

STEWARD LEADERSHIP AMONG CHRISTIAN LEADERS
OF FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

A Dissertation
Presented To
The Faculty of
Tennessee Temple University

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

By
Howard C. Rich III

April 2012

STEWARD LEADERSHIP AMONG CHRISTIAN LEADERS
OF FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

by

Howard C. Rich III

Approved:

Committee Chair

Dr. Andrew T. Alexson, Ed.D.

Committee Members

Dr. David C. Edwards, Ph.D.

Dr. Roger H. Stiles, Ed.D

Director, Ph.D. in Leadership Program

Dr. Andrew T. Alexson, Ed.D.

ABSTRACT

The results of this research determined the predominant models of leadership used by Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit organizations, and revealed significant attitudinal relationships existed based on a leader's identification with distinguishable steward leader characteristics. The researcher administered the Christian For-Profit Leader Survey, modified with permission from Wilson's (2010) Christian Nonprofit Leader Survey, to 209 Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit organizations. The survey included eight demographic type questions and five attitudinal questions, containing 58 opinion statements that respondents ranked on a five point Likert-type scale.

This research found servant leadership (80%) was the predominant leadership model used by Christians in senior leadership of for-profit companies. The research revealed a minority (19%) of Christian leaders of for-profit organizations claimed to operate under steward leadership. The study concluded significant attitudinal differences and relationships existed between steward leaders and non-steward leaders based on identifiable steward leader characteristics. A leader's self-identification as a steward leader is a predictor of a leader's attitude toward responsibility, authority, accountability, organizational ownership, and concern for the poor.

This study presented findings that may be useful in future research regarding steward leadership among Christians in for-profit organizations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge several people who contributed to the successful completion of this research project. I would like to thank my wife, Terri, for encouraging and supporting me when I needed it most, for saying yes, and for drawing out the best in me. I thank my children, Amanda and Matthew, for making it so easy to write from home, and for adapting to my work schedule. We joke about how you are the best kids in the world. It is not a joke to me. God has given me the blessing, joy, and responsibility of stewarding some of His gifts, and you two are the most precious of those gifts. Thank you for being two of my greatest cheerleaders.

Dr. Andrew T. Alexson, thank you for guiding me through the dissertation process with such ease. Your personal support and godly advice helped me navigate some rough waters during the doctoral program; you were a lighthouse guiding me around some dangerous rocks. Dr. Edwards and Dr. Stiles, thank you for being a vital part of my committee.

Dr. Susan Twaddle, thank you for working with me through the labyrinth of statistical analysis. You helped me focus and drill down into the survey data, making it much easier to concentrate on answering the research questions.

I would also like to mention a great friend and fellow sojourner, Dr. Matt Argano. You pushed me forward and pulled me upward as we worked through the doctoral program. Your writing and dedication to the program inspired me to work harder. Thank you.

The incredible efforts of Generous Giving, Todd Harper, and the Maclellan Foundation inspired me to spread the message of generous living. Thank you for being my mentors from afar.

I thank Jesus, my savior and owner, for His grace and unwavering care for me. He sets the example for me as a servant, steward, disciple, father, husband, and friend. May I be found a faithful steward.

CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Approval Page.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Contents	vi
Tables.....	ix
Chapter I – Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of the Study	2
Conceptual Framework.....	3
Research Questions.....	4
Definition of Terms.....	5
Situating the Self.....	7
Relevance of the Study	9
Chapter II – Literature Review	11
General Review of Leadership.....	11
General Review of Leadership Motivations	13
General Review of Business as a Force for Good	22
General Review of Ownership and Property in Relation to Christian Faith.....	25
General Review of Steward Leadership Literature.....	28
Literature Review Conclusions.....	34

Chapter III – Methodology	36
Research Design.....	36
Limitations of the Study.....	36
Delimitations of the Study	37
Description of the Population and Sample.....	38
Data Collection	39
Instrumentation	39
Chapter IV – Results.....	42
Purpose of the Study	42
Demographics	43
Research Questions.....	47
Introduction.....	47
Research Question 1	48
Research Question 2	49
Research Question 3	65
Research Question 4	68
Research Question 5	69
Chapter V – Discussion	76
Research Question 1	76
Research Question 2	77
Research Question 3	81
Research Question 4	83
Research Question 5	84

Summary of Discussion 88

 Research Question 1 88

 Research Question 2 88

 Research Question 3 89

 Research Question 4 89

 Research Question 5 89

Recommendations for Future Research 89

Conclusion 91

References..... 93

Appendices..... 103

 Appendix A: Invitation to Participate in Survey..... 103

 Appendix B: Letter Asking for Referrals to Survey 104

 Appendix C: Christian For-Profit Leader Survey 105

TABLES

1. Basic Comparison of Servant Leadership with Steward Leadership.....	9
2. Characteristics of a Steward Leader	32
3. Leadership Titles.....	43
4. Age.....	44
5. Number of Employees under Respondent’s Leadership.....	45
6. Revenue of Organization Led by Survey Participants	46
7. Self-reported Leadership Models.....	48
8. Self-reported Leadership Roles.....	50
9. Part 1: Perceptions of Character	52
10. Part 2: Perceptions of Character	54
11. Part 1: Perceptions of Accountability	56
12. Part 2: Perceptions of Accountability	58
13. Part 1: Perceptions of Responsibility	60
14. Part 2: Perceptions of Responsibility	62
15. Submission Attitudes	64
16. Views of Employee Motivation.....	66
17. Care for Employees.....	67
18. Care for the Poor	68
19. Part 1: Leadership Opinions.....	70
20. Part 2: Leadership Opinions.....	72
21. Part 3: Leadership Opinions.....	75

Chapter I. Introduction

Background

Leadership, just like any other aspect of a Christian's life, is a gift on loan from God intended for use in His Kingdom. Jesus used the Parable of the Talents in Matthew 25:14-30 to illustrate that His people are stewards, not owners. The story was about an owner entrusting resources into the hands of slaves, to be used for the owner, not for the slaves. The slaves were not the owners of the resources, they were managers who will eventually be required to return the resources to the owner. Not only were the resources entrusted to the slaves to manage; the owner expected a return or an increase from the resources. It was not enough to hold onto the resources that were on loan, but it was necessary for the manager to utilize the possessions in ways that increased the estate of the owner; the steward was responsible for developing the assets that the owner had loaned in ways that benefited the owner, not the manager.

Thus, a leader's position and influence is on loan from God. Leaders are His representatives, owning nothing, and controlling nothing. Alcorn (2003) illustrates our lives on earth in terms of a dot and a line. The line represents the continuum of time and the dot represents our time on earth in relation to the line of eternity. Alcorn uses this illustration to demonstrate how foolish it is to lay up treasures on earth when our lives represent such a finite moment in time. He makes the case that by laying up treasures in heaven, through generously investing in others, we are able to use our defined time on earth to influence people for God's Kingdom. Christian leaders have an obligation to steward the leadership influence entrusted to them by God. A leader can make his dot on the line much bigger by influencing as many people as possible for God's Kingdom. As

a leader invests in, equips, empowers, and launches new leaders, the dot on the line of time eternal can be extended beyond the leader's lifetime.

The development of outstanding leadership is essential to the success of any organization. Kouzes and Posner (2007) claimed extraordinary leaders lead by example; they model the way. An indispensable part of modeling the way is clarifying shared values. The leadership style exemplified by the leader will demonstrate to the organization's constituency what is most valued in the culture of the organization.

Statement of the Problem

Responding to organizational demands, personnel development, accountability to stakeholders, and responsibility to the greater community within which the organization operates gives leaders vast opportunities to act as trustees or stewards. Yet, Christian business leaders have largely adopted leadership practices, attitudes, behaviors, and techniques from secular business models, and therefore exhibit leadership styles indiscernible from their non-believing peers (Nash, 1994; Rodin, 2010; Solomon, 2004). How should business leaders influenced and informed from a Christian faith handle leadership responsibilities in connection with their faith in Jesus Christ? Is there a model of leadership that allows the Christian business leader to practice his faith by honoring God in charity, honesty, integrity, service, and humility while still generating a profit?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the predominant models of leadership used by Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit organizations, and to explore whether significant attitudinal relationships existed based on a leader's identification with distinguishable steward leader characteristics.

Within this study, the term senior leadership refers to an individual who is actively leading the organization as owner, Chief Executive Officer, President, Vice President, Director, or through some other recognized business position customarily seen as vital to organizational decision-making.

Conceptual Framework

This project used correlation and descriptive research (Glatthorn & Joyner, 2005) to analyze survey responses and answer the research questions. The findings of this research may contribute to the development of a viable model for Christian leaders of for-profit businesses based not on ownership demands, but on stewardship responsibilities. This may alleviate the tension many Christian business people feel between following religious convictions and the constant drive for stakeholder profits (Green & Schmiesing, 2001).

Contemporary leadership models available to Christian business people are often based on the conviction that owners and stakeholders have rights to the business which often conflict with what might benefit customers, employees, the community at large, and even what might be best for the health of the business (Solomon, 2004). Arthurs and Busenitz (2003) found Agency Theory (Bøhren, 1998; Donaldson & Davis, 1991; Sahlman, 1990; Sapienza & Gupta, 1994) and servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1991; Wong, 2003) greatly influence the methods many business leaders employ as they navigate ownership and personnel issues in the marketplace. Davis, Schoorman, and Donaldson (1997) developed the Stewardship Theory of Management as an alternative to Agency Theory. Olson (2008) found a higher rate of employee satisfaction and engagement in organizations that adopted a stewardship management approach. A model

of steward leadership may help Christian business leaders balance the perceived rights of owners, stakeholders, employees, and the community by realizing the entire organization and process of business is entrusted to their care as a manager (steward), not as the rightful owner.

Research Questions

Five primary questions guided this research:

Research Question 1: What are the predominant models of organizational leadership practiced by Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit organizations?

Research Question 2: Are there differences in attitudes concerning distinguishable steward leadership characteristics between Christians in for-profit organizations who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

Research Question 3: Are there differences in leaders' views of employee motivation between Christian leaders who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

Research Question 4: Is there a difference in leaders' concern for the poor between Christian leaders who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

Research Question 5: Are there differences in the perceptions of stewardship principles (values) between Christian leaders who identify as steward leaders and those who do not?

Definition of Terms

Authoritarian Leadership: This leader is the primary decision maker.

Subordinates have little input into policy or procedures and are expected to carry out the orders of the decision maker without question (Finzel, 2007).

Characteristics: Distinguishing attributes and qualities that are observable and integral to an individual's personality.

Charismatic Leadership: This leader draws people to himself through the power of his personality, and leads due to a sense of exceptional giftedness (Bass, 2008).

Democratic Leadership: Leadership through discussion, consensus, and the sharing of ideas. This leader takes the input of many people or groups and forms the best decision based on free-flowing interaction (Bass, 2008).

For-profit organization: A for-profit organization, often incorporated under various state laws, is any enterprise engaged in commerce with the intent of increasing wealth for stakeholders.

Leadership: Leadership is "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (Northouse, 2007, p. 3).

Owner: The term owner refers to the individual who controls the majority financial interest in the organization, and is actively leading the organization as Chief Executive Officer, President, or through some other recognized business title.

Ownership: The perceived right and legally recognized claim to tangible or intangible objects.

The Poor: Those who lack the resources and material possessions adequate to supply their basic food, shelter, and clothing needs.

Servant Leadership: This leader views himself as a servant first, understanding his primary responsibility as the care of others. Leadership is accomplished by serving the needs of the organization, employees and customers (Greenleaf, 1991).

Situational Leadership: This leader flows between four major types of interaction with followers: he may tell followers exactly what needs to be done, he may explain a situation in an effort to increase a follower's buy-in, he may actually participate in the accomplishment of the task, or he may simply delegate the task to followers he deems responsible (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Stakeholder: A stakeholder is an individual, group, or entity with vested interest in the decisions and activities of a business.

Stewardship: Stewardship is the responsible "management of the property or resources belonging to another in order to achieve the owner's objectives" (Wilson, 2010, p. 15).

Steward Leadership: Valuing everything under his care, this leader understands his position, influence, organization, and resources are on loan, and must be used for the benefit of the rightful owner. This leader gives authority away, empowers, decreases himself so he may increase the value of others, and seeks the highest good of others (Rodin, 2000; Rodin, 2010; Westbrook, 1996; Wilson, 2010).

Team Leadership: Leadership is shared by many people or groups of people, with decisions made by those who are most capable and informed on the subject in question. Leadership is more horizontal than vertical (Northouse, 2007).

Transactional Leadership: Leadership is based on reward or punishment. When employees accomplish goals and are successful they are rewarded. When employees

miss targets and do not reach goals they are reprimanded. The leader/follower relationship is based on giving something of value in return for something of value (Bass, 2008).

Transformational Leadership: Followers are valued for their unique ideas, dreams, and desires. The transformational leader enables followers to grow and develop into whole people. This type of leadership is focused on positive change in followers (Burns, 1978; Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

Situating the Self

Following college, this researcher entered seminary with a great passion to serve the poor of South Central Colorado. After forming a non-profit corporation, he pursued funding through corporate grants to purchase a working cattle ranch in the Saguache valley of Southern Colorado. The ranch would employ people from the surrounding area, and contain a retreat facility for pastors experiencing ministry fatigue. The majority of the cattle raised on the ranch were to be sold, yet some would be butchered, and the meat given to the underprivileged of the community. The sale of livestock and hay would fund the operation of the ranch as well as literacy programs and vocational training for the community.

After the denial of grant proposals, this researcher decided to start a chocolate making business in Denver, Colorado to fund the non-profit. The store was a complete failure, driving him into debt, which took several years to repay. This researcher realized a leader's dream must be the right dream for the right time. Even though his desires were altruistic, he operated under flawed financial guidelines and leadership assumptions, which nearly caused bankruptcy and a ruined witness for Jesus Christ.

This researcher's interest in Christian stewardship, especially related to money and possessions, compelled him to teach several Biblical financial studies, as well as serve on church and non-profit boards working directly with financial and fundraising issues. In his experience, Christian leaders have received minimal training in Biblical stewardship, and therefore, spend little time addressing ownership issues or teaching those under their leadership how to handle money, possessions, property, and financial responsibility. This researcher first became aware of the message of Christian stewardship in for-profit organizations through the writings of Rundle and Steffen (2003) and their work with what they refer to as Great Commission Companies.

Kimball (2007) discovered Christians are increasingly being known for their adherence to do's and don'ts, instead of regarded as people exemplifying love, compassion, good works, and service. Good Christians don't smoke, don't drink, and don't associate with those who participate in these activities. Jesus promised His followers an abundant, vibrant life in service to Him (Jn 10:10). It appears to this researcher large numbers of American Christians exchange the freedom to live an abundant life of selfless service for rules on how to live a safe and happy life, especially as consumers in a prosperous economy. Christian business owners have a unique opportunity to influence the way Jesus Christ is viewed. By engaging the world in business, believers can use their vocation to reflect Jesus. This researcher desires to see business leaders set an example of how one's faith can be authentic in the marketplace.

Relevance of the Study

Steward leadership takes the underlying tenets of servant leadership and advances the servant’s role a step further by emphasizing rightful ownership, accountability and submission of the leader to his superiors. The servant leader finds his core identity as servant, whereas, the steward leader realizes he is a manager for the rightful owner (Table 1).

