

really want is to feel that they are contributing to a higher purpose and that they have the opportunity as individuals to learn and grow. The women believe that employees and peers perform better when they feel they are part of an organization and can share in its success. Allowing them to get involved and to work to their potential is a way of maximizing their contributions and using human resources most efficiently.⁷⁰

Whether understood as a tool to dismantle patriarchal power, the goal of sharing power is not the sharing itself, but transforming active participation from participants into producing satisfied outcomes for common goals. By promoting gender equality and creating a common vision in multidimensions of diverse experiences, feminist leadership in business or other organizations intends to transform patriarchal organizational cultures into gender-equitable cultures and exercise intentional inclusivity and diversity. However, the goal of feminist leadership is not this transformation itself. By eliminating a toxic patriarchy, this leadership aims to create better environments for women, so that this better, gender-equitable environment can help all participants to produce better outcomes beyond expectations. In the end, a better outcome is the ultimate goal of feminist leadership in a socioeconomic context.

The goal of leadership including feminist leadership is obtaining desired outcomes or exceeding outcomes beyond expectations. It is cultivated by influencing, motivating, inspiring, organizing, managing, monitoring, nurturing, empowering, and transforming people to achieve certain organizational goals. The purpose of exercising leadership in a secular context is to achieve organizational goals, not to help people. To attain organizational goals, the role of leaders is clear: maximize people's capacity to have better outcomes by any means.

Chapter 2

Leadership in Christianity

Leadership in a Christian Historical Context

Leadership from Biblical Context

Leadership in Christianity is commonly discussed from the characters of biblical leaders such as Jesus, Moses, Miriam, David, Esther, Paul, Peter and so forth. The model of Jesus's leadership is the most popular leadership model in Christian church and history. This model is intensely discussed in chapter 5. The model of Moses's leadership is another popular example of Christian leadership that many priests and pastors consider. However, Moses's leadership is not just considered as a good model of leadership in the Christian church and ministry but in the circle of management and organizational leadership studies. As Moses is considered as the Great Man and a transformative leader,¹ his leadership is commonly approached by the Great Man theory, trait theory, and charismatic transformative leadership theory.² Because of Moses' personal characteristics such as visionary, charisma, humility, empathy, integrity, tenacity, and self-confidence known by both God (Numbers 12:7-8) and his community (Numbers 12:3), his leadership can be easily named as individual heroic charismatic leadership.³

However, in recent leadership studies, Moses is recognized as more than just an individualistic transformative charismatic leader. Observing his collaborative work with Aaron, Miriam, Joshua, Caleb, and other officers, several scholars such as Hal M. Lewis, Evangeline Anderson, and Arthur J. Wolak suggest shared leadership as Moses's leadership model. Moses formed collaborative leadership from the beginning of his ministry. As he

received his calling from God, he asked God to work together with his older brother, Aaron, in Exodus 4 and his sister, Miriam, in Exodus 15. As he was aware of his disability of speech, he chose to work with Aaron as a co-leader to effectively communicate with his community as well as his enemies. As Aaron covered Moses' disability and became a mediator between Moses and the others, Moses trusted Aaron's ability and shared authority with Aaron. Unlike Aaron, it is not written in the Bible how Miriam becomes a co-leader with Moses and Aaron. However, the Bible reveals her leadership skill even in her young age when she saved Moses, led him to Pharaoh's daughter, and connected Pharaoh's daughter with her mother.⁴ She was a risk-taker, negotiator, and mediator. She became a co-leader with Moses and Aaron with shared authority and respect. Even when she was punished by God and confined outside the camp for seven days, all of Israel showed her respect and trust. They did not move but waited for her to be brought back to the community (Numbers 12:15). Evangeline Anderson claims that Miriam was "not just a leader of the women's wing of Israel but of the *whole people*."⁵ As Aaron and Miriam shared authority with Moses, they often debated and challenged Moses even in front of God (Numbers 12:4). As Moses, Aaron and Miriam were recognized as co-leaders in their community (Numbers 12:15 and 20:29), their collaborative leadership was continuously and successfully performed until their deaths. Furthermore, their collaborative leadership was extended with Joshua, Caleb and other leaders in the community. When Jethro visited Moses, he advised Moses to work with other officials over thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens (Exodus 18:19–26). Moses took the advice from Jethro and shared the leadership with other leaders. He transformed the community to take responsibility to share leadership together. He was an efficient organizer, effective manager, and collaborative, transformative open-minded leader. His leadership model has been proposed as the model of collaborative transformative team ministry in many Christian churches.

