrence O. and Clyde Hoeldtke. Church Leadership: Following the Example of Jesus Christ. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980.
- Rountree, Paul Clifford. The Pastoral Calling. Great Fish, N.Y.: Channel Press, 1961.
- Sanders, J. Oswald. Spiritual Leadership. Chicago: Moody Press, 1967.
- Schaller, Lyle E. The Decision Makers. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974.
- Segler, Franklin M. "Theological Foundations for Ministry." Southwestern Journal of Theology, 37 (1987): 5-18.
- Shawchuck, Norman. How To Be a More Effective Church Leader. Downers Grove: Spiritual Growth Resources, 1981.
- Shawchuck, Norman and Richard L. Olson. "Shifting Denominational Power." Leadership. (Spring 1986) 19-I.
- Stewart, Thomas A. "Turning Around the Lord's Business." Fortune, 25 September 1989: 116-128.
- Stott, John R.W. "Ideals of Pastoral Ministry." Bibliotheca Sacra, (January-March 1989): 3-11.
- Taylor, Richard S. Principles of Pastoral Success. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1989.
- Tillich, Paul. Systematic Theology. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Vol III, 1963.
- Towns, Elmer. America's Fastest Growing Churches. Nashville: Impact, 1972.
- Tread, Ordway. The Art of Administration. New York:

McGraw-Hill, 1951.

Westfall, John F. and Bobbie Reed. Let Go. San Diego:
Single Adult Ministry Associates, 1990.

White, Ernest. "The Crisis in Christian Leadership."
Review and Expositor, 83, no. 4 (1986): 545-557.

Williamson, G.B. Overseers of the Flock. Kansas City:
Beacon Hill Press, 1952.

Wright, Walter C., Jr. "Renewal: An Antidote for Entropy."
Crux, December 1988: 2-5.

Yeager, Richard et al. "A Manual for the Administrative
Board on Developing and Evaluating an Effective
Ministry." Produced by Division of Ordained Ministry,
Board of Higher Education and Ministry, The United
Methodist Church, 1987.

Yaeger, William E. Who's Holding the Umbrella? Nashville:
Thomas Nelson, 1984.

Young, Doyle L. New Life for Your Church. Grand Rapids:
Baker Book House, 1989.

Zaleznik, Abraham. Human Dilemmas of Leadership. New York:
Harper and Row, 1966.