Table 1

Basic Comparison of Servant Leadership with Steward Leadership

Core Identity	Servant Leadership	Steward Leadership
	Servant	Steward (manager)
Motivation for leadership	Altruism and selfless pursuit of the interests of others	Responsibility to the owners/stakeholders, altruism, fulfillment
Characteristics	Service, selflessness, empowering others	The same plus accountability, faithfulness, knows the master (relationship), mission-focused, non-ownership, and acts with delegated authority
Primary action	Serve people’s highest priority needs. “Servant first, leader second”	Lead the organization to accomplish the desires and objectives of stakeholders. Leverage and grow the resources, not necessarily for self, but for the rightful owner
Goal of leadership	Empowered followers	Fulfilled mission, sustainable organization, responsibility for using resources in accordance with the owner’s desire and will

Note. Adapted from *Steward Leadership: Characteristics of the steward leader in Christian nonprofit organizations*, by Kent Wilson, 2010, University of Aberdeen, Scotland. Adapted with permission.

In the vertical leadership hierarchy, servant leaders look downward toward the responsibility the leader has to those under his leadership; whereas, steward leaders additionally look up toward the responsibility the leader has to those above his leadership. In a horizontal or flat organizational structure, the servant leader serves everyone around him in the organization, especially those behind him on the horizontal continuum, while the steward leader also looks ahead on the horizontal continuum toward the intent and direction of the rightful owner.

Jesus' style of leadership was unique to who He is - Christians can model after Him, but are to reflect Him, not themselves. If one uses a leadership technique based on the examples set by Jesus, yet places the focus on oneself, he runs the risk of losing his role as slave to Jesus. One leads as a servant of Jesus Christ endowed with His power for His purpose, which naturally transitions the servant into a steward.

Chapter II. Literature Review

General Review of Leadership

A general review of character integrity in leadership served to inform a deeper review of literature on steward leadership. Without integrity of character, the leader maintains little moral authority to influence followers positively (MacArthur, 2004). Furthermore, without integrity of character, the researcher must automatically question the motives of business leaders who claim to operate by stewardship principles.

According to Kouzes and Posner (2009), “the capacity to imagine exciting future possibilities is the defining competence of leaders” (p. 27). During a television interview, Dr. Kouzes stated effective leaders build trust in their followers by maintaining a high level of character, especially in times of adversity,

When you encounter adversity you want to know, as a constituent that the leader is clear about their character, their values and beliefs. Adversity introduces us to the character we’ve already developed over those years and exposes those values and beliefs and that is what we base our actions upon (Kibrick, 2008, *Between the Lines*, Part 1).

Northouse (2007) connected ego, character and ethics to leadership by addressing the motives, morals and values under which leaders operate. On one side of the spectrum is the leader who is motivated by underlying self-interest, referred to as Ethical Egoism. This leader is motivated by what benefits himself most. On the other side of the motivational spectrum is what Northouse referred to as the “authentic transformational” leader (p. 344). This leader is concerned about the highest good of those under his care as a leader. Northouse contended that a transformational style of leadership, informed by

altruistic values, is the only style of leadership that can consistently integrate values and beliefs in an ethical framework. Northouse tethers altruism to an Aristotelian heritage; however, one may better understand altruism by reflecting on the teachings of Jesus, especially those found in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5:1-7:29). Jesus consistently teaches His followers to seek the highest good of others, to serve instead of being served, and to care for those who cannot care for themselves (Mt 20:26-27, Mt 23:11, Mk 9:35, Mk 10:43-45, Lk 22:24-26, Jn 13:12-15).

One of the practices of an effective leader, as defined by Kouzes and Posner (2007), is the ability to model the way for his followers. Dr. Kouzes (Kibrick, 2008, *Between the Lines*, Part 1) addressed the practice of modeling the way when he stated the following,

It is making sure that when we take action we align our actions with our words, it is practice what you preach...it is the fundamental foundation, it is what people look to when they are determining whether we have that fundamental character, whether we are someone who can be considered credible.

According to Kouzes (Kibrick, 2008, *Between the Lines*, Part 2), trust is “the fundamental glue that holds us all together.” Leaders must establish and nurture trusting relationships with their followers. Kouzes contended that the greatest indicator of a leader’s success is the degree to which he “treats others with dignity and respect.” Bass (2008) quoted Drucker on this very point “to work in an organization whose value system is unacceptable or incompatible with one’s own values condemns a person both to frustration and to nonperformance” (p. 169).

General Review of Leadership Motivations

Research by Kipnis, Price, Schmidt, and Stitt (1981) found perceptions of employee motivation influenced a business leader's interactions with followers. McGregor (1967) proposed a spectrum of employee motivation explained by two basic theories, Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X, buttressing one end of the motivational spectrum, hypothesized individuals dislike work, evade it when possible, lack ambition, shun responsibility, prefer to be led, and desire security. Management motivates Theory X employees through control, coercion, and a system of punishment. Supporting this view was Buckingham's (2005) contention that employees look for leaders "to calm our fears" (p.192).

On the other end of the motivational spectrum lies McGregor's (1967) Theory Y employee. This individual enjoys work, finds fulfillment and satisfaction in the workplace, seeks responsibility, seeks opportunity, and desires a degree of autonomy. Management motivates Theory Y employees through positive recognition, rewards, a challenging and creative work environment, and a role in decision-making.

Ouchi (1981) proposed an alternative to McGregor's (1967) two managerial theories. His Theory Z suggested employees could be positively motivated when they believed management truly cared for their overall well-being at work and at home. Ouchi differentiated his Theory Z employees from Theory X and Theory Y employees by emphasizing the role of community and teamwork in contrast to the prominence McGregor placed on individual motivations. The Theory Z employee displays loyalty to the organization and management through alignment with shared group values, is highly

productive, exhibits high morale, expresses satisfaction in a job well done, and thrives in an environment that values team decision-making and collaboration.

Porter and VanderVeen (2002) explained Christian views of employee motivation by acknowledging the sinful nature of humanity and the redemptive power of Jesus Christ in the life of His followers. Therefore, Christian leaders should be “biased toward a Theory Y perspective,” (p. 28), and attempt to serve those under their care.

An important factor for effective leadership is shaping a shared vision and helping people move toward that vision, which is a major component of Buckingham’s (2005) understanding of the purpose of leadership. Buckingham claimed, “great leaders rally people to a better future” (p. 47) and that it is a future as seen through the leader’s eyes. There are two points where Buckingham’s prime arguments proved useful to the direction of steward leader research. First, he insisted leaders must “have a strong ego” (p. 51). He did caution against egomaniacal leaders who direct leadership to selfish gain, yet maintained that a leader must be optimistic, confident, and “believe in every fiber of” his being that he is “the one to make this future come true” (p. 52). Buckingham further claimed that humility has no place in a leader’s thinking, and that “virtually nothing about them is humble” (p. 52). In contrast, Elliott (2010) suggested leaders who practice humility “understand they are only parts of the whole and they do not sense the same egocentric concerns as do the prideful” (p. 11).

Guttman (2009) explained the need for leadership teams and a flattening of vertical hierarchies into more horizontally structured organizations. He claimed the rethinking should begin with the leader, who must “put aside ego and insist that team members hold him or her accountable for promised results” (p. 275). It is possible many

leaders find their identity in being at the top of an organization, and lack the humility to act like a member among equals. Ego likely hinders a leader's ability to think and act as a steward, and plays a large role in leaders not being able to build operational and effective teams.

Guttman (2009) went on to explain how hierarchical organizations are vertically structured with power residing at the top, with diminishing power as one works down the chain, and that this structure often serves as a "mechanism for control and compliance" (p. 275). It is possible that ego and a need for control work hand-in-hand against the establishment of steward leadership in organizations. The researcher understands there are certain responsibilities and authority vested in leaders, but it can be argued that Buckingham (2005) overstated the usefulness of ego in leadership.

Batson (2006) described four varieties of interpersonal motivation, which may be helpful to the discussion of steward leadership. First, egoism motivates through self-interest and concern for what is best for oneself. Batson explained this has been the traditional understanding of what most motivates people to promote what appear to be mutually beneficial actions, policies, and attitudes. The idea behind egoism is that a person will encourage what is in the best interests of himself, and is less interested in supporting that which does not in some way further his own welfare.

Batson (2006) gave three alternatives to the promotion of self-interest through egoism. Altruism takes the focus off oneself and places it on "increasing the welfare of one or more individuals other than oneself" (p. 202). He claimed that emotions of empathy lie behind altruistic behavior. For empathy to exist there is most likely some type of interpersonal relationship at play. Altruistic behavior is generally directed toward

one's friends or those with whom there is some type of affinity. Batson acknowledged the problem with mutually beneficial motivation centered in altruism is that people tend not to have empathy for those with whom they do not have a relationship.

Batson (2006) reviewed the interpersonal motivation of collectivism, which "is motivation with the ultimate goal of increasing the welfare of a group" (p. 204). This motivation looks at what is good or beneficial to a group. The group or collective could be a person's "race, religion, sex" (p. 205), or even an amorphous grouping like the institution of marriage. A potential problem area for collectivism as a motivation is the possibility of groups competing in an "us vs. them" rivalry for benefits.

The third alternative to egoism is principlism, which focuses on "upholding some moral principle such as justice" or "the greatest good for the greatest number" (Batson, 2006, p. 206). This is usually practiced based on "some universal and impartial moral" (p. 206) code such as the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, or other spiritually based teachings. Batson saw one of the problems with principlism as "knowing when and how a given principle applies" (p. 208) as situations and circumstances are encountered.

A solution to the danger of self-promotion inherent in Buckingham's (2005) elevation of ego is Batson's (2006) proposal that leaders combine the four motivations by using the strengths of each and discarding their weaknesses. Batson contended that the largest factor inhibiting leaders from utilizing all four is the underlying belief that self-interest is the motivating factor behind interpersonal interactions. One can see the advantages to merging the best of each motivation in an effort to ensure self-interest is not always the default mode of operation for those attempting to lead people as a steward.

An extensive investigation of management and the integral role marshaling resources plays in accomplishing organizational tasks fell outside the scope of this current study. However, there may be merit in Buckingham's (2005) reduction of the role of management to the ability "to select people effectively" (p. 12) based on talents, then "figure out the best way to transform these talents into performance" (p. 35).

Buckingham (2005) made a clear differentiation between managers and leaders where the two were concerned with developing people. He contended it is the role of a manager to develop personnel and the role of a leader to align the person with the purposes of the organization. Buckingham placed the follower at the disposal of the leader to further the goals, vision, and values of the organization. In contrast, Batson (2006) saw "motives as goal-directed forces" in the attainment and maintenance of "valued states" (p. 198). By this he meant that one "prefers" (p. 198) a certain state of being and interaction over another set of circumstances. The preferred state is that which offers the most moral validity while allowing goal attainment. This idea contrasts with Buckingham's insistence that people follow leaders who soothe their fears; suggesting instead that followers choose leaders based on values and personal alignment rather than some type of primal need for security.

Bass (2008) contended leaders choose their careers and life work based on the "values they assimilated" (p. 168). Assimilated values are different from values that are simply stated, but not enacted. An assimilated value is acted upon and is evident in the actions and reactions of a leader. Bass referred to principles that are merely stated as espoused values and the actual behavior of a leader as enacted values. Incongruence in a leader's stated values and his actions can cause followers to lack confidence in that

leader. Followers rightly believe that their leaders share their core values and will consistently act with consideration to those values. When leaders violate those shared understandings, followers lose confidence in that leader, questioning his character.

Religious moorings contribute to the formation of personal as well as cultural and organizational values (Bass, 2008; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Sheehy, 1995). The role of spirituality in the development of leaders seems extremely important in respect to shaping values in organizations (MacArthur, 2004). A leader's spiritual development informs the decisions he makes in relation to the shared values in his particular organization (Sanders, 1994). A high level of spiritual development on the part of a leader should translate espoused values into enacted values (Bass, 2008). Without consistent spiritual growth, leaders will not be able to guide their constituencies through moral and ethical challenges, especially if one's ego becomes a motivating factor in a leader's judgment calls.

Buckingham (2005) gave cursory mention to integrity by stating, "all leaders should possess integrity, but so should the rest of us" (p. 47). By appealing to values, leaders can build an organization with employees and constituents revolving around shared values as a fuel for reinforcing desired organizational motivations and goals. Tyler (2006) claimed that in order to do this, leaders "need to structure workplaces that more effectively draw on employee's...sense of moral responsibility" (p. 226). Building organizations around values appeals to a person's character, and his sense of right and wrong.

The concept of the Golden Rule, "Do to others as you would have done to you," has variations found in Buddhism, Brahmanism, Judaism, Confucianism, Islam, and even

Wicca (Bass, 2008, p. 221). Christian humility, rooted in a relationship with Jesus Christ, may provide a primary answer to self-centered and egotistical leadership. Pascarella (1999) found “Christ-centered” leaders “relate their business behavior to Christ’s teachings” (p. 55).

By linking leadership to a vision for change and movement in a different direction, Turman and Burtis (2010) argued that nearly anyone in an organization can take on a leadership role. These roles are often fluid, and are not considered positional in the sense of a manager. A manager maintains a permanent position and is responsible for marshaling and deploying resources to accomplish tasks. Leadership can be offered by anyone from the janitor to the doorkeeper, as long as that person is offering a vision and direction that aims at realigning the organization or addressing a crisis that leads to redirection or transformation in the organization. Buckingham (2005) agreed with Turman and Burtis (2010) on the necessity of vision, change, and movement, but clearly disagreed on the idea that anyone in an organization can lead. Buckingham differentiated leaders from ordinary people by their preoccupation with the future, stating “you are a leader if...you are restless for change, impatient for progress, and deeply dissatisfied with the status quo” (p. 48), and “only if” you are “able to rally others to a better future” (p. 47).

Turman and Burtis (2010) wrote extensively concerning vision and how it is utilized in direction giving. The authors defined vision as “a story the group shares about its desired future experience” (p. 208). Direction givers use vision to help form a group’s identity through the use of stories and shared values. In their explanation, vision is “made salient by crisis” (p. 205) and serves to direct a group toward a purpose or final

result. By linking a vision with leadership during a crisis, the authors argued that leadership is a direction giving type that is much less prevalent than the management type of direction giver.

As both Kouzes & Posner (2007) and Goldsmith (2003) stressed, effective leaders are forward-looking and inspire a shared vision for a common goal, often challenging the accepted processes in an effort to lead the way. Kouzes & Posner (2009) bleakly pointed out “today’s leaders stink” (p. 28) at being forward-looking.

When a leader begins to pursue his own interests, comfort, security, and enrichment, that leader will neglect the very people he is entrusted to represent. Another warning against strongly emphasizing a leader’s ego is when a leader sees success in personal accomplishment instead of the promotion of others, that leader is headed for pitfalls that will ensnare him and reduce his effectiveness as a leader that inspires followers (Schilling, 2009).