Like Moses, Esther is another leader that demonstrates heroic charismatic and collaborative leadership. She was chosen to be a queen because of her obedience to King Ahasuerus,⁶ but her obedience to God led her into disobedience to the existing law and tradition. Her disobedience can be interpreted as individual heroic rebellious action. She put her life for her people of Israel. She was ready to sacrifice herself even if she might be killed (Esther 4:16). Instead of choosing her personal safety and comfort, she chose her community. She puts "people as a priority,"

not her individual priority.⁷ Despite the fact that she is a charismatic, rebellious leader, her leadership is not just performed as individual heroic charismatic leadership. She collaboratively worked with Mordecai and communicated with the community to work with her. As she put her life for the community, she made a request for the community to fast for the event with her (Esther 4:16). Communal fasting is an important act because of two reasons. First, requesting communal fasting leads her into revealing her Jewish identity or her connection with the Jewish community. Her reluctance to reveal her Jewish identity or the family connection with the Jewish community can be interpreted as an action to protect her identity in secret⁸, but requesting the communal action for fasting could be understood that Esther was ready to reveal her personal secret of identity.⁹ Through fasting, she wanted to reconnect with her Jewish community and God.¹⁰ Working with her Jewish community, Esther wanted to confirm her Jewish identity over her social role as a queen of Persia. As a leader, she gave up her secret and privilege for her community. Second, communal fasting leads the community into reconnection with Jewish identity.¹¹ By requesting the whole community's participation in fasting, members of the community had to participate in Jewish rituals. This action would lead the community to make a distinction from the Persian populace and rediscover their communal identity in a diasporic context.¹² She encouraged the community to reform their Jewish identity and remember who they were in God. As she collaboratively worked with her community, she transformed the community including herself from fear to faith. In the action of collaboration between Esther, Mordecai, and the community, the survival of the Jewish community was achieved.

As these analyses are shown, many biblical figures such as Moses, Esther, Joseph, Miriam, Peter, Mary, Paul and others are easily selected and presented as the models of Christian leadership. However, even though models of leadership from biblical figures are common practices to understand leadership in Christianity, many leadership scholars in both business and theology agree that leadership studies did not appear until the nineteenth century. As the leadership analysis of both Moses and Esther are shown, the analysis of leadership from biblical figures and historical Christian leaders are products of the current leadership studies. In fact, theological leadership study has vibrantly formed its concepts and theories of Christian leadership in the twentieth century. As many theologians and pastors recognize the importance of leadership and try to define the meaning of leadership, they seek concepts of leadership

from the Bible, the Early Church, the priesthood in church offices, and current church ministry.

The Meaning of Leadership in an Early Christian Context

The early Christian concept of leadership was not formed from scripture and the Early Church model of leadership alone. As Christianity itself was formed under the great influences of Greek and Roman cultures, the concept of leadership naturally developed within those influences.

As trait theories demonstrate, leadership in Greek culture is exemplified by the characteristics of warriors. Lifting up the warrior's nobility and excellence, Greek culture understands leader as harmonizers and teachers.¹³ Plato advanced the concept of leaders in a philosophical sense of justice, politics, and ethics in dialogue with Socrates, who seriously struggled with the concept of justice. Reflecting on Socrates, in the *Republic*, Plato constructed the ideal city and categorized people in three classes: "philosopher-rulers, auxiliaries (soldiers), and workers (moneymakers)."¹⁴ Understanding human nature to be self-interested and assuming the human desire to exercise "power over others," Plato claimed the concept of rational philosopher-kings as ideal leaders who seek for truth, protect it, and attain wisdom, and "knowledge of the Good."¹⁵ He pointed out three notions of leadership:

The first is the general notion that the best educated people, who are able to distinguish knowledge and truth from mere opinion and belief, should have the principal leadership positions and principal positions of responsibility. . . . The second is the notion that leaders should have a broader moral horizon than followers; leaders are to look beyond immediate desires and concerns and see a larger picture, and to take action on behalf of a broader public good. . . . (The third is) that the character of leaders makes a large difference in whether they are able to rule effectively on behalf of the community.¹⁶

Plato believed that leaders should be the best-educated people and have certain intellectual philosophical qualities, emphasizing the importance of proper education for leaders. Because he understood the ideal city as aristocratic, there was a clear boundary between leaders and followers in terms of class, education, and character. He selected elites as leaders,

those who possessed reason and wisdom to see the city as a whole and to cultivate better relationships with other states so that they could transform knowledge of the Good into good practices, such as just laws and effective education programs for all people in the city.¹⁷ He strongly argued that leaders should work for the benefit of everyone and on behalf of the community. Plato's concepts of leadership and ideas concerning leaders were among the most powerful influencing Christian leadership.

Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century developed the concept of Christian leadership, integrating the Plato's concepts of leadership with that of Aristotle. He set up the divine model as a model for leaders. God or Jesus was always on the top of this leadership model. In his understanding, a king was a leader who needed to teach virtue to his subjects and take care of their needs. The goal of this leadership was to make the king's subjects as fully human as possible and give them the happiness of the world.¹⁸ For Aquinas, the ideal leader is a teacher, and morally, ethically, spiritually superior person who emulates Jesus. Many church fathers, such as Saints Augustine, Clement, Anselm, Aquinas, and others, followed the life of Jesus and demonstrated his leadership practices in their lives. The model of Jesus's leadership has been the subject of church ministry from the early Christian fathers to current theological educators and pastors. It is frequently discussed in most theological leadership studies.

Christian Clergy Leadership in Catholic and Protestant Contexts

One of the most prominent leadership studies in Christianity is the study of church officers and their leadership styles, from the pope, bishops, and priests in Catholic traditions to ordained pastors in Protestant traditions. In fact, Christian leadership study has been exclusively focused on male clergy leadership. By studying male clergy leadership, Christian leadership is formed and presented to the public.

Clergy leadership is commonly claimed to originate in a divine calling. Representing Jesus and following Jesus's leadership, these clergy believe that they are chosen to follow Jesus. The rationales of clergy leadership establishment are found in 1 Corinthians 15:7. Jesus commanded everyone to serve but chose twelve to be the apostolate in his resurrection. It is interpreted that the meaning of Jesus's "eschatological revelation of salvation" was revealed in this divine calling.¹⁹ The Early Church government in Acts was led by the twelve apostles under the leadership of Peter. By selecting additional officers in Acts 1:5-26 and

1:1-6, the apostles agreed to have more church representatives. The Early Church recognized the position of the apostles as leaders of entire church communities beyond Jerusalem.

Even though Paul was not one of the twelve apostles, he greatly influenced church government. He established the concepts of order and subordination.²⁰ In 1 Corinthians 12:28, his writing implies that there is an order or even rank of church officers: "God has appointed in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then deeds of power, then gifts of healing, forms of assistance, forms of leadership, various kinds of tongues."²¹ This verse is often interpreted as indicating that this order is a hierarchical order approved by God. Emphasizing order and submission as "expression of service," Paul understood the purpose of these leadership roles as service that is "acting out of faith" for demonstrating love for others.²² For him, the goal of these positions is to provide help for other people.

The word "bishop" originated in the Greek word *episkopos* and implied "overseer," often illustrated in the Old Testament through comparisons with the duties of a shepherd (Jer. 23:2; Ezek. 34:6; Zech. 10:3, 11:16).²³ Even though elders and bishops were the same or similar positions in the first century, in I Timothy 3:2, 4-5, and Titus 1:9, the role of bishop became distinguished by teaching and supervision, and this distinction led to "the formation of the *monarchical episcopate*" in the beginning of the second century.²⁴ Comparing the images of Jesus as a shepherd and his leadership with monarchical episcopacy, the office of bishops claimed legitimate succession and authority. Ignatius was one of the Early Church Fathers who supported this hierarchical arrangement. He identified the office of bishops with the church and equated "bishop, presbyter, and deacon" with "God, the Apostles, and Christ."²⁵ He understood the office of bishops as a necessary and important hierarchical organization.

By the debates and discussions of many Early Church Fathers, this succession and its doctrine were successfully established in the fourth and fifth centuries, establishing an institutionalized official ordination process to produce specific ordained clergy and church administrators. As the episcopal office developed, a hierarchical distinction between the roles of bishop, presbyter, and deacon existed. The bishop was regarded as the protector of the apostolic tradition and the minister of ordination with oversight of several congregations in particular vicinities, whereas presbyters became representatives of the bishop and performed word and sacrament in local churches only.²⁶ The bishop occupied the top of

this hierarchy. This institutionalized process strongly affirms the Catholic conception of the apostolate and its continuation through papacy, bishops of the diocese of Rome, and the ordained priesthood.

Under Constantine the Great the bishops as the highest ecclesiastical dignitaries were also publicly and legally granted their full power to teach, to consecrate, and to exercise jurisdiction (within their dioceses). . . . The public tasks of the Church grew immeasurably through the complete Christianization of the empire. . . . It certainly remained true that belonging to the Church depended legally and dogmatically on the connection with the bishop, that "only where the bishop is, there is the Church," and the Church understood itself to be an episcopal Church.²⁷

Both the church and the office of bishops were completely integrated in the constitution of the empire. They performed not only as spiritual religious leaders but also as political leaders. They commonly exercised their spiritual authority as political power, such as by leading religious rituals as a way of influencing political decisions. As they developed imperial ecclesiastical systems through the church and later beyond the church, they became essential parts of the empire as leaders. The duties of the office of bishop served not only the church but also the states, even after the collapse of the Roman Empire. Kings performed as the protectors of this office. However, when the Frankish-Ottonian-Salian imperial ecclesiastical system broke down, disintegration between empire and papacy appeared. As Western Christian history was reflected in many different countries, with many complicated historical, sociopolitical, and cultural clashes and conflicts, the office of bishops repeatedly exercised its power over an independent ecclesiastical territorial system, but received strong resistance from the elites to the masses, and then, finally reestablished its power and influence within the church.