Two of the most dangerous pitfalls awaiting a self-focused leader are pride and an inflated ego (Pullen & Rhodes, 2008). Pride blinds a leader from seeing the realities before him. When a leader allows pride to obscure his vision, he begins to shape his own reality. Pride causes a leader to think that he is the one responsible for the successes of the organization, and to blame others for organizational failures. Buckingham’s (2005) insistence on a leader’s confidence that he is the one with the vision and the one specially endowed to take his organization to a preferred future can easily and deceptively move a leader into a destructive pride. Instead of equipping, empowering, and launching, the prideful leader holds people back. The prideful leader becomes toxic to other leaders around him. A leader who is motivated by self will begin to see the organization and

those in it as being there to serve them. Cultivating a stewardship mentality may be a primary way to combat pride and maintain a healthy understanding of leadership.

Buckingham's (2005) understanding of how ego and a vision of the future define a leader, contrasts with the concept of steward leadership. Responding to organizational demands, personnel development, accountability to stakeholders, and responsibility to the greater community within which the organization operates gives leaders vast opportunities to act as trustees or stewards. Rodin (2010) explained steward leadership as "an ongoing, disciplined practice of becoming a person of no reputation" (p. 13), which counteracts the common human instinct of self-recognition. It is not logical to think that one can become a great and effective leader by relinquishing recognition. It may not be the relinquishment of authority, or even responsibility, but the release of recognition that scares leaders the most. A leader's authority and responsibility are often reinforced and propagated by the recognition that leader receives from peers, family members and those in his leadership hierarchy. It is normal to expect recognition for achievements; it is often one of the primary reasons people continue to work within an organization (Moriarty, 2007). People like to know they are appreciated and that they are adding value to the organization for which they are working (Lencioni, 2007). In a leader, this recognition can result in an inflated ego, an unrealistic and bloated sense of worth, and a pride that pushes the contribution of others aside.

Rodin (2010) stated, "Steward leaders empower their people, give away authority, value and involve others, see the best in and from their people, and constantly lift others up, push others into the limelight and reward those they lead" (p. 17). Prideful, arrogant, and egoistic leaders cannot put the focus on others. One may assume Buckingham

(2005) did not write with the intention of inflating a leader's ego, or with the idea that effective leaders are egomaniacal. Buckingham wrote to stress the fact that leaders must know where they are going, where they want to take their organization, and must possess the inner confidence that they are the one with the leadership ability to take the organization to that preferred future. There may be a danger in leaders becoming "overly directive at best and autocratic at worst" due to self-centeredness and an "overestimating" of a leader's "worth" (Rodin, 2010, p. 16).

Steward leaders do not require an increase in their worth, or an increase in their position. Their worth is wrapped up in the growth and development of those under their leadership care. A steward leader can know he is endowed with the vision of a preferred future, and the assurance he is the one to lead the group to that preferred future, while also knowing that his leadership and influence is expendable. Humility serves to temper ego (Elliott, 2010), and keeps a leader's focus on developing those under his watch.

General Review of Business as a Force for Good

Handy (2009) proposed a change in the substance of business as the world changes. He argued forms can remain intact, but the inner workings of the enterprise should change as society changes. Depree (1998), Pollard (2006), and Russell (2010), warned against the dangers of Christian leaders adopting so much of the culture around them that there is no discernible difference between a Christian led business and a non-Christian led business. For Christians, form can change, but substance must remain true to Jesus Christ and Scripture, otherwise, modifying business standards can lead to a false representation of the Gospel. Handy asserted capitalism needs to shift from profit motives to investing in society. Corporations have predominantly served the interests of

profit and investors (Friedman, 2008), but definitely need to focus more on employees and communities (Wong & Rae, 2011).

Handy's (2009) assessment of the partnership between democracy and capitalism is poignant, considering capitalism appears to be under attack due to broad economic disparity between the wealthy and the poor (Brooks, 2006). Handy was correct in his concern that capitalism is seen as a "rich man's game" (p. 96). One of the best ways to change that perception is for businesses to serve the highest good of the communities around them, and to add value to society (Alford & Naughton, 2001; Wong & Rae, 2011). Purposes and motivations need to change from an attitude of profiting from society to prospering society. Businesses need to add to people's lives as they prosper from business transactions.

Bolman and Deal (2009) anchored the goodness and essence of a business to sincerely held mores when they wrote, "we believe ethics must reside in soul, a sense of bedrock character that harbors core beliefs and values" (p. 133). The soul belongs to the Creator, guided by His moral laws (Friesen & Maxson, 2004). When one strays from that mooring, ethics and moral behavior become amorphous.

Many organizations increasingly demonstrate altruistic and socially beneficial reasons for existing, beyond financial profit. Bolman and Deal (2009) used the pharmaceutical company Merck as an example that profit cannot serve as the deciding factor in all product decisions if the company is to remain true to its stated purpose. This was exhibited by the company's decision to develop a drug for the treatment of onchocerciasis (river blindness), subsequently giving it free of charge to those in the most need of it.

Bolman and Deal's (2009) explanation of spirituality and the presence of soul in business can be beneficial to the study of stewardship. According to the authors, "soul can also be viewed as a resolute sense of character, a deep confidence about who we are, what we care about, and what we deeply believe in" (p. 134). The correlation made between the soul of a person and the soul of a business enterprise makes sense, and can definitely serve to guide the moral and ethical climate of an organization. The authors used the idea of soul to convey the inner essence, heartbeat, and life force behind an organization's purpose for operation. The soul defines the attitude and countenance of the business, providing reason, emotion, and motivation. They reasoned if the soul is ethically grounded, it will reflect in the actions of the business, likewise, if the soul is rotten, the ethics of the business will manifest corrupt practices.

Galbraith (2009) commented on the pressures businesses feel to produce growth and wealth for investors, explaining the necessity to expand into related products or services in order to satisfy the pursuit of growth. In a capitalist economy, there is a need for wealth creation and value investors seek, yet it seems this can be accomplished without unrelenting growth. A company that produces a quality, and profitable product, which it sells to the mass markets on a regular basis, can realize wealth and intrinsic value. Greed may play an intricate part in the pursuit of growth.

The scandals at Enron, Worldcom, Global Crossing and Tyco are examples of leadership failure and corruption (Pullen & Rhodes, 2008). The primary answer to these problems of corruption, dishonesty, and poor leadership may only come from a Christian ethic rooted in a relationship with Jesus Christ (Maxwell, 2003). Business ethics and leadership models will struggle if the basis for trying to "do the right thing" is not

founded on Jesus Christ and informed by the Bible. A social ethic unrelated to an underlying religious belief cannot successfully address society's challenges. Religious beliefs define transcendent meaning, without transcendent meaning people remain selfish and self-motivated (Sanders, 1994). Johnson (2009) explained how difficult it could be for a leader to mobilize massive numbers of people to work toward a common good if the common good is changeable and focused on conflicting rights or values. He claimed this is especially true if the conflicting rights involve actual or perceived ethical corruption connected to the leader. Jackson (2009) referenced the Puritans in this light, as having "a big audacious goal" (p. 129). They were stewards of a vision and society, who attempted to pass their world on to the next generation in a better condition than they found it.

General Review of Ownership and Property in Relation to Christian Faith

The failures at Enron clearly demonstrate inflated attitudes of ownership rights, privileges, and entitlement can lead to oppressive and sometimes abusive leadership characteristics (Tourish & Vatcha, 2005). Rethinking ownership, rights, and entitlements may be the greatest deterrent to destructive leadership that results in harm to organizations and their constituents.

González (2002) and Avila (1983) claimed early Christians understood ownership rights were a primary competitor with Jesus Christ for lordship in their lives. The Christian steward modeled the way in service to Jesus because he understood "No one can serve two masters. Either you will hate the one and love the other, or you will be devoted to the one and despise the other" (Mt 6:24). It is through this understanding of lordship that Christian steward leaders can rightfully submit ownership issues to Jesus.

Alford and Naughton (2001) explained ownership on four levels of ethics. The first level is theological. God created everything, and God owns everything. Humanity was given dominion as a gift, not as a perpetual ownership with rights. The second level is what Alford referred to as "the universal destination of goods" (p. 161). This second level informs the possessor of the gift and that the gift is for humanity's universal good, not just the rich and privileged. The third level of ownership deals with the leveraging of property and possessions for the greatest common good. The fourth and final level of ethic for the property owner is the use and deployment of assets to foster "a community of work," (p. 165) which leads to the development of common or shared values and virtues.

Even though stewards operate under the will and desires of the owner, the steward does retain discretionary authority over the use of what has been entrusted to him (Westbrook, 1996). The authority granted a steward is not absolute, and is always tempered by the desires of the rightful owner (Pollard, 2006).

In addressing the gap between rich and poor, some Christians have advocated a broad redistribution of wealth (Conrad, 1954), often based on the idea that economic mobility and wealth-generating resources are contained or limited. Werning (1986) addressed the fallacy of the "container model" of stewardship," (p. 7) by drawing attention to God's inexhaustible resources. Werning successfully developed the concept of relying on God's storehouse of "limitless spiritual and material resources" (p. 13), while charging Christians to give freely when God provides.

Rodin (2010) contended, "it is in the area of resources and the environment that we struggle the most" (p. 47) in our life as stewards. Rodin argued that there is true

freedom in being a steward as opposed to being an owner. The steward is free from possessions and encumbrances, but is obligated to understanding the intentions of the rightful owner. Stewardship “denotes dependence on the one who is the true owner” (p. 82) and frees the leader to “worship as a joyful response” (p. 49) to the Creator.

Rodin’s (2010) assertion of freedom for the steward draws the leader to a renewed and necessary attention for “personal devotion and prayer” (p. 48). Scripture and prayer are the conduits to the steward leader’s understanding of how the Creator wants His resources deployed.

The book of Genesis established people as the cultivators, managers, and caretakers of God’s creation. Many verses, including Leviticus 25:23, Psalm 50:10-12, Haggai 2:8, and 1 Chronicles 29:11-12 clearly demonstrate God’s ownership and control of earth, as well as all creation. Operating under the basic assumption that a Being powerful enough to create the universe must be able to sustain that universe bolsters the need for stewards to realize they are not owners and have an enormous opportunity to manage the vast resources available for their management. Further, Scripture such as the book of Revelation reveal the fate of earth and humanity. There is no doubt who controls the created order – God, not humans, determines how life begins, develops, and ends.

Isaiah chapter 40 perfectly illustrates humanity standing before a magnificent and holy God. God proclaims His greatness and the insignificance of mankind, as well as all of creation, in the face of His power, authority, and strength. Isaiah writes about smoothed deserts, valleys lifted up, flattened mountains, and valleys formed from rugged earth. Created humanity cannot stand against the Creator any more than grass or flowers. God nurtures, sustains, and protects His creation, as seen in His desire to shepherd and

protect His people. Beginning in verse 12 of chapter 40, Isaiah records God's rebuke of those who are haughty enough to compare themselves with His authority. God alone holds the oceans in His hand, knows the dimension of the heavens, has counted the dust of the earth, and weighed mountains. Isaiah 40:22 begins a beautiful, undeniable, description of God's power over His creation. God sits above His creation, viewing humanity as grasshoppers. God grants all authority at His pleasure, with prosperity or despair meted out for His purposes. Scripture, as demonstrated by Isaiah 40, clearly recognizes God setting nature on its course under His direction and by "His might and the strength of His power" (Isa 40:26).

Created humanity responds as nothing more than a grateful manager of what clearly belongs to God, as seen in passages such as Matthew 25:14-30. The parable of the talents clearly teaches the principle of stewardship, and the inescapable fact nothing belongs to a person that has not been entrusted to him by the rightful owner. One must understand the incredible responsibility God placed on His stewards to return His possessions when required, and with increase, if possible.

Rodin's (2010) antidote to an ownership mentality is both profound and convicting, "When we reflect God's caring nurture of us by caring for and nurturing his creation, we find meaning in a world that screams at us that meaning is found only in the hoarding and consumption of resources" (p. 36).

General Review of Steward Leadership Literature

Writers who briefly touched on steward leadership included Coleman (1998), Spears (1998), and Solomon (2004). Werner (2008) identified steward leadership in leaders she researched, yet did not develop the concept beyond a basic description.

Even though DePree (1998) acknowledged steward leadership as a separate model of leadership, he did not develop the idea in his writing. Instead, his understanding relied heavily on the servant leadership model suggested by Greenleaf (1991).

Clinton (1989), a professor at Fuller Theological Seminary, included steward leadership as one of four models of leadership described in the Christian Scriptures. In his assessment, “The Stewardship Model is the most general of the New Testament Philosophical models” because “it applies to followers as well as leaders” (p. 58).

Clinton offered eight principles in support of steward leadership:

1. A person’s life work, or vocation, originates in God.
2. God requires accountability in how leaders use their influence and interact with followers.
3. Leaders are eternally judged before God for their governance.
4. Eternal rewards await faithful leaders.
5. Leaders have an obligation to God for developing their gifts and using them in God’s service.
6. God grants leadership gifts for His use.
7. A leader’s effectiveness results in rewards.
8. According to 1 Timothy 3:2 and Titus 1:7 leaders “must be above reproach,” and are held to a higher standard than followers.

Ford (2006) listed four typical myths in leadership that encourage upward mobility and oppose a stewardship mentality:

1. Self-centered leadership based on me in contrast to equipping and releasing others.

2. Individualism concerned about building me instead of building community.
3. The ladder myth of building me up, in direct opposition to stewardship, indicates an ownership mindset.
4. The sarcasm myth of putting you down resists being an encouragement to others.

In opposition to the leadership myths, Ford proposed what he labeled the “stewardship three-step process” (p. 166) of stewarding the leader’s identity, stewarding the identity of the organization, and stewardship of the greater community surrounding the organization.

Rodin (2010) located leadership in who the leader is, the leader’s identity, rather than in leadership activities or the process of how leaders perform.

The steward leader does not derive her identity from being a leader, even being a steward leader, but solely from being a godly and faithful steward. . . . The steward leader starts with the call to be a godly steward and ends with the heart of the godly steward, open to transformation, called to lead (p. 76).

Rodin (2010) anchored the process of steward leadership development to three foundations:

1. Redeemed believers in Jesus Christ find their purpose in reflecting the image of God.
2. God brings freedom, resulting in the steward’s “joyful obedience” (p. 69).
3. Steward leadership is distinctive because it emphasizes “being over doing,” and a complete “dependence on the one who is the true owner” (p.82).

Rodin (2010) examined stewardship holistically by concentrating on the transformation process a leader goes through on the journey to steward leader. This transformation of the leader progresses simultaneously on four levels: with God, with one's self, with others, and with creation. Rodin found eight significant results from this transformation:

1. Steward leaders are united with the people they serve.
2. Steward leaders cultivate culture.
3. Steward leaders develop whole people.
4. Steward leaders harness the power of people.
5. Steward leaders build and value community as its own end.
6. Steward leaders are caretakers of their community.
7. Steward leaders marshal resources effectively.
8. Steward leaders create organizational consistency and witness (p. 93).

Wilson (2010) conducted a two-phase study, where he began by looking at ancient understandings of stewardship and steward responsibilities, then surveyed and interviewed contemporary leaders serving in non-profit organizations. His research verified a typology of steward leadership existed and can be recognized by the presence of distinct characteristics (Table 2).