In the century of the Reformation, legitimation of the office of bishops was seriously questioned and criticized. The office of bishops lost its expanded, exceeded power. "In the end the concentration of the work of the Church in the pastoral office was that which helped most Reformation Churches to abandon the episcopal office,"²⁸ even though the proletariat priests provided great leadership models in many Catholic countries. Based on the new understanding of the Gospel, Martin Luther

denounced the divine right of the papacy to rule in the church. He repudiated the thought that "the pope alone possessed the prerogative of the exposition of the Scriptures" and positioned himself above the council.²⁹ When Luther claimed that Christ was the only the Head of the church and all Christians could be members of ecclesiastical offices, he declared the universal priesthood of all believers. Because he saw roles of bishop and pastor were equal and same, he rejected the authority of the bishop's office to appoint pastors or preachers.³⁰ Witnessing the Peasants' Revolt and different situations in various congregations, Luther and his reformers were urged to restructure the church and clarify legal relationships for pastors and religious institutions. They challenged the office of leadership in the Catholic Church and formed a new leadership in the churches of the Reformation that "promoted the cause of the Gospel personally and governmentally over against the emperor, the empire, and the pope."³¹

Even though the Catholic Church continued to maintain the high status of clergy in its hierarchy, Protestant clergy proclaimed their status outside the Catholic Church. Denouncing the problems of the Catholic Church and its restrictive and hierarchal rules of clergy selection under the influence of the Reformation and the Enlightenment, Protestant clergy groups formed their own denominations and exercised the same rights and services that they could provide for the church such as preaching, communion, church law and disciplines, among others.

However, leadership in the church did not expand beyond clergy leadership, even in the Protestant church. The characteristics of Protestant clergy and their leadership positions have been understood as the characteristics of leaders in the church. Instead of the office of bishops (pope and bishops), the pastoral office (pastors) occupied leadership positions. Leadership in the church was equated with power and the authority of ordained clergy only in Protestant churches. Even though the Protestant church criticized the office of the pope and bishops in the Catholic Church for its exclusive leadership, the pastoral office in the Protestant church held similar privileges and rights over individual congregations in terms of leadership. Declaring their spiritual authority as a power given by God, pastors often exercise their spiritual gifts over parishioners in the name of service. The role of leadership in both the Catholic and Protestant churches is performed exclusively by ordained clergy, whether they are appointed by the office of bishops or called by individual congregations. They are expected to be leaders in the church. In other words, whether in the Catholic or Protestant church, Christian

leadership is still greatly concentrated in the clergy. Members of the church remain followers. They are seen as helpless sheep that need to be led by the Shepherd.

Servant Leadership

It is the common assumption of both Protestant and Catholic clergy that they be recognized as leaders. Even though they gain privilege and power in the church through their positions, both claim that the goal of leadership is service only to others, not for themselves. Many Christian leadership scholars in fact agree with this claim as the predominant concept of Christian leadership. Based on the model of Jesus's leadership, Christian leadership is service that imitates Jesus.

Servant leadership is a popular Christian leadership theory that exemplifies "serving others to follow Jesus." This leadership was a very popular theory that many theologians and pastors discussed. However, the theory of this leadership was not created by Christian theologians or pastors. Even though many theologians and pastors referred to Jesus's leadership as servant leadership, it was Robert K. Greenleaf, a researcher in the field of management, who initiated this concept of leadership. In his 1977 book *Servant Leadership*, he conceptualized leadership as servant leadership in business, education, foundations, the church, bureaucratic society, and the world. He recognized institutions and trustees as servants to all people. Inspired by the protagonist, Leo, in Hermann Hesse's *Journey to the East*, Greenleaf understood a servant as a person capable of hearing the prophetic voice and seeing the disparity between society and the institutions that serve society. He believed that a servant would know where resources were and how to use them. A servant would relate to people not in a coercive way but in a supportive way. Greenleaf viewed churches as "the institutionalization of humankind's religious concern" and saw a Christian leader as a servant who would learn to "know experimentally" with superior wisdom.³²

To practice this leadership, he suggested four elements of a general strategy: 1) goals-concept, 2) leadership, 3) structure, 4) trustees³³ and defined "a concept of a distinguished serving institution" as the institution that should consider all people to meet "nobler stature and greater effectiveness than they are likely to achieve on their own."³⁴ In this definition, this serving institution needs to understand both leadership and followership because everyone in this institution is both a leader and a

follower. The challenge of this leadership is then how to handle power and authority. He suggested trustees as a solution to this challenge.³⁵ Forming trustees and their collaborative work and service are integral to the process of this leadership.