Table 2

Characteristics of a Steward Leader

Accountable	Humble	Self-sacrificing
Authority from God	Integrity	Sense of purpose
Caring	Loving	Stewardship awareness
Diligent	Obedient	Submission to authority
Faithful	Ownership recognition	Transparent
Giving	Passionate	Trustworthy
Honest	Responsible	Vulnerable

Note. Adapted from *Steward Leadership: Characteristics of the steward leader in Christian nonprofit organizations*, by Kent Wilson, 2010, University of Aberdeen, Scotland. Adapted with permission.

The steward leader's first obligation of obedience (Table 2) is to God's calling and direction in his life. Recognition of God's sovereignty and direction allows the leader to acknowledge rightful authority and willfully submit to the direction and goals of the board of directors. The steward leader avoids personal recognition, leads from a confidence and authority that does not rely on ego, and finds honor in fulfilling his duties. The leader discharges his duties to the best of his abilities out of care and responsibility to the rightful owners, employees, and customers.

Relationships of trust are foundational in steward leadership. Steward leaders demonstrate and maintain faithfulness (Table 2) to God and stakeholders through consistent integrity and trustworthiness. Integrity is basic to Christian character, and essential to steward leadership. Steward leaders exhibit integrity by consistently enacting the values they claim to espouse. Followers expect leaders to be genuine and reliable. By preserving integrity, leaders build an organization with employees and constituents

revolving around shared values as a fuel for reinforcing desired organizational motivations and goals.

Generosity and self-sacrifice (Table 2), often demonstrated by service and altruistic behavior, are characteristics present in steward leaders. Stewards practice generosity by placing others before themselves, promoting the organization over personal gain, and through wise charitable giving.

Steward leaders accept and respect accountability (Table 2) relationships. The leader understands he is responsible for his actions while working to accomplish organizational objectives, and acts to honor the authority of God, the board of directors, and stakeholders.

The steward leader reports organizational results honestly (Table 2) and accurately. Transparency and vulnerability help the leader to remain objective and truthful in his dealings with the board of directors, owners, stakeholders, and employees. The steward leader invites relationships that encourage openness, and offers venues for exploring personal weaknesses and limitations.

Steward leaders work conscientiously, model diligence (Table 2), and expect reliability from those under their leadership. The leader values time and resources, and is acutely aware of his responsibility to increase the resources under his administration.

Leaders motivated by Christian stewardship are passionate and engaged by a sense of purpose and mission (Table 2). The leader understands and promotes the vision and goals of the organization not based on a need for personal accomplishment, but through the judicious use of the authority granted to him by the rightful owners and custodians.

Wilson (2010) also identified several general behaviors and spiritual characteristics exhibited by a steward leader. The Christian steward leader understands stewardship, views himself as a steward, and acknowledges he is not an owner (Table 2). The resources under his care are on loan, and do not belong to him. He effectively manages the owner's resources and strives to increase the value of those resources, while maintaining a servant attitude in relationship to those he leads. The steward leader's relationship with God is strong, vital, and integral to his ability to administer the organization and resources. For the steward leader, the relationship with God allows him to surrender ownership, serve others, and shepherd his followers.

Even though Wilson's (2010) work concentrated on the non-profit leader, his findings were useful in identifying steward leadership characteristics, practices, and motivations that were easily applied to for-profit organizations and leaders.

Literature Review Conclusions

Within the literature reviewed concerning Christian leadership and steward leadership, agreement existed on several foundational concepts.

God is the originator of everything in existence, He grants access to His resources at His discretion, and He has never abdicated His ownership (Van Duzer, 2010). Stewardship encompasses everything under the influence of the leader; therefore, the leader is answerable to God for his decisions, actions, and use of the resources under his management. Similarly, leaders who view themselves as stewards experience a high sense of accountability to stakeholders and the community at large in how they utilize resources. Acknowledging resources are not their own, stewards are obligated to owners and to the followers under their leadership.

The Holy Bible and the common Christian faith are fundamental to the understanding of stewardship, and contain sufficient examples for discharging one's duties. The leader's own development and identification with stewardship principles is a prerequisite of leadership.

The research revealed several shortcomings in the literature on steward leadership. Even though Wilson's (2010) research moved the study of steward leadership toward a robust and viable model, steward leadership lacks a clear, compelling, and broadly recognized definition. Servant leadership is confused with the emerging understanding of steward leadership, and some researchers (Block, 1993) correlated steward characteristics heavily with management and less with leadership. There were few examples for understanding how steward leaders at various levels in organizations work with one another.

Chapter III. Methodology

This chapter described the research design and methodology used in the research project.

Research Design

The project was a quantitative, and descriptive cross-sectional study designed for demographic and attitudinal data collection. Survey results were cross-tabulated and analyzed to compare attitudinal relationships between participants who self-identified on the assessment instrument as a steward leader and those who did not self-identify as a steward leader.

The use of a survey instrument requiring self-reporting by participants posed a threat to internal validity. The respondent's willingness to accurately answer survey questions and honestly report attitudinal responses posed threats to external validity.

The study examined Christian business owners, and Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit organizations to include CEO, President, Vice President, or other commonly recognized executive leadership positions. Senior leaders actively engaged in organizational leadership were the subject of research, not the organization itself. Participation in the study was voluntary with each participant fully informed before the survey of the intent of the research.

Limitations of the Study

The research intended to determine the predominant models of leadership used by Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit organizations, and explored whether significant attitudinal relationships existed based on a leader's identification with distinguishable steward leader characteristics.

The research did not consider what factors contributed to the formation and implementation of steward leadership in the practices of the leaders under examination. The identification and exploration of formative factors in steward leader development fell outside the scope of this study and is an area for future research.

The research did not attempt to verify congruence between a survey respondent's answers and that leader's enacted behavior. An analysis of the relationship between a leader's self-perceptions and that leader's actions as it relates to steward leadership is an area for future research.

The Christian business leaders who participated in the survey were residents of the United States, and operated under the laws, economic environment, and presumptions of a Western democratic republic, that supports a capitalist free-market system. The worldview and opinions of the respondents are likely shaped by the religious and economic freedoms experienced by living and working in the United States.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was delimited in two specific ways. First, the study concentrated exclusively on Christians engaged in for-profit activities in the marketplace. Secondly, the study examined either business owners, or those in senior leadership positions to include Chief Executive Officer, President, Vice President, or other commonly recognized executive leadership positions.

Based on these qualifying and limiting criterion, the researcher employed a quantitative survey for assessing the scope of steward leadership characteristics represented in Christian leaders of for-profit organizations actively engaged in business operations within the United States.

Undoubtedly, some non-Christian business leaders may operate under the conviction that the business they lead is in their care as a steward, and they may even exhibit visible actions consistent with Christian stewardship principles. Yet, these leaders fell outside the purview of this study due to their lack of identification with faith in Jesus Christ.

Description of the Population and Sample

Candidates for the survey were Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit businesses. The researcher solicited participants for the survey by contacting the leadership of ten associations representing Christian business executives in the United States. The leader's affiliation with business associations representing evangelical Christian business people increased the likelihood the leader was attempting to live out his faith in the marketplace, and striving to make business decisions based on a worldview informed by his personal faith in Jesus Christ. Both male and female participants were solicited for participation in the research project.

The researcher sent an email letter (Appendix B) to the leadership of associations representing Christian business executives introducing the researcher, explaining the research, and requesting either permission to contact the association's constituency, or requesting the leadership ask members of their association to take the survey. The email contained a sample letter requesting participation in the electronic survey, including an internet link to the survey. In addition to contacting the leadership of associations representing Christian business executives, this researcher sent survey invitations to individual business leaders based on the recommendation of associates familiar with this research.

A total of 430 invitations were sent requesting participation in the research project. The researcher sent 226 email invitations, while leaders representing associations of Christian business executives sent 204 email invitations, resulting in 209 (48.6%) participants completing the online survey.

Data Collection

Each participant completed a self-administered survey assessing the presence of steward leader characteristics in their leadership philosophy and practices. The data was collected electronically through the online survey site www.surveymonkey.com.

Instrumentation

Research into steward leadership as a viable typology in leadership studies is relatively young; even so, one recently developed tool proved useful to this study. Wilson (2010) developed a quantitative survey on steward leadership in non-profit organizations based on the results of his extensive literature review of steward leader characteristics, and by following recognized methods of creating survey instruments outlined in *Introduction to Research Methods* by Robert Burns (2000). He formed questions simply and clearly to minimize confusion and to normalize the style of the statements and possible responses. Wilson chose a five point Likert-type scale to measure attitudes and worded statements in an attempt to minimize “emotionally charged opinions” (p. 104). Where multiple-choices were available, Wilson randomized the order “to avoid early-option bias” (p. 103). Prior to fully deploying the survey, he field-tested the instrument for face validity (Gaber & Gaber, 2010; Nevo, 1985) and ease of use on eight subjects from his target population of non-profit leaders.

This researcher received written permission from Dr. Wilson to slightly modify the survey and utilize it for this research project. The modifications required to the survey included simply changing references from “non-profit” to “for-profit,” and re-wording the Likert scale options. The researcher field-tested the modified survey on nine Christian for-profit business leaders for face validity and ease of use.

The Christian For-Profit Leadership Survey (Appendix C) contained twelve primary questions. Questions 1 through 3 were demographic in nature, related to title, gender, and age. Questions 4 through 6 asked for general data on the organization related to industry, number of employees, and annual revenue.

Survey question 7 asked participants to identify the types of leadership they apply in their own organizational leadership. The respondents were allowed to select more than one type. Question 7, part 6, presented the participants with the option to self-identify as a steward leader, which allowed the researcher to compare survey responses with participants who did not view themselves as utilizing steward leadership.

Participants ranked their responses to questions 8, 11, and 12 based on a five point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Survey questions 9 and 10 asked participants to rate their responses based on a five point Likert-type scale ranging from very unimportant to very important.

Survey question 8 asked respondents to rate ten specific leadership functions. Survey questions 9 and 10 asked participants to indicate how important twenty-seven specific characteristics are to effective organizational leadership. Survey question 11 asked respondents to indicate their understanding of a leader’s accountability to recognized business authorities and constituents as well as accountability to God. Survey

question 12 contained thirteen statements related to stewardship principles and organizational leadership.

Chapter IV. Results

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the predominant models of leadership used by Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit organizations, and to explore whether significant attitudinal relationships existed based on a leader's identification with distinguishable steward leader characteristics.

This study addressed the following questions:

Research Question 1: What are the predominant models of organizational leadership practiced by Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit organizations?

Research Question 2: Are there differences in attitudes concerning distinguishable steward leadership characteristics between Christians in for-profit organizations who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

Research Question 3: Are there differences in leaders' views of employee motivation between Christian leaders who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

Research Question 4: Is there a difference in leaders' concern for the poor between Christian leaders who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

Research Question 5: Are there differences in the perceptions of stewardship principles (values) between Christian leaders who identify as steward leaders and those who do not?

This chapter presented the data compiled from returned surveys through tables and descriptive analyses of those tables. A qualified statistician compiled and formatted the data results into tables, which this researcher adapted for presentation in this chapter.

Demographics

Survey question number 1 asked participants to select a title representing his leadership position. Fifty-eight (28%) respondents were business owners or self-employed in some capacity (Table 3). Chief Executive Officers represented 23% of those participating in the study.

Table 3

Leadership Titles

Title	<i>n</i>	%
Chief Executive Officer	48	23.5
President	25	12.3
Vice President	12	5.9
Other Corporate Executive	20	9.8
Division Director	10	4.9
Department/Team Manager	21	10.3
Board of Director	10	4.9
Owner/Self-Employed	58	28.4
Total	204	

Note. Five participants did not answer question number 1.

Survey question number 2 asked participants to indicate their gender. One hundred forty-two (68%) of the 209 survey respondents were male and 67 (32%) were female.

Survey question number 3 asked participants to select a range indicating their age. Nearly 36% (Table 4) of participants were between the ages of 40 and 49. Leaders aged 50-59 represented 30% of those surveyed, while leaders under the age of 40 amounted to less than 25% of respondents.

Table 4

Age

Age	<i>n</i>	%
21-29	7	3.4
30-39	43	20.8
40-49	74	35.7
50-59	62	30.0
60 or older	21	10.1
Total	207	

Note. Two participants did not answer question number 3.

Survey question number 5 asked participants to select a range indicating the number of employees under his or her leadership. Slightly over half (53%) of the respondents indicated they led twenty or fewer employees (Table 5). Nearly one-third of total participants led no more than five employees; however, 16% indicated they led at least 100 employees.

Table 5

Number of Employees Under Respondent's Leadership

Number of Employees	<i>n</i>	%
1 – 5	60	29.3
6 – 10	18	8.8
11 – 15	12	5.9
16 – 20	19	9.3
21 – 25	6	2.9
26 – 30	13	6.3
31 – 40	9	4.4
41 – 50	10	4.9
51 – 75	12	5.9
76 – 100	13	6.3
100 +	33	16.1
Total	205	

Note. Four participants did not answer question number 5.

Survey question number 6 asked participants to select a range indicating the annual revenue of their organization. Nearly two-thirds (63%) of survey participants reported they led organizations with revenues greater than one million dollars (Table 6). Twenty-six percent of the respondents led organizations with revenues of \$500,000 or less.

Table 6

Revenue of Organization Led by Survey Participants

Revenue	<i>n</i>	%
Less than \$10,000	2	1.0
\$10,000 - \$50,000	8	3.9
\$50,000 - \$100,000	16	7.8
\$100,000 - \$500,000	28	13.7
\$500,000 - \$1 Million	18	8.8
\$1 Million - \$5 Million	44	21.6
\$5 Million - \$25 Million	43	21.1
Greater than \$25 Million	45	22.1
Total	204	

Note. Five participants did not answer question number 6.

Research Questions

Introduction

Research question 1, “What are the predominant models of organizational leadership practiced by Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit organizations?” was answered by analyzing the responses to survey question 7, which presented a broad spectrum of leadership models business leaders claim to utilize. Unlike the remaining research questions, this question made no distinction between steward leaders and those who did not claim to be steward leaders. However, analyzing the survey statistics to answer the remaining four research questions required examination of the data based on responses specific to the leadership style, function, and characteristics of a steward as identified through Wilson’s (2010) research.

Servant leaders and steward leaders share many commonalities; therefore, specific steward leader identifiers were isolated and grouped in tables for comparison. Steward leaders may express a heightened sense of responsibility and accountability to authorities such as owners, stakeholders, government, and the Board of Directors. One may expect to observe higher recognition of God’s role in resource management and ownership by those identifying as steward leaders in comparison with those who do not identify as stewards.

After grouping question responses in comparable categories, these specific survey responses were cross-tabulated using survey question 7, part 6 (Steward Leadership), as the comparison marker. In answering the remaining research questions, a comparison was made between survey respondents who self-identified as utilizing steward leadership (question 7, part 6) with those who did not self-identify as a steward leader.

Research Question 1: What are the predominant models of organizational leadership practiced by Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit organizations?

One hundred sixty-eight (80%) participants self-identified as engaging a model of servant leadership in their organizations (Table 7). Respondents also identified themselves as utilizing team and transformational models nearly equally, 57% and 56.5% respectively. Slightly less than 19% of senior business leaders claimed to use steward leadership.