The focus of servant leadership is not making a profit but serving people. Leaders provide service by leading. They give more power to followers and the community. While they cultivate interdependence, respect, and trust, they commit themselves to communal and individual growth. There are some characteristics of leaders that define this leadership. However, the characteristics of this leadership are in fact not developed by Greenleaf himself. It is Larry C. Spears who identifies Greenleaf's servant leadership in ten characteristics: "1) listening, 2) empathy, 3) healing, 4) awareness, 5) persuasion, 6) conceptualization, 7) foresight, 8) stewardship, 9) commitment to the growth of people, and 10) building community."³⁶

Many transformational leadership scholars in a business context classify servant leadership as a part of transformational leadership. In fact, servant leadership and transformational leadership have similar concepts of leadership in a business context. Both leadership theories emphasize appreciation for all group members, listening, valuing, mentoring, encouraging, and empowering. The common elements of both leaderships are "influence, vision, trust, respect/credibility, risk-sharing/delegation, integrity and modeling."³⁷ Both theories demonstrate great concern for followers. However, there are many differences, too. Servant leadership accentuates higher trust for followers and requires more service from leaders. Even though it stresses the importance of influence, the way that servant leaders relate to people is quite different from how transformational leaders relate to them.

There is yet a more distinctive difference to be noticed. That is the focus of leadership. The focus of servant leadership is service to followers, but the focus of transformational leadership is transforming followers and the institutional environment.³⁸ In other words, the focus of transformational leadership is transformation, whereas the focus of servant leadership is service. While servant leaders attend to understanding followers and serving them as people who constitute organizations, transformational leaders attend to the institution to which followers belong. By providing more service, servant leaders influence and motivate others to find the meaning of work, whereas transformational leaders influence and motivate others to produce better results by demonstrating their individual charisma and inspiration.³⁹

As servant leadership analyzes some similarities and differences with transformational theory, scholars such as Margaret Benefiel, Jerry Biberman, Louis W. Fry, A.L. Jue, Robert A. Giacalone, and Carole L. Jurkiewicz classified this leadership as part of a "spiritual," "spirit-centered," or "valued-based leadership" that is often treated also as a part of transformational leadership. Whereas traditional leadership theories are based on the organizational benefits in terms of a modern business setting, spiritual leadership and/or servant leadership theories emphasize "vision, altruistic love, faith/hope" based on the needs of others.⁴⁰ The focus of servant leadership theories is "mutual trust and empowering others" by enhancing followers' autonomous intrinsic and extrinsic motivational behaviors.⁴¹ However, the goal of spiritual leadership differs from the focus of spiritual leadership. Fry claims that "spiritual leadership is necessary for the transformation to and continued success of a learning organization. Spiritual leadership taps into the fundamental needs of both leader and follower for spiritual survival so they become more organizationally committed and productive."⁴² Even though the immediate focus in spiritual leadership is taking care of spiritual survival, the ultimate goal of this leadership is the same as transformational leadership that produces better results. In a similar manner, even though servant leadership is focused on service to others, the goal of servant leadership in a business setting is not about service itself but about better productivity through better service. Servant leadership is frequently used in a consumerist context and the concept of the servant is strongly beneficial to consumerism.⁴³ Providing better service, it anticipates greater profit for organizations. The way that servant leadership is used in a consumerist society is similar to the way transformational leadership functions in that society.

In a modern business setting, spiritual leadership, servant leadership, and transformational leadership have a common goal: making followers perform better and produce more. These three leadership styles have similar approaches to this goal and share similar characteristics of leadership styles. However, Chin-Yi Chen, Chun-Hsi Vivian Chen, Chun-I Li, Don Page, and Paul T.P. Wong, among others, claim that servant leadership has its own extensive set of characteristics, therefore requiring its own measurement. Chen, Chen, and Li characterize the servant leadership style as "caring for others," viewing their work as a "calling, ethical decisions, integrity, modeling, authenticity, vision/mission, empowering others/supporting personal decisions, emphasizing the development and accomplishment of employees, and emphasizing the nature of service, humility, self-sacrifice,

and altruism."⁴⁴ These characteristics emphasize the qualities of servant leaders ethically, morally, intellectually, psychologically, spiritually, and even physically. They are expected to encompass all dimensions of leaders' lives. To deliver better quality of service to others, servant leaders are expected to demonstrate these unrealistic characteristics.

Because of this unrealistic higher expectation, assessment of servant leaders is often unquantifiable. Since many religious leaders are recognized as servant leaders, it is often believed that servant leaders are not made, but chosen by God, especially in a Christian context. Their religious leadership is led by God or the Spirit. This implies that servant leadership is not measurable. However, in a business setting, many leadership scholars attempt to measure qualifications or characteristics of servant leaders. Don Page and Paul T.P. Wong created a twelve-dimension scale, including "integrity, humility, servanthood, caring for others, empowering others, developing others, visioning, goal-setting, leading, modeling, team-building, and shared decision-making."⁴⁵ Unlike servant leadership in a Christian context, servant leadership in a business context operates under the assumption that servant leadership is not just for the select few. Servant leadership is measurable. It is learnable like other types of leadership. "Leadership isn't a position; it's a process. It's an observable, understandable, learnable set of skills and practices available to everyone anywhere in the organization."⁴⁶ As the name "servant leadership" indicates, anyone can be a servant if he or she wants. Few can be masters or owners, despite their wishes, but anyone can be a servant. Servant leadership is a choice for everyone.

However, the path forward for Christian servant leaders is not clear based on this assumption. On the one hand, servant leaders are chosen by God: as reflected by the history of the office of bishops or ordination history in both the Catholic and Protestant churches, Christian leaders, especially clergy, are considered people who are called by God. The logic is that Jesus calls everyone, but only a few people are chosen to be leaders, such as the twelve apostles. On the surface, more authority rests with God, but beneath, more authority is invested in privileged selected clergy. Servant leadership is given. On the other hand, God calls everyone to be servant leaders. Whoever answers the call can be servant leaders. Servant leadership is not given but open to anyone. It is not chosen, but made. It is learnable and followable. It is not a position of privilege, but a service to others.

Servant leadership in a Christian context is based on what Jesus said and did. Many theologians and pastors try to find characteristics of servant leadership from Jesus. Based on several biblical foundations, many theologians and pastors claim Jesus's leadership as servant leadership.

So Jesus called them and said to them, "You know that among the Gentiles those whom they recognize as their rulers lord it over them, and their great ones are tyrants over them. But it is not so among you; but whoever wishes to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wishes to be first among you must be slave of all. For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many." (Mark 10:42-45, NRSV)

For who is greater, the one who is at the table or the one who served? Is it not the one at the table? But I am among you as one who serves. (Luke 22:27, NRSV)

After he had washed their feet, had put on his robe, and had returned to the table, he said to them, "Do you know what I have done to you? You call me Teacher and Lord-and you are right, for that is what I am. So if I, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have set you an example, that you also should do as I have done to you." (John 13:12-15)

Whereas the goal of servant leadership in a business context is producing better results for institutional goals in the end, Christian leadership scholars and pastors claim that the goal of servant leadership in a Christian context is service to others. Both the focus and the goal of servant leadership in a Christian context are people, not products. The process of caring for people itself is the object to be achieved of Christian servant leadership. When Jesus demonstrated his service of foot washing (John 13:1-20), he said that he set an example of how to serve others. Jesus acted as a servant to his followers. Even though he was Teacher and Lord who needed to be served, he was the one who served others. He used his higher social status and intellectual power not to be served, but to serve. Based on these biblical foundations, many theologians and pastors claim

that Christians who want to follow Jesus should be servants to others as Jesus did because they are chosen to be leaders.

Diakonia as Christian Leadership

Christian theologians and pastors seek the meaning of service from the Greek word *diakonia*, understood as service. The meaning of this word is interpreted as "to serve as a slave, with a stress on subjection," to have "the special quality of indicating very personally the service rendered to another," and to show "a stronger approximation to the concept of a service of love."⁵¹ It is service to all people, both neighbors and strangers, the local and world communities. *Diakonia* is one of the most important virtues and disciplines that many Christian churches cherish, regardless of denominations. It is one of the actions that many Christian traditions emphasized. John W. Stewart interprets it as "service," "service at the table," "waiting at tables, serving food, pouring wine," and, in a more expansive sense, "caring for the physical needs of others" and a service connecting "available resources to crippling human needs."⁵² In the context of the Christian church, service is the main function that Christians are expected to perform not only within the church but beyond the church. In fact, its importance is greater "beyond the Church." Service to others was never meant to be performed inside the church and to church members only. It must be on earth as it is in heaven.