A respondent’s self-identification with steward leadership on this question served as the cross-tabulation marker in comparing steward leader responses with those who did not self-identify as a steward leader.

Table 7

Self-reported Leadership Models

Types of Leadership	<i>n</i>	%
Servant	168	80.4
Team	119	56.9
Transformational	118	56.5
Democratic	69	33.0
Situational	58	27.8
Charismatic	47	22.5
Steward	39	18.7
Transactional	23	11.0
Authoritarian	3	1.4

Note. Respondents could select more than one model.

Research Question 2: Are there differences in attitudes concerning distinguishable steward leadership characteristics between Christians in for-profit organizations who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

Survey question 8 asked respondents to rate ten specific leadership functions. Survey questions 9 and 10 asked participants to indicate how important specific characteristics are to effective organizational leadership. Survey question 11 asked respondents to indicate their understanding of a leader's accountability to recognized business authorities and constituents as well as accountability to God.

Steward leaders demonstrate service, act as a shepherd to those under their leadership, and express a vision for the future of the organization (Wilson, 2010). Table 8 examined four leadership roles from survey question 8, servant, shepherd, visionary, and steward. Respondents who self-identified as steward leaders were more likely to view their role as visionary (92.3%) than those who did not identify as a steward leader (82.6%). Steward leaders were also more likely to agree or strongly agree that shepherd (84.6%) described their leadership style or function as opposed to 67.5% of respondents who did not identify as a steward leader. One hundred forty-seven (88.6%) of the 166 participants who did not self-identify as a steward leader claimed they perceived themselves as performing the role of steward in their organization.

Table 8

Self-reported Leadership Roles

Leadership Role	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Servant				
Strongly Agree	23	59.0	90	54.2
Agree	15	38.5	62	37.3
Disagree or NA	1	2.6	14	8.4
Shepherd				
Strongly Agree	11	28.2	34	20.5
Agree	22	56.4	78	47.0
Disagree or NA	6	15.4	54	32.5
Steward				
Strongly Agree	23	59.0	36	21.7
Agree	16	41.0	111	66.9
Disagree or NA	0	0.0	19	11.4
Visionary				
Strongly Agree	22	56.4	73	44.0
Agree	14	35.9	64	38.6
Disagree or NA	3	7.7	29	17.5
Total Respondents				
	39		166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 7.

Survey question 9 contained eight items dealing specifically with a leader's perception of character as related to organizational leadership. Tables 9 and 10 presented a comparison of the perceptions of character between those who self-identified as a steward leader (survey question 7, part 6) and respondents who did not view themselves as a steward leader.

The first four character topics from survey question 9, accountability, diligence, faithfulness, and hardworking were presented in Table 9.

Thirty-nine (100%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders perceived accountability, diligence, and faithfulness as important characteristics for effective organizational leadership.

Respondents who did not self-identify as steward leaders agreed at slightly lower rates that accountability (99%), diligence (98%), and faithfulness (98%) were important characteristics for effective organizational leadership.

One hundred ninety-nine (97%) out of the total 204 respondents perceived hard working as important to effective leadership, with virtually no difference reported between steward leaders and other types of leaders in the study.

Table 9

Part 1: Perceptions of Character

Character	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Accountability				
Very Important	23	59.0	87	52.4
Important	16	41.0	77	46.4
Unimportant or NA	0	0.0	2	1.2
Diligence				
Very Important	15	38.5	64	38.6
Important	24	61.5	99	59.6
Unimportant or NA	0	0.0	3	1.8
Faithfulness				
Very Important	20	51.3	65	39.2
Important	19	48.7	97	58.4
Unimportant or NA	0	0.0	4	2.4
Hard working				
Very Important	15	38.5	69	41.6
Important	23	59.0	92	55.4
Unimportant or NA	1	2.6	5	3.0
Total Respondents		39	166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 9.

The final four character topics from survey question 9, humility, integrity, trustworthy, and wisdom were presented in Table 10.

Thirty-nine (100%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders perceived integrity, trustworthy, and wisdom as important characteristics for effective organizational leadership.

Respondents who did not self-identify as steward leaders agreed at slightly lower rates that integrity (98%), trustworthy (99%), and wisdom (99%) were important characteristics for effective organizational leadership.

Respondents who self-identified as steward leaders (97.5%) were more likely to perceive humility as important for effective organizational leadership than those who did not identify as a steward leader (82%).

Table 10

Part 2: Perceptions of Character

Character	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Humility				
Very Important	22	56.4	52	31.3
Important	16	41.0	84	50.6
Unimportant or NA	1	2.6	30	18.1
Integrity				
Very Important	31	79.5	119	71.7
Important	8	20.5	44	26.5
Unimportant or NA	0	0.0	3	1.8
Trustworthy				
Very Important	26	66.7	82	49.4
Important	13	33.3	82	49.4
Unimportant or NA	0	0.0	2	1.2
Wisdom				
Very Important	25	64.1	74	44.6
Important	14	35.9	90	54.2
Unimportant or NA	0	0.0	2	1.2
Total Respondents		39	166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 9.

Survey question 11 contained eight items dealing specifically with a leader's perception of accountability relationships associated with organizational leadership. Tables 11 and 12 presented a comparison of the perceptions of accountability relationships between those who self-identified as a steward leader (survey question 7, part 6) and respondents who did not view themselves as a steward leader.

A leader's perception of accountability to the Board of Directors, the community, employees/staff, and to God was presented in Table 11.

Thirty-eight (97%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders agreed leaders should be accountable to the Board of Directors. One hundred fifty-six (94%) respondents who did not self-identify as steward leaders agreed leaders should be accountable to the Board of Directors.

Thirty-seven (95%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders agreed leaders should be accountable to the community. One hundred fifty-nine (96%) respondents who did not self-identify as steward leaders agreed leaders should be accountable to the community.

Thirty-nine (100%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders agreed leaders should be accountable to employees and staff. One hundred sixty-five (99%) respondents who did not self-identify as steward leaders agreed leaders should be accountable to employees and staff.

Thirty-eight (97%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders agreed leaders should be accountable to God. One hundred sixty-four (99%) respondents who did not self-identify as steward leaders agreed leaders should be accountable to God.

Table 11

Part 1: Perceptions of Accountability

Relationship	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
To the Board of Directors				
Strongly Agree or Agree	38	97.4	156	94.0
Disagree or NA	1	2.6	10	6.0
To the Community				
Strongly Agree or Agree	37	94.9	159	95.8
Disagree or NA	2	5.1	7	4.2
To Employees/Staff				
Strongly Agree or Agree	39	100	165	99.4
Disagree or NA	0	0.0	1	0.6
To God				
Strongly Agree or Agree	38	97.4	164	98.8
Disagree or NA	1	2.6	2	1.2
Total Respondents	39		166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 11.

A leader's perception of accountability to the government, constituents/customers, stockholders, and volunteers was presented in Table 12.

Thirty (77%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders agreed that a leader is accountable to government, and 23% disagreed or had no opinion. One hundred twenty-four (75%) respondents who did not self-identify as steward leaders agreed that a leader is accountable to government, and 25% disagreed or had no opinion.

Thirty-nine (100%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders agreed leaders should be accountable to their constituents and customers. One hundred sixty-four (99%) respondents who did not self-identify as steward leaders agreed leaders should be accountable to their constituents and customers.

Thirty-seven (99%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders agreed leaders should be accountable to stockholders. One hundred fifty-one (91%) respondents who did not self-identify as steward leaders agreed leaders should be accountable to stockholders.

In relation to survey question 11, participants expressed the strongest disagreement with accountability to volunteers (question 11, part 8). Twenty-seven (69%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders agreed that a leader is accountable to volunteers, but 31% disagreed or had no opinion. One hundred two (61%) respondents who did not self-identify as steward leaders agreed that a leader is accountable to volunteers, and 38% disagreed or had no opinion.

Table 12

Part 2: Perceptions of Accountability

Relationship	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
To Government				
Strongly Agree or Agree	30	76.9	124	74.7
Disagree or NA	9	23.1	42	25.3
To the Constituents/Customers				
Strongly Agree or Agree	39	100	164	98.8
Disagree or NA	0	0.0	2	1.2
To Stockholders				
Strongly Agree or Agree	37	94.9	151	91.0
Disagree or NA	2	5.1	15	9.0
To Volunteers				
Strongly Agree or Agree	27	69.2	102	61.4
Disagree or NA	12	30.8	64	38.6
Total Respondents	39		166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 11.

Survey question 10 contained six items dealing specifically with a leader's perception of responsibility associated with organizational leadership. Tables 13 and 14 presented a comparison of the perceptions of responsibility between those who self-identified as a steward leader (survey question 7, part 6) and respondents who did not view themselves as a steward leader.

A leader's perception of the responsibility to make resources grow, effectively use resources, and know what stakeholders want was presented in Table 13.

Thirty-nine (100%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders perceived knowledge of stakeholder desires and the responsibility to effectively use resources as important characteristics. Respondents who did not view themselves as steward leaders agreed at slightly lower rates that leaders are responsible to know stakeholder desires (91%) and to use resources effectively (99%).

Thirty-eight (97%) steward leaders and one hundred sixty-four (99%) respondents who did not view themselves as stewards perceived the desire to make organizational resources grow as important.

Table 13

Part 1: Perceptions of Responsibility

Responsibility	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Desire to make resources grow				
Very Important	17	43.6	87	52.4
Important	21	53.8	77	46.4
Unimportant or NA	1	2.6	2	1.2
Effective use of resources				
Very Important	20	51.3	89	53.6
Important	19	48.7	75	45.2
Unimportant or NA	0	0.0	2	1.2
Knowledge of what stakeholders want				
Very Important	16	41.0	71	42.8
Important	23	59.0	80	48.2
Unimportant or NA	0	0.0	15	9.0
Total Respondents	39		166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 10.

A leader's perception of the responsibility to obey stakeholder goals, general leadership responsibility, and the willingness to take risks was presented in Table 14.

Thirty-nine (100%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders perceived responsibility as an important characteristic. One hundred sixty-four (99%) respondents who did not view themselves as steward leaders regarded responsibility as important.

Thirty-seven (95%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders perceived obedience to stakeholder goals as an important characteristic. Twenty-two (13%) respondents who did not view themselves as steward leaders either had no opinion or felt obedience to stakeholder goals was unimportant.

Respondents who did not self-identify as stewards viewed the willingness to take risks as slightly more important (97%) than steward leaders (95%).

Table 14

Part 2: Perceptions of Responsibility Reported

Responsibility	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Obedience to goals of stakeholders				
Very Important	13	33.3	65	39.2
Important	24	61.5	79	47.6
Unimportant or NA	2	5.1	22	13.3
Responsibility				
Very Important	23	59.0	73	44.0
Important	16	41.0	91	54.8
Unimportant or NA	0	0.0	2	1.2
Willingness to take risks				
Very Important	16	41.0	60	36.1
Important	21	53.8	101	60.8
Unimportant or NA	2	5.1	5	3.0
Total Respondents	39		166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 10.

Survey question 9 contained three items exploring a leader's attitude regarding submission to authority, ownership, and God. Table 15 presented a comparison of submission attitudes between those who self-identified as a steward leader (survey question 7, part 6) and respondents who did not view themselves as a steward leader.

Thirty-nine (100%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders perceived the recognition that one's leadership authority originates with God as an important characteristic. One hundred fifty-four (93%) respondents who did not view themselves as steward leaders considered recognition that one's leadership authority originates with God as important.

Thirty-seven (95%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders perceived a strong relationship with God as an important characteristic. One hundred fifty-four (93%) respondents who did not view themselves as steward leaders regarded a strong relationship with God as important.

In relation to survey question 9, participants expressed the strongest disagreement with the recognition that one does not own the organization or its resources (question 9, part 7). Thirty-six (92%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders indicated that it is important to realize one does not own the organization. Eighty-one (49%) respondents who did not self-identify as steward leaders indicated that it is important for a leader to recognize he does not own the organization, but 51% had no opinion or felt recognition of ownership was unimportant to effective leadership.

Table 15

Submission Attitudes

Submission Attitude	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Recognition authority originates with God				
Very Important	33	84.6	91	54.8
Important	6	15.4	63	38.0
Unimportant or NA	0	0.0	12	7.2
Recognition one does not own the organization				
Very Important	20	51.3	35	21.1
Important	16	41.0	46	27.7
Unimportant or NA	3	7.7	85	51.2
Strong relationship with God				
Very Important	31	79.5	120	72.3
Important	6	15.4	34	20.5
Unimportant or NA	2	5.1	12	7.2
Total Respondents	39		166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 9.

Research Question 3: Are there differences in leaders' views of employee motivation between Christian leaders who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

Two items from survey question 12 (part 7 and part 13) related to a leader's perception of employee motivation were displayed in Table 16. The table compared the opinions of respondents who self-identified as a steward leader (survey question 7, part 6) and respondents who did not view themselves as a steward leader.

Twenty-six respondents (66%) who self-identify as steward leaders either agreed or strongly agreed that employees generally like work, are self-motivated, and accept responsibility. One hundred twenty-seven (76.5%) respondents who did not identify as steward leaders viewed employees as being self-motivated and seeking responsibility.

Table 16

Views of Employee Motivation

Motivation	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
People generally like work, are self-motivated, accept and seek responsibility				
Agreement	26	66.7	127	76.5
NA	1	2.6	4	2.4
Disagreement	12	30.7	35	21.1
People generally dislike work, need to be directed, and want security instead of responsibility				
Agreement	11	28.2	36	21.7
NA	1	2.6	4	2.4
Disagreement	27	69.2	126	75.9
Total Respondents	39		166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 12.

The responses to survey question 10, part 4, which asked respondents to report how important care and concern for employees is to effective organizational leadership were displayed in Table 17. The table compared the opinions of respondents who self-identified as a steward leader (survey question 7, part 6) and respondents who did not view themselves as a steward leader.

The research showed (Table 17) nearly identical concern for employees between those who identified as a steward leader (100%) and those who did not identify (99%) as a steward leader.

Table 17

Care for Employees

People Group	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
Care and concern for employees/staff	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Very Important	23	59.0	97	58.4
Important	16	41.0	68	41.0
NA	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unimportant	0	0.0	0	0.0
Very Unimportant	0	0.0	1	.06
Total Respondents	39		166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 10.

Research Question 4: Is there a difference in a leader’s concern for the poor between Christian leaders who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

The data from survey question 10, part 5, which asked respondents to indicate how important a leader’s care and concern for the poor or less fortunate is to effective organizational leadership was presented in Table 18. The table compared the opinions of respondents who self-identified as a steward leader (survey question 7, part 6) and respondents who did not view themselves as a steward leader.

Thirty-six (92%) respondents who self-identified as steward leaders reported care and concern for the poor is important. In comparison, 27% of the participants who did not identify as steward leaders reported care for the poor as unimportant or not applicable to leadership effectiveness.

Table 18

Care for the Poor

People Group	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
Care and concern for poor or less fortunate	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Very Important	15	38.5	41	24.7
Important	21	53.8	80	48.2
NA	3	7.7	10	6.0
Unimportant	0	0.0	34	20.5
Very Unimportant	0	0.0	1	.06
Total Respondents	39		166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 10.

Research Question 5: Are there differences in the perceptions of stewardship principles (values) between Christian leaders who identify as steward leaders and those who do not?

Survey question 12 asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with 13 statements concerning organizational leadership. The question contained nine statements related to stewardship principles in association with organizational leadership. Tables 19, 20, and 21 presented a comparison of opinions between those who self-identified as a steward leader (survey question 7, part 6) and respondents who did not view themselves as a steward leader.

A comparison of opinions relating to authority and ownership was presented in Table 19.

Alignment with stewardship principles necessitated disagreement with the statement, “When one leads with the mindset of a steward, he/she gives up all authority and power.” Thirty-four (87%) respondents who self-identified as a steward leader disagreed with the statement. Five (13%) of the steward leaders either had no opinion or agreed with the statement. One hundred thirty-four (81%) respondents who did not view themselves as a steward disagreed with the statement. Nearly one-fifth (19%) of the non-steward leaders either had no opinion or agreed with the statement.

Alignment with stewardship principles necessitated disagreement with the statement, “When leading a for-profit organization, one has to act like he/she owns the organization.” Thirty-four (87%) respondents who self-identified as a steward leader disagreed with the statement. Five (13%) of the steward leaders either had no opinion or agreed with the statement. Fifty (30%) respondents who did not view themselves as a

steward disagreed with the statement. One hundred-sixteen (70%) of the non-steward leaders either had no opinion or agreed with the statement.

Table 19

Part 1: Leadership Opinions

Opinion Statement	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
When one leads with the mindset of a steward, he/she gives up all authority and power				
Strongly Disagree	17	43.6	24	14.5
Disagree	17	43.6	110	66.3
Agree or NA	5	12.8	32	19.3
When leading a for-profit organization, one has to act like he/she owns the organization				
Strongly Disagree	16	41.0	15	9.0
Disagree	18	46.2	35	21.1
Agree or NA	5	12.8	116	69.9
Total Respondents	39		166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 12.

A comparison of opinions relating to the relationship between the leader and stakeholders was presented in Table 20.

Alignment with stewardship principles necessitated agreement with the statement, “The stakeholders of an organization have the right to determine the direction and goals of the organization.” Thirty-one (79%) respondents who self-identified as a steward leader agreed with the statement. Eight (20%) of the steward leaders either had no opinion or disagreed with the statement. One hundred fifty (90%) respondents who did not view themselves as a steward agreed with the statement. Sixteen (10%) of the non-steward leaders either had no opinion or disagreed with the statement.

Alignment with stewardship principles necessitated disagreement with the statement, “A leader’s own personal vision and goals are more important than the vision and goals of the stakeholders.” Thirty-two (82%) respondents who self-identified as a steward leader disagreed with the statement. Seven (18%) of the steward leaders either had no opinion or agreed with the statement. One hundred forty-six (88%) respondents who did not view themselves as a steward disagreed with the statement. Twenty (12%) of the non-steward leaders either had no opinion or agreed with the statement.

Alignment with stewardship principles necessitated disagreement with the statement, “Leaders have the right to make decisions contrary to the wishes of stakeholders.” Twenty-one (54%) respondents who self-identified as a steward leader disagreed with the statement. Eighteen (46%) of the steward leaders either had no opinion or agreed with the statement. One hundred eight (65%) respondents who did not view themselves as a steward disagreed with the statement. Fifty-eight (35%) of the non-steward leaders either had no opinion or agreed with the statement.

Table 20

Part 2: Leadership Opinions

Opinion Statement	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
The stakeholders of an organization have the right to determine the direction and goals of the organization				
Strongly Agree	9	23.1	63	38.0
Agree	22	56.4	87	52.4
Disagree or NA	8	20.5	16	9.6
A leader's own personal vision and goals are more important than the vision and goals of the stakeholders				
Strongly Disagree	13	33.3	48	28.9
Disagree	19	48.7	98	59.0
Agree or NA	7	17.9	20	12.0
Leaders have the right to make decisions contrary to the wishes of stakeholders				
Strongly Disagree	2	5.1	11	6.6
Disagree	19	48.7	97	58.4
Agree or NA	18	46.2	58	34.9
Total Respondents	39		166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 12.

A comparison of opinions relating specifically to stewardship was presented in Table 21. Alignment with stewardship principles necessitated agreement with the statements presented in the table.

Thirty-seven (95%) respondents who self-identified as a steward leader agreed with the statement, “A biblical model of leadership is the steward leader.” Two (5%) of the steward leaders either had no opinion or disagreed with the statement. Eighty-eight (53%) respondents who did not view themselves as a steward agreed with the statement. Seventy-eight (47%) of the non-steward leaders either had no opinion or disagreed with the statement.

Thirty-seven (95%) respondents who self-identified as a steward leader agreed with the statement, “God calls every person to be a steward of the resources He provides.” Two (5%) of the steward leaders either had no opinion or disagreed with the statement. One hundred sixty-six (100%) respondents who did not view themselves as a steward agreed with the statement.

Thirty-eight (97%) respondents who self-identified as a steward leader agreed with the statement, “Resources God gives us to manage or steward go well beyond money to include almost every aspect of life.” One (3%) of the steward leaders either had no opinion or perceived the statement as not applicable. One hundred sixty-five (99%) respondents who did not view themselves as a steward agreed with the statement. One (1%) of the non-steward leaders had no opinion or perceived the statement as not applicable.

Thirty-eight (97%) respondents who self-identified as a steward leader agreed with the statement, “A major reason God gives us resources to steward is to make them

grow.” One (3%) of the steward leaders disagreed with the statement. One hundred sixty-three (98%) respondents who did not view themselves as a steward agreed with the statement. Three (2%) of the non-steward leaders either had no opinion or disagreed with the statement.

Table 21

Part 3: Leadership Opinions

Opinion Statement	Identified as Steward			
	Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
A biblical model of leadership is the steward leader				
Strongly Agree	17	43.6	12	7.2
Agree	20	51.3	76	45.8
Disagree or NA	2	5.1	78	47.0
God calls every person to be a steward of the resources He provides				
Strongly Agree	27	69.2	56	33.7
Agree	10	25.6	110	66.3
Disagree or NA	2	5.1	0	0.0
Resources God gives us to manage or steward go well beyond money to include almost every aspect of life				
Strongly Agree	29	74.4	65	39.2
Agree	9	23.1	100	60.2
Disagree or NA	1	2.6	1	0.6
A major reason God gives us resources to steward is to make them grow				
Strongly Agree	23	59.0	54	32.5
Agree	15	38.5	109	65.7
Disagree or NA	1	2.6	3	1.8
Total Respondents	39		166	

Note. Four respondents did not answer question number 12.

Chapter V. Discussion

Research Question 1: What are the predominant models of organizational leadership practiced by Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit organizations?

Participants were asked, “What types of leadership do you try to apply in your own organizational leadership?” This question served two primary purposes in understanding the leadership practices of Christians in business. First, participants were offered the opportunity to align their identity as a business leader with an accepted and defined leadership model. Steward leadership is a relatively new model of organizational leadership and may be unfamiliar to most business people; therefore, the second purpose of the question was to introduce steward leadership as a viable option for selection by participants.

Christians in senior leadership of for-profit organizations predominately identified with servant, team, and transformational leadership (Table 3). Not surprisingly, just over 80% of respondents self-identified as servant leaders. The identification of Christians with servant leadership is entrenched and vigorously promoted to Christians through books, sermons, seminars, and fellowship groups, making servant leadership a natural and default model for followers of Jesus (Wong, 2003).

Respondents also associated strongly with team (57%) and transformational (56.5%) leadership models. Identification with team leadership signals an understanding that one does not hold all the answers, and that the leader desires to develop others by utilizing their strengths (Costanza, 2011). Association with transformational leadership suggests value for employees and a desire to see positive personal development among those under one’s leadership (O’Shea, Foti, Hauenstein, & Bycio, 2009).

This research indicated the vast majority of participants claimed to utilize servant, team, and transformational leadership, yet slightly less than 19% attempted to use steward leadership. The relatively low selection of steward leadership as a model practiced by Christian business leaders is not surprising due to the general lack of awareness of the model in the marketplace of ideas (Wilson, 2010).

Research Question 2: Are there differences in attitudes concerning distinguishable steward leadership characteristics between Christians in for-profit organizations who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

To answer research question 2, tables were created by grouping survey questions into categories, based on related characteristics. The research analyzed participant's leadership roles, perceptions of character, accountability, and responsibility, as well as attitudes of submission toward authority. The items in these tables were recognized as integral to steward leadership by Wilson (2010). Responses to survey questions analyzed in the tables were compared between participants who identified as steward leaders (survey question 7, part 6) and participants who did not claim to be steward leaders.

Survey question 8, "This describes my leadership style," asked respondents to rate ten specific leadership functions based on the role they assume in their particular organization. Steward leaders demonstrate service, act as a shepherd to those under their leadership, and express a vision for the future of the organization (Wilson, 2010); therefore, these four leadership functions were examined for observable differences between steward leaders and non-steward leaders.

The research found noticeable differences between steward leaders and non-steward leaders in relation to identifiable steward leader roles. Analysis of the survey

results demonstrated steward leaders identified strongly, and at higher rates than non-steward leaders, with the roles of servant, shepherd, steward, and visionary.

Survey question 9 asked participants eight items dealing specifically with a leader's perception of character as related to organizational leadership. Character exemplified through morality, ethics, responsibility, accountability, and issues of integrity are core tenets of the Christian faith (Maxwell, 2003); therefore, this researcher expected to observe general agreement from respondents in the perceived importance of the character themes presented in the survey instrument. The items selected to answer research question 2 were identified as specific and essential to steward leadership (Wilson, 2010) and were expected to expose differences between steward leaders and non-steward leaders. The eight items related to Christian character were examined for observable differences between steward leaders and non-steward leaders.

The research found only one noticeable difference between steward leaders and non-steward leaders in relation to perceptions of character. Analysis of the survey results demonstrated steward leaders identified humility as an important and desirable aspect of character at higher rates than non-steward leaders. There were no noticeable differences between stewards and their non-steward peers in perceptions of accountability, diligence, faithfulness, hardworking, integrity, trustworthiness, or wisdom.

Survey question 9 also contained three items exploring a leader's attitude regarding submission to authority, ownership, and God. The research found two noticeable differences between steward leaders and non-steward leaders in relation to perceptions of submission. Analysis of the survey results demonstrated steward leaders perceived recognition that their authority originates with God as more important than

other types of leaders in the study. The most noticeable difference between steward leaders and non-steward leaders was in response to organizational ownership. Steward leaders (92%) perceived recognition that one does not own the organization as significantly more important than non-steward leaders (49%). There were negligible differences between stewards and non-stewards concerning the importance of a strong relationship with God.

Survey question 10 contained six items dealing specifically with a leader's perception of responsibility associated with organizational leadership. The research found two noticeable differences between steward leaders and non-steward leaders in relation to perceptions of responsibility. Analysis of the survey results demonstrated steward leaders (100%) identified the knowledge of stakeholder desires as more important than non-steward peers (91%). Steward leaders (95%) also identified obedience to stakeholder goals as more important than non-steward leaders (87%).

These findings were not consistent with the responses to later questions regarding stakeholder rights.

Steward leaders (21%) disagreed at higher rates than non-steward leaders (10%) that "stakeholders of an organization have the right to determine the direction and goals of the organization" (survey question 12, part 12). Steward leaders (18%) agreed at higher rates than non-steward leaders (12%) that "a leader's own personal vision and goals are more important than the vision and goals of the stakeholders," (survey question 12, part 3). Nearly half (46%) of the steward leaders and 35% of their non-steward peers agreed that "leaders have the right to make decisions contrary to the wishes of stakeholders" (survey question 12, part 6).

Considering the inconsistency and apparent discrepancy between steward leader responses to statements concerning stakeholder accountability and rights, analysis of the research did not demonstrate verifiable distinctions between steward leaders and non-steward leaders in the area of responsibility to stakeholders.

There were negligible differences between stewards and non-stewards in perceptions of resource growth, effective use of resources, responsibility in general, and the willingness to take risks.

Survey question 11 asked respondents to indicate their understanding of a leader's accountability to eight items dealing specifically with a leader's perception of accountability relationships associated with organizational leadership. A comparison of perceptions of accountability demonstrated negligible differences between steward leaders and other types of leaders in the study. The most noticeable difference was observed in the perception of accountability to volunteers. Steward leaders (69%) perceived an accountability relationship with volunteers at slightly higher rates than non-steward leaders (61%). Both groups rated the relationship with volunteers substantially less important than the other seven accountability relationships. This may have been due to the nature of the organizations represented in the study. The for-profit organizations represented in the project may not have had active relationships with volunteers.

Research Question 3: Are there differences in leaders' views of employee motivation between Christian leaders who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

Participants were asked two questions related to their views on employee motivation, and one question rating the leaders' concern for employees.

McGregor's (1967) Theory Y assumes employees enjoy work, are naturally inclined to work hard, seek responsibility, take pride in accomplishment, are often self-directed, and desire to increase their own abilities. Motivation Theory Y was examined in survey question 12, part 7, which asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, "people generally like work, are self-motivated, accept and seek responsibility."

McGregor's (1967) Theory X assumes employees are naturally lazy, lacking initiative, and in constant need of direction, instruction, and guidance. Motivation comes through threats, coercion, fear of punishment, and hopes of rewards. Motivation Theory X was examined in survey question 12, part 13, which asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, "people generally dislike work, need to be directed, and want security instead of responsibility."

Survey question 10, part 4, asked participants how important "care and concern for employees/staff" is to effective organizational leadership. Previous research (Conrad, 1954; Rodin, 2000; Rodin, 2010; Wilson, 2010) indicated the Christian leader's responsibility to care for others, especially employees, can be included as a characteristic of a steward leader under the role of shepherd. Attitudes on a leader's care for employees was included as supporting data for answering research question 3, "Are there differences

in leaders' views of employee motivation between Christian leaders who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?" Whether or not a leader cares about his employees may have an impact on how he views employee motivation.

Two hundred four respondents (99.4%) agreed care and concern for employees was important or very important, with only one (0.6%) participant ranking the item as very unimportant. This research study found no difference in care and concern for employees between those who identified themselves as steward leaders and those who did not view themselves as steward leaders.

Wilson's (2010) research on steward leadership in non-profit organizations found 65% of the participants in his study viewed employees as generally liking work, accepting responsibility and being self-motivated. This research study found similar results with 67% of steward leaders viewing employees as generally liking work and accepting responsibility (Theory Y). However, 77% of respondents who did not identify as steward leaders viewed employee motivation through McGregor's (1967) Theory X.

This study revealed 69% of steward leaders and 80% of their non-steward peers rejected McGregor's (1967) Theory X. The study revealed both steward leaders and non-steward leaders strongly rejected the notion that employees dislike work and require constant supervision.

Considering steward leaders and non-steward leaders viewed care for employees equally important, this particular aspect of the study did not offer supporting data for answering how steward leaders view employee motivation.

The research found differences existed in perceptions of employee motivation between steward leaders and other types of leaders in the study. Even though steward

leaders viewed employee motivation optimistically, respondents who did not self-identify as steward leaders were 10% more likely to perceive employee motivation in positive terms. Identification with steward leadership did not result in higher agreement with positive views of employee motivation.