In traditional teaching, many Christians believe that Jesus came to this world to serve people and died to save them from their sins. It was a "service" that Jesus delivered from heaven to earth. Stewart interprets Jesus's crucifixion as the ultimate and fundamental signifier of *diakonia*.⁴⁸ Service is a way to invest the *kin-dom* of God on the earth. It should be provided in the public square. Creating a space of *diakonia* is an important task for Christian theologians and pastors. To create this space, they propose different practices of *diakonia*. For example, Stewart proposes a gospel-derived, Spirit-empowered *diakonia* with three programmatic efforts: "1) creative acts of compassion in a congregation's surrounding community, 2) cooperative efforts to redress and change local social and cultural systems that perpetuate injustices, and 3) missional efforts across cultural boundaries."⁴⁹ Using church as a base, he creates different ways to serve both the people and their community. There is another example. To emphasize the importance of service (*diakonia*), James Martin imagines the celebration of foot washing every Sunday in addition to the Eucharist.⁵⁰ By interpreting the meaning of foot washing, he urged people to think

about what Jesus asked us to do: service in action. Jesus's service was not by word, but by deed, such as foot washing, healing the sick, feeding the hungry, and comforting those in despair.

Many Christian scholars and pastors repeatedly confirm that church is the place to perform these services for others. Working quietly at the local level, most members of mainline congregations practice *diakonia* "by doing volunteer work in their communities, attending lectures about social issues, and supporting congregational activities such as soup kitchen and day-care centers."⁵¹ However, most North American mainline churches invest their time and resources in the spiritual well-being of members before service.⁵² Standing in relatively privileged places, they assign social issues and public services to certain members. Service is an obligation of the church, but not an obligation to individual church members in the church, because church members are "free agents."⁵³ As long as service is carried out by certain members, the church fulfills its mission, service. Therefore, service becomes certain individuals' responsibility.

As capitalism and consumerism become the norm of modern society, the church becomes "simply one more organization that is marketing goods and services."⁵⁴ The meaning of the church is challenged and the function of the church is questioned. As a consequence, the concept of servant leadership in the Christian church is understood under the heavy influence of consumerist behaviors. It is not understood as Jesus showed, but rather as a process that makes consumers satisfied. In other words, church leadership is often evaluated by rating the quality of music and worship service for church members. The expectation is to make church members satisfied as an audience by the worship service and as a consumer of fellowship after worship service. Excellence of service is not intended to serve the poor, the hungry, and the powerless, but to serve people who are members and visitors of church in worship.

Struggling with this consumerist mentality, some mega churches demonstrate a CEO-style of leadership. However, observing this influence and responding to multicultural challenges in a church context, various Christian scholars and pastors exhibit different practices of leadership. Especially after the approval of women's ordination, which is intensely discussed in the next section, many churches emphasized a collaborative leadership and partner leadership, even though many other churches still operate under patriarchal hierarchical leadership.

Creating a space for *diakonia* requires various leadership approaches. Depending on different cultural, social, and racial contexts, each church or each denomination adopts different leadership approaches. Some churches,

such as the Roman Catholic Church, United Methodist Church, Episcopal Church, and others, constitute a strong hierarchical leadership, whereas other churches, such as the Congregational Church, United Church of Christ, Presbyterian Church (USA), some Baptist churches, Holiness Church, and others, assert horizontal relational leadership in terms of church relations. Beside these traditional mainline churches, there are many new small, multicultural, immigrant independent churches that practice a new type of leadership. Many Christian churches encounter a new complicated, multi-intercultural era locally and globally. Considering multi-intercultural churches, many practical theologians and pastors try to develop or suggest a new Christian leadership approach. Mark Lau Branson's model is one example. He suggests a new approach of Christian leadership with three steps: interpretive leadership, relational leadership, and implemental leadership.

Interpretive leadership is about meaning: it provides the resources and guidance needed to shape a community of leaders that pays attention to and interprets both texts and contexts. Relational leadership shapes all of the human connections (internal and external) and attends to the health and synergism of those relationships. Implemental leadership guides and initiates activities and structures so that a church embodies gospel meanings and relationships. Even though this description notes separate spheres, they overlap and they must remain vitally connected. If they lose their cohesion, then organizational dysfunction results.⁵⁵

Guiding people to understand the current situation systematically, culturally, and sociopolitically, Branson believes that interpretive leadership is the first step that churches should take. After the analysis of these three steps, he suggests that church leaders should examine existing connections, build new connections and nourish them together for new and better action. When consistency is reached between these two processes, he proposes that churches should reform current structures and implant new activities. Like Branson, many Christian scholars and pastors have developed different approaches of leadership reflecting their own contexts. They observe complex situations, challenge the systems, and start new practices of leadership. Struggling with racism, sexism, classism, capitalism, consumerism, postmodernism, colonialism/postcolonialism, immigration,

globalization, multiculturalism, and many other ideologies, they seek a new leadership. They try to create new goals of Christian modern leadership engaged in multidimensional layers of these struggles and work to redefine the meanings of leadership in the twenty-first century.