Research Question 4: Is there a difference in leaders' concern for the poor between Christian leaders who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

Participants were asked one question related to their perspective on the relationship between effective organizational leadership and concern for the poor. Survey question 10, part 5, asked participants how important "care and concern for the poor or less fortunate" is to effective organizational leadership.

Care and concern for the poor is a basic tenet of the Christian faith (Mt 19:21; Mt 25:35; Acts 9:36; Rom 12:20; Jas 1:27; 1 Jn 3:17-18), and a major motivation for philanthropic giving (Bishop & Green, 2009; Brooks, 2006; Kao, Kao, & Kao, 2005). Jesus sought the outcast because the healthy do not need a physician (Mk 2:17); He had a special affinity with the poor, sick, and downtrodden.

Research on Christian stewardship found a positive attitude toward the poor is a characteristic of a steward leader (Wilson, 2010). One study in particular concerning giving, "showed that Evangelical Christian donors strongly agreed with biblical stewardship principles" (Brooks, 2005, p. i). Some wealthy Christian business people are leading efforts to help their peers understand once reasonable personal and family needs are met, one should endeavor to take care of the needs of others (Cathy, 2011; National Christian Foundation, 2011; Tam & Anderson, 1969). These business people provide an

example for their peers by leading from a life of generosity, with an open hand and an open heart toward those who are in need (Hanna, 2008).

The results of the data collected in this study found steward leaders (92%) perceived care and concern for the poor as more important than non-steward leaders (73%). None of the steward leaders in the study considered care for the poor as unimportant; however, the research revealed 20% of their non-steward peers perceived care and concern for the poor as unimportant.

This research demonstrated a substantial difference in perceptions of care for the poor between Christian leaders who identified as steward leaders and those who did not.

Research Question 5: Are there differences in the perceptions of stewardship principles (values) between Christian leaders who identify as steward leaders and those who do not?

To answer research question 5, tables were created by grouping survey questions into categories, based on related opinion statements. The research analyzed participant's leadership opinions concerning authority, ownership, stakeholder rights, and basic stewardship principles.

Survey question 12, "Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements," asked respondents to rate thirteen opinion statements. Nine of those statements applied directly to research question 5, "Are there differences in the perceptions of stewardship principles (values) between Christian leaders who identify as steward leaders and those who do not?" The items analyzed in these tables were recognized as integral to steward leadership by Wilson's (2010) research on steward leadership among leaders of non-profit organizations. Responses to survey questions analyzed in the tables were compared between participants who identified as steward

leaders (survey question 7, part 6) and participants who did not claim to be steward leaders.

The research found noticeable differences between steward leaders and non-steward leaders in relation to the leadership opinions presented in the survey instrument.

Analysis of the survey results demonstrated steward leaders disagreed with the opinion that leaders give up all authority and power while acting as a steward at higher rates than other leaders in the study. This is consistent with the recognition that stewards are given authority and power to accomplish their duties as overseers for the owner (Kao, 2007; Werning, 1982; Westbrook, 1996).

Steward leadership allows the leader to exercise authority and power, while serving, due to the responsibilities God places on His stewards (Rodin, 2000; Rodin, 2010; Werning, 1982; Werning, 1986; Westbrook, 1996; Wilson, 2010). The Christian is both a slave and an heir. As slaves, Christians can only do what the owner desires. The rights and privileges of inheritance are not necessarily received immediately as followers of Christ, but are evident through participation in Christ's eternal rule following the believer's resurrection.

While recognizing secular business leaders do not approach their work from a Biblical perspective, this study addressed ownership issues with the Christian businessperson in mind.

Steward leaders rejected the opinion "when leading a for-profit organization, one has to act like he/she owns the organization" at higher rates (87%) than their non-steward leader peers (30%). This corresponded to the findings from an earlier question regarding ownership. Survey question 9, part 8, asked respondents to rate the importance of a

leader's "recognition that one does not 'own' the organization or its resources." Steward leaders overwhelmingly agreed (92%) with the importance of this statement on ownership.

Analysis of the survey data revealed differences in respondent's opinions of stakeholder rights. Steward leaders (21%) disagreed at higher rates than non-steward leaders (10%) that "stakeholders of an organization have the right to determine the direction and goals of the organization" (survey question 12, part 12). Steward leaders (18%) agreed at higher rates than non-steward leaders (12%) that "a leader's own personal vision and goals are more important than the vision and goals of the stakeholders," (survey question 12, part 3). Nearly half (46%) of the steward leaders and 35% of their non-steward leader peers agreed that "leaders have the right to make decisions contrary to the wishes of stakeholders" (survey question 12, part 6). According to the responses to statements concerning stakeholder rights presented in survey question 12, non-steward leaders appeared to respect stakeholder rights at higher levels than steward leaders.

These findings were not consistent with the responses to earlier questions regarding accountability to stakeholders. Survey question 10, part 8, asked participants to rate the importance of a leader's "knowledge of what the organization's stakeholders want." One hundred percent of steward leaders agreed with the importance of knowing what stakeholders want, compared with 91% of non-stewards. Survey question 10, part 9, asked participants to rate the importance of a leader's "obedience to the desires and goals of the stakeholders." Ninety-five percent of the steward leaders agreed with the statement, compared with 87% of non-stewards. Steward leaders (95%) were also more

likely than non-steward leaders (91%) to agree that a leader is accountability to stockholders (survey question 11, part 7).

Considering the inconsistency and apparent discrepancy between steward leader responses to statements concerning stakeholder accountability and rights, analysis of the research did not demonstrate verifiable distinctions between steward leaders and non-steward leaders in relation to stakeholder rights.

Analysis of the survey data revealed differences in respondent's opinions of stewardship principles. Steward leaders agreed at higher rates than non-steward leaders with the opinion "a biblical model of leadership is the steward leader" (survey question 12, part 5).

Steward leaders agreed at slightly lower rates than non-steward leaders with the statement, "God calls every person to be a steward of the resources He provides," (survey question 12, part 9). Steward leaders agreed at slightly lower rates than non-steward leaders that "resources God gives us to manage or steward go well beyond money to include almost every aspect of life" (survey question 12, part 10) and "a major reason God gives us resources to steward is to make them grow" (survey question 12, part 11).

According to this analysis, non-steward leaders appeared to understand and value stewardship principles at higher levels than steward leaders. Future research in the area of steward leadership may focus on exploring the depth and complexity of a leader's interpretation of stewardship principles.

Summary of Discussion

This section provides a summary of the findings for each research question.

Research Question 1: What are the predominant models of organizational leadership practiced by Christians in senior leadership positions of for-profit organizations?

1. The vast majority of participants claimed to utilize servant, team, and transformational leadership.
2. Less than 20% of respondents claimed to utilize steward leadership.

Research Question 2: Are there differences in attitudes concerning distinguishable steward leadership characteristics between Christians in for-profit organizations who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

1. Steward leaders identified strongly, and at higher rates than non-steward leaders, with the roles of servant, shepherd, steward, and visionary.
2. Steward leaders identified humility as an important and desirable aspect of character at higher rates than non-steward leaders.
3. There were no noticeable differences between stewards and non-stewards in perceptions of accountability, diligence, faithfulness, hardworking, integrity, trustworthiness, or wisdom.
4. Steward leaders perceived recognition that their authority originates with God as more important than non-steward leaders.
5. Steward leaders perceived the importance of recognition that one does not own the organization at significantly higher rates than non-steward leaders.

Research Question 3: Are there differences in leaders' views of employee motivation between Christian leaders who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

Analysis found steward leaders were less likely than non-steward leaders to view employee motivation positively.

Research Question 4: Is there a difference in leaders' concern for the poor between Christian leaders who identify themselves as steward leaders and those who do not?

Steward leaders were substantially more likely than non-steward leaders to perceive care and concern for the poor as important.

Research Question 5: Are there differences in the perceptions of stewardship principles (values) between Christian leaders who identify as steward leaders and those who do not?

1. Steward leaders rejected the opinion one must act like an owner at substantially higher rates than non-steward leaders.
2. Steward leaders agreed that steward leadership is a biblical model of leadership at far higher rates than non-steward leaders.
3. Steward leaders rated basic stewardship principles and ideals at slightly lower rates than non-steward leaders.

Recommendations for Future Research

The results of this research project exposed an unexpected discrepancy between the opinions of self-identified steward leaders and other types of leaders in the study. Steward leaders rated general stewardship principles slightly lower than did their non-steward leader peers. One would expect the research to show self-professed Christian

stewards identifying with stewardship principles at higher levels than other Christians in the study. Exploring this apparent inconsistency is an area for future research.

This researcher expects humility plays a large role in the character of a steward leader. Humble recognition that one is a trustee and not an owner is a critical “step in becoming a steward” (Westbrook, 1996, p. 17). A survey developed by Elliott (2010) may prove useful in helping to determine the presence or absence of humility in the character of self-identified steward leaders. The exploration of humility in steward leadership may prove helpful in future research.

To develop a better understanding of the steward leader’s perceptions of employee motivation, future studies may consider the relationship between the organization’s primary industry and a leader’s view of employee motivation. Industries experiencing high employee turnover or low employee satisfaction rates may add to a leader’s negative view of employee motivation. Similarly, business segments marked by high levels of employee satisfaction and low turnover may influence a leader to view employee motivation more positively.

The identification and exploration of formative factors in steward leader development is a viable subject for future research. In-depth personal interviews would also prove beneficial to understanding areas of character development that fall beyond the objectives of this study. Interviews might include the following areas of inquiry:

1. A definition of stewardship in the leader’s own words.
2. A description or definition of who a steward is in the leader’s understanding of stewardship.

3. A listing of characteristics described by the leader, which signify the presence of steward leadership in a leader.
4. How is steward leadership distinctive from other models of leadership?
5. How did the leader become aware of steward leadership principles, and how did the leader implement those principles in his personal leadership?
6. How is resource management different under steward leadership as opposed to an ownership mentality?
7. What is the goal of resource management under the model of steward leadership?
8. How does the steward leader manage risks in an effort to grow profits and expand the business enterprise?
9. What is the responsibility of the steward leader to other stakeholders in the company?

Conclusion

This research project found ownership attitudes were foundational to steward leadership among Christian business leaders. The recognition that the business leader did not own the resources under his care was a major identifying characteristic of steward leaders (Tables 15 & 19). While the research and development of steward leadership as a viable model for Christian business people continues, there is a need for a consistent and Biblically informed acknowledgment that the business leader serves and manages resources for Jesus. Jesus had a special and unique mission on earth that no other person can match or duplicate. His leadership methods were intended to create followers of

Himself; therefore, Christian business leaders who operate under stewardship point followers to Jesus, either directly or through their leadership.

This study revealed steward leaders perceive care for the poor as a legitimate concern and attribute of an effective leader. This was an intriguing discovery and may encourage steward leaders in business to develop socially and economically beneficial enterprises for addressing poverty.

Many Christian business leaders have taken the opportunity to live and lead as representatives of Jesus, placing their businesses in the marketplace as instruments of advancing the Gospel, caring for the poor, and working toward social justice (Wong & Rae, 2011; Yamamori & Eldred, 2003). The Christian business movement known as Business as Missions (Johnson & Rundle, 2009; Nash, 1994) appears to have opened the door for Christians to proclaim their faith openly in the marketplace, and operate their enterprises as though God is in control (Pascarella, 1999). Christian stewards understand and value the conviction that everything under their care is on loan from God and is not their own. The Business as Missions movement demonstrates businesses can affect good in society, if people lead them with a moral and spiritual compass aligned with Jesus Christ. Steward leadership may enhance the Christian business leader's ability to pursue organizational and missional goals (Russell, 2010) by diminishing the entanglements and obligations many leaders experience due to views of ownership, privilege, conflicting lines of authority, and misunderstood roles of accountability.

References

- Alcorn, R. C. (2003). *Money, possessions, and eternity*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers.
- Alford, H. J., & Naughton, M. (2001). *Managing as if faith mattered: Christian social principles in the modern organization*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Arthurs, J. D., & Busenitz, L. W. (2003). The boundaries and limitations of agency theory and stewardship theory in the venture capitalist/entrepreneur relationship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(2), 145-162.
- Avila, C. (1983). *Ownership, early Christian teaching*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Batson, D.C. (2006). Orchestrating prosocial motives. In Rhode, D. L. (Ed.). *Moral leadership: The theory and practice of power, judgment, and policy* (pp. 197-212). Warren Bennis signature series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bishop, M., & Green, M. (2009). *Philanthro-capitalism: How giving can save the world*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press.
- Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Bøhren, Ø. (1998). The agent's ethics in the principal-agent model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(7), 745.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2009). Reframing ethics, spirit, and soul. In Hesselbein, F., & Goldsmith, M. (Eds.), *The organization of the future 2: Visions, strategies,*

and insights on managing in a new era (pp. 132-144). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brooks, A. C. (2006). *Who really cares: The surprising truth about compassionate conservatism : America's charity divide--who gives, who doesn't, and why it matters*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Brooks, J. M. (2005). *A study of the motivations and preferences for charitable giving among women and men who support evangelical Christian higher education*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertation database. (UMI No. AAT 3200295).

Buckingham, M. (2005). *The one thing you need to know: About great managing, great leading, and sustained individual success*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Burns, J. M. G. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Burns, R. B. (2000). *Introduction to research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Cathy, S. T. (2011). *Wealth: Is it worth it?* Decatur, GA: Looking Glass Books.

Clinton, J. R. (1989). *Leadership emergence theory: A self-study manual for analyzing the development of a Christian leader*. Altadena, CA: Barnabas Resources.

Coleman, A. (1998). Legacy leadership: Stewardship and courage. *Health Progress*. 79(6), 28.

Conrad, A. C. (1954). *The divine economy: A study in stewardship*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Costanza, R. J. (2011). *A study of shared leadership among department chairs in a state college*. Chattanooga, TN: Tennessee Temple University.

- Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 20-47.
- Depree, Max. (1998). *Leadership is an Art*. New York, NY: Dell.
- Donaldson, L., & Davis, J. H. (1991). Stewardship theory or agency theory: CEO governance and shareholder returns. *Australian Journal of Management*, 16(1).
- Elliott, J. C. (2010). *Humility: Development and analysis of a scale*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/795
- Finzel, H. (2007). *The top ten mistakes leaders make*. Colorado Springs, CO: David C. Cook.
- Ford, P. R. (2006). *Knocking over the leadership ladder*. St. Charles, IL: ChurchSmart Resources.
- Friedman, T. L. (2008). *Hot, flat, and crowded: Why we need a green revolution-- and how it can renew America*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Friesen, G., & Maxson, J. R. (2004). *Decision making and the will of God*. Sisters, OR: Multnomah Publishers.
- Gaber, J., & Gaber, S. L. (2010). Using face validity to recognize empirical community observations. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 33(2), 138-146. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0149718909000809>
- Galbraith, J. R. (2009). Multidimensional, multinational organizations of the future. In Hesselbein, F., & Goldsmith, M. (Eds.), *The organization of the future 2: Visions, strategies, and insights on managing in a new era* (pp. 174-187). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Glatthorn, A. A., Joyner, R. L. (2005). *Writing the winning thesis or dissertation: A step-by-step guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Goldsmith, M. (2003). *Global leadership: The global generation*. Harlow, England: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- González, J. L. (2002). *Faith and wealth: A history of early Christian ideas on the origin, significance, and use of money*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Green, J., Schmiesing, K. E. (2001). *The state of economic education in United States seminaries: A report from the Center for Economic Personalism at the Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty*. Grand Rapids, MI: Acton Institute.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1991). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, IN: Robert K. Greenleaf Center.
- Guttman, H. M. (2009). The new high-performance, horizontal organization. In Hesselbein, F., & Goldsmith, M. (Eds.), *The organization of the future 2: Visions, strategies, and insights on managing in a new era* (pp. 268-281). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Handy, C. (2009). Revisiting the concept of the corporation. In Hesselbein, F., & Goldsmith, M. (Eds.), *The organization of the future 2: Visions, strategies, and insights on managing in a new era* (pp. 88-97). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hanna, F. J. (2008). *What your money means: (and how to use it well)*. New York, NY: Crossroad Publishing.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.