Women's Ordination and Leadership in a Church Context

One of the most powerful leadership shifts in the Christian church came with women's ordination. Under the pressure of the feminist movement, women's ordination brought the most critical paradigm shift in Christian leadership. As reflected by Christian history, Christian leadership was exclusively and solely occupied by male clergy. From the beginning of Christian history, women's leadership was ignored and dismissed. Even in the Bible, women's leadership was performed and evaluated within a patriarchal paradigm. Establishing and legitimating male clergy ordination, the Christian church recognized women's leadership as illegitimate and abnormal. Women leaders were imagined as treacherous and malicious figures. The suspicion of witchcraft was one example of that. Women's leadership was demonized and disdained. Women's ordination was the mission of impossible possibility in Christian history. However, as feminist movements challenged every aspect of sociopolitical cultural belief and its infrastructure, issues of women's ordination were rigorously raised and severely challenged. After long, relentless challenges, many Protestant churches and denominations approved women's ordination, even though the Roman Catholic Church and some Protestant denominations still do not approve women's ordination even today.

The Issue of Women's Ordination

The issue of women's ordination had been interpreted as a non-biblical act until the last two decades of the twentieth century. Even though there were various theological debates to reject women's ordination in different denominations, the most influential debate played out in the *Declaration on the Question of Admission of Women to the Ministerial Priesthood*, published by the Vatican on October 15, 1976, at the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, the feast of Saint Teresa of Avila.⁵⁶ In this document, the Roman Catholic Church illustrated six points against women's

ordination. First, "the church's constant tradition."⁵⁷ The Catholic Church stands on its constant tradition that, "by calling only men to the priestly Order and ministry in its true sense, the Church intends to remain faithful to the type of ordained ministry willed by the Lord Jesus Christ and carefully maintained by the Apostles."⁵⁸ Second, "the attitude of Christ."⁵⁹ "Jesus did not call any women to become part of the Twelve."⁶⁰ Third, "the practice of the Apostles."⁶¹ "On the day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit filled them all, men and women (Acts 2:1, 1:14), yet the proclamation of the fulfillment of the prophecies in Jesus was made only by Peter and the Eleven' (Acts 2:14)."⁶² Fourth, "permanent value of the attitudes of Jesus and the Apostles."⁶³ Fifth, "the ministerial priesthood in the light of the mystery of Christ."⁶⁴ "When Christ's role in the Eucharist is to be expressed sacramentally, there would not be this 'natural resemblance' which must exist between Christ and his minister if the role of Christ were not taken by a man: in such a case it would be difficult to see in the minister the image of Christ. For Christ himself was and remains a man."⁶⁵ Sixth, "the ministerial priesthood illustrated by the mystery of the church."⁶⁶ These six points emphasize the maleness of Christ and the calling of the Twelve "males." Priesthood was prescribed and limited to only males. Gender difference was the reason to reject women's ordination and denied their leadership in the church.

After this document, there are two more documents, *Mulieris Dignitatem* (Apostolic Letter on the Dignity and Vocation of Women, 1988)⁶⁷ and a *Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Collaboration of Men and Women in the Church and in the World* (by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, 2004)⁶⁸ that develop the argument against women's ordination in the Roman Catholic Church. As *Mulieris Dignitatem* defined women strictly in terms of motherhood and women's role of bearing children, it dismissed the existence of single women and childless women.⁶⁹ Since women were defined as mothers only, they were valued only as the body to carry the child. This argument was affirmed again in the *Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Collaboration of Men and Women in the Church and in the World*. Women's work and value were defined only in relation to the family, and their main *normative* identity was recognized only in motherhood. In this document, women's role was seen to be the helpmate and their values were fundamentally connected with women's capacity for caring for others. Emphasizing women's contribution as the nourishment and protection of others, this document limited women's call

into service without ordination. In the final chapter, it concluded, "In this perspective, one understands how the reservation of priestly ordination solely to men does not hamper in any way women's access to the heart of Christian life. Women are called to be unique examples and witnesses for all Christians of how the Bride is to respond in love to the love of the Bridegroom."⁷⁰ Manipulating the meaning of women's service as women's unique call from God, this document designated women's roles in a submissive position in the church and dismissed women's ordination as unnecessary effort.

These documents were widely used not only in the Roman Catholic Church but also in various Protestant churches beyond a Western context. These were globally accepted and circulated, regardless of denominations of the Protestant and Catholic churches. Emphasizing the maleness of the Apostles as the legitimated authority of leaders in the church and images of Jesus as a male, the Roman Catholic