- Jackson, I. A. (2009). The best hope for organizations of the future: A functioning society. In Hesselbein, F., & Goldsmith, M. (Eds.), *The organization of the future 2: Visions, strategies, and insights on managing in a new era* (pp. 120-131). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Johnson, C. E. (2009). *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership: Casting light or shadow*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Johnson, C. N., & Rundle, S. (2009). *Business as mission: A comprehensive guide to theory and practice*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Kao, R. W. Y. (2007). *Stewardship-based economics*. Singapore: World Scientific.
- Kao, R. W. Y., Kao, K. R., & Kao, R. R. (2005). *An entrepreneurial approach to stewardship accountability: Corporate residual and global poverty*. Singapore: World Scientific.
- Kibrick, B. (2008). *Between the lines Jim Kouzes, part 1* [Video file]. Video posted to <http://www.leadershipchallenge.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-322032.html>
- Kibrick, B. (2008). *Between the lines Jim Kouzes, part 2* [Video file]. Video posted to <http://www.leadershipchallenge.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-322033.html>
- Kimball, D. (2007). *They like Jesus but not the church: Insights from emerging generations*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Kipnis, D., Price, K., Schmidt, S., & Stitt, C. (1981). Why do I like thee: Is it your performance or my orders? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66(3), 324-328.
doi:10.1037/00219010.66.3.324
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2009). The leader's mandate: Create a shared sense of destiny. In Hesselbein, F., & Goldsmith, M. (Eds.), *The organization of the future 2: Visions, strategies, and insights on managing in a new era* (pp. 27-36). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lencioni, P. (2007). *The three signs of a miserable job: A fable for managers (and their employees)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- MacArthur, J. (2004). *The book on leadership*. Nashville, TN: Nelson.
- Maxwell, J. C. (2003). *There's no such thing as business ethics: There's only one rule for making decisions*. New York, NY: Warner Books.
- McGregor, D. (1967). *The professional manager*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Moriarty, M. (2007). Workplace coach: Recognition of work is a welcome gift any time of the year. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*. Retrieved May 26, 2011, from http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/business/342843_workcoach10.html
- Nash, L. L. (1994). *Believers in business*. Nashville, TN: Nelson.
- National Christian Foundation. (2011). *The Generous business: A guide for incorporating giving at work*. Retrieved February 22, 2012, from NationalChristian.com: <http://www.nationalchristian.com/download/474>
- Nevo, B. (1985). Face validity revisited. *Journal of Educational Measurement*. 22(4), 287-93.
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

- Olson, K. (2008). *The Relationship between stewardship theory of management and employee engagement: A case study exploration of the leadership philosophy of a professional services firm*. Lisle, IL: Benedictine University.
- O'Shea, P., Foti, R., Hauenstein, N. M. A., & Bycio, P. (2009). Are the best leaders Both transformational and transactional? A pattern-oriented analysis. *Leadership*, 5(2), 237-259.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1981). *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. New York, NY: Avon.
- Pascarella, P. (1999). *Christ-centered leadership: Thriving in business by putting God in charge*. Rocklin, CA: Prima Publishing.
- Pollard, C. W. (2006). *Serving two masters?: Reflections on God and profit*. New York, NY: Collins.
- Porter, B., & VanderVeen, S. (2002.). Motivation from a Christian perspective. Retrieved March 10, 2012, from http://www.cbfa.org/Porter_VanderVeen_Paper.pdf
- Pullen, A. & Rhodes, C. (2008). 'It's all about me!': Gendered narcissism and leader's identity work. *Leadership*, 4(1), 5-25.
- Rodin, R. S. (2000). *Stewards in the kingdom: A theology of life in all its fullness*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Rodin, R. S. (2010). *The steward leader: Transforming people, organizations and communities*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Rundle, S., & Steffen, T. A. (2003). *Great commission companies: The emerging role of business in missions*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

- Russell, M. (2010). *The missional entrepreneur: Principles and practices for business as mission*. Birmingham, AL: New Hope Publishers.
- Sahlman, W. (1990). The structure and governance of venture capital organizations. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 27, 473–524.
- Sanders, J. O. (1994). *Spiritual leadership: Principles of excellence for every believer*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.
- Sapienza, H.J. & Gupta, A.K. (1994). Impact of agency risks and task uncertainty on venture capitalist-entrepreneur relations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1618–1632.
- Schilling, J. (2009). From ineffectiveness to destruction: A qualitative study on the meaning of negative leadership. *Leadership*, 5(1), 102-128.
- Sheehy, G. (1995). *New passages: Mapping your life across time*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Solomon, L. D. (2004). *Evangelical Christian executives: A new model for business corporations*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Spears, L. C. (1998). *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Tam, S., & Anderson, K. (1969). *God owns my business*. Waco, TX: Word Books.
- Tourish, D. and Vatcha, N. (2005). Charismatic leadership and corporate cultism at enron: The elimination of dissent, the promotion of conformity and organizational collapse. *Leadership*, 1(4):455-480.
- Turman, P. D., & Burtis, J. O. (2010). *Leadership communication as citizenship*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

- Tyler, T. R. (2006). Self-sacrifice and self-interest: Do ethical values shape behavior in organizational settings? In Rhode, D. L. (Ed.). *Moral leadership: The theory and practice of power, judgment, and policy* (pp. 213-226). Warren Bennis signature series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Van Duzer, J. B. (2010). *Why business matters to God: (and what still needs to be fixed)*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Werner, A. (2008). The influence of Christian identity on SME owner-managers' conceptualisations of business practice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82(2), 449-462.
- Werning, W. J. (1982). *Christian stewards, confronted and committed*. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House.
- Werning, W. J. (1986). *Supply-side stewardship: A call to Biblical priorities*. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House.
- Westbrook, K. (1996). *Enter into the joy: Living as God's steward*. Boston, MA: Pauline Books & Media.
- Wilson, K. (2010). *Steward Leadership: Characteristics of the steward leader in Christian nonprofit organizations*. University of Aberdeen, Scotland.
- Wong, K. L., & Rae, S. B. (2011). *Business for the common good: A Christian vision for the marketplace*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Wong, P. T. (2003). *An opponent-process model of servant leadership and a typology of leadership styles*. Retrieved January 09, 2012, from Trinity Western University: <http://www.twu.ca/academics/graduate/leadership/servant-leadership/servant-leadership-roundtable-typology.pdf>

Yamamori, T., & Eldred, K. A. (2003). *On kingdom business: Transforming missions through entrepreneurial strategies*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.

Appendix A: Invitation to Participate in Survey

I would like to invite you to participate in a research survey I am conducting through Tennessee Temple University concerning the characteristics of Christian leaders in business.

As a respected Christian in business, your contribution will provide the foundation for this project. I realize you are busy, with many people and projects demanding your time. Participation in the survey is completely voluntary, online, and takes 10-15 minutes to complete. The online survey will be active for your participation until February 1, 2012.

Would you take a few moments to give your input on leadership in business?

Please use the following link https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/*** to take the survey.

If you have any questions, please contact me at ***@***.com

Thank you for helping add value to the understanding of Christians in the marketplace.

Respectfully,

Howard Rich

Appendix B: Letter Asking for Referrals to Survey

I am a Ph.D. student researching the leadership characteristics of Christians in for-profit businesses. As part of this research, I have designed a survey that will form the foundation for my dissertation; therefore, your input and the input of the members of the organization you represent are invaluable.

If you are interested in assisting with this vital research, would you consider the following:

1. Putting me in contact with Christian business leaders represented by _____ willing to take the survey?

OR

2. Copying the below email inviting business leaders to participate in the survey, and sending it out to your constituents?

AND

3. Taking the survey yourself using the link in the invitation letter below?
You may preview the survey here:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/***

With the help of organizations like _____, this research can broaden our understanding of the impact of Christian leaders in for-profit businesses.

I would like to invite you to participate in a research survey I am conducting through Tennessee Temple University concerning the characteristics of Christian leaders in business.

As a respected Christian in business, your contribution will provide the foundation for this project. I realize you are busy, with many people and projects demanding your time. Participation in the survey is completely voluntary, online, and takes 10-15 minutes to complete. The online survey will be active for your participation until February 1, 2012.

Would you take a few moments to give your input on leadership in business?

Please use the following link https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/*** to take the survey.

If you have any questions, please contact me at ***@***.com

Thank you for helping add value to the understanding of Christians in the marketplace.

Appendix C: Christian For-Profit Leader Survey

1. Which of the following best represents your current title (select one)?

1. Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
2. President
3. Vice President
4. Other Corporate Executive
5. Division Director
6. Department/Team Manager
7. Board of Director
8. Owner/Self-Employed
9. Other

2. What is your gender?

1. Male
2. Female

3. Which category below includes your age?

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> 17 or younger | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 40-49 |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> 18-20 | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> 50-59 |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> 21-29 | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> 60 or older |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 30-39 | |

4. What industry best describes the primary activities of your company?

5. What is the number of full and part time employees/staff that are under your leadership?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> 1-5 | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> 31-40 |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> 6-10 | 8. <input type="checkbox"/> 41-50 |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15 | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> 51-75 |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 16-20 | 10. <input type="checkbox"/> 76-100 |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 21-25 | 11. <input type="checkbox"/> 100+ |
| 6. <input type="checkbox"/> 26-30 | |

6. What is the total annual revenue of your organization (in US dollars)?

1. Less than \$10,000
2. \$10,000 - \$50,000
3. \$50,000 - \$100,000
4. \$100,000 - \$500,000
5. \$500,000 - \$1 Million
6. \$1 Million - \$5 Million
7. \$5 Million - \$25 Million
8. Greater than \$25 Million

7. What types of leadership do you try to apply in your own organizational leadership?
You may select more than one.

1. Authoritarian Leadership - This leader is the primary decision maker. Subordinates have little input into policy or procedures and are expected to carry out the orders of the decision maker without question.
2. Charismatic Leadership - This leader draws people to himself through the power of his personality, and leads due to a sense of exceptional giftedness.
3. Democratic Leadership - Leadership through discussion, consensus, and the sharing of ideas. This leader takes the input of many people or groups and forms the best decision based on free-flowing interaction.
4. Servant Leadership - This leader views himself as a servant first, understanding his primary responsibility as the care of others. Leadership is accomplished by serving the needs of the organization, employees and customers.
5. Situational Leadership - This leader flows between four major types of interaction with followers: he may tell followers exactly what needs to be done, he may explain a situation in an effort to increase a follower's buy-in, he may actually participate in the accomplishment of the task, or he may simply delegate the task to followers he deems responsible.
6. Steward Leadership - Valuing everything under his care, this leader understands his position, influence, organization, and resources are on loan, and must be used for the benefit of the rightful owner. This leader gives authority away, empowers, decreases himself so he may increase the value of others, and seeks the highest good of others.
7. Team Leadership - Leadership is shared by many people or many groups, with decisions made by those who are most capable and informed on the subject in question. Leadership is far more horizontal than vertical.
8. Transactional Leadership - Leadership is based on reward or punishment. When employees accomplish goals and are successful they are rewarded; when employees miss targets and do not reach goals they are reprimanded. The leader/follower relationship is based on giving something of value in return for something of value.
9. Transformational Leadership - Followers are valued for their unique ideas, dreams, and desires. The transformational leader enables followers to grow and develop into whole people. This type of leadership is focused on positive change in followers.
10. I follow no particular model of leadership.

8. This describes my leadership style:

Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1. Administrator					
2. Authority					
3. Coach					
4. Delegator					
5. Manager					
6. Mentor					
7. Servant					
8. Shepherd					
9. Steward					
10. Visionary					

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = N/A

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly Agree

9. How important are the following characteristics for effective organizational leadership?

Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1. Accountability					
2. Diligence					
3. Faithfulness					
4. Hard working					
5. Humility					
6. Integrity					
7. Recognition that one does not "own" the organization or its resources					
8. Recognition that one's leadership authority originates with God					
9. Sense of mission or purpose					
10. Servant attitude					
11. Strong relationship with God					
12. Trustworthy					
13. Vision					
14. Wisdom					

- 1 = Very Unimportant
- 2 = Unimportant
- 3 = N/A
- 4 = Important
- 5 = Very Important

10. Here are additional words and phrases. How important are these characteristics for effective organizational leadership?

Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1. Ability to delegate work or duties to others					
2. Ability to motivate others					
3. Always learning					
4. Care and concern for employees/staff					
5. Care and concern for the poor or less fortunate					
6. Desire to make the resources of the organization grow					
7. Effective and efficient use of organizational resources					
8. Knowledge of what the organization's stakeholders (i.e., donors, Board of Directors, constituents) want the organization or leader to do					
9. Obedience to the desires and goals of the stakeholders					
10. Responsibility					
11. Self-control					
12. Strategic thinking/planning					
13. Willing to take risks					

- 1 = Very Unimportant
- 2 = Unimportant
- 3 = N/A
- 4 = Important
- 5 = Very Important

11. An organizational leader should be accountable for his/her decisions:

Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1. To the Board of Directors					
2. To the Community					
3. To Employees/Staff					
4. To God					
5. To Government					
6. To the Organization's Constituents/Customers					
7. To Stockholders					
8. To Volunteers					

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = N/A
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

12. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by checking the item that best expresses your opinion.

Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1. A leader can be effective if he/she sees himself/herself as a servant of others					
2. When one leads with the mindset of a steward, he/she gives up all authority and power					
3. A leader's own personal vision and goals are more important than the vision and goals of the stakeholders					
4. The leader of an organization should not take risks with the organization's resources					
5. A biblical model of leadership is the steward leader					
6. Leaders have the right to make decisions contrary to the wishes of stakeholders					
7. People generally like work, are self-motivated, accept and seek responsibility.					
8. When leading a for-profit organization, one has to act like he/she owns the organization to be effective					
9. God calls every person to be a steward of the resources He provides.					

10. The resources God gives us to manage or steward go well beyond money to include almost every aspect of life.					
11. A major reason God gives us resources to steward or manage is to make them grow.					
12. The stakeholders of an organization have the right to determine the direction and goals of the organization.					
13. People generally dislike work, need to be directed, and want security instead of responsibility					

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = N/A
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

13. Please help us by providing your name and email address (both optional) for possible follow-up. Rest assured all survey results will be reported anonymously.

Name	
Email Address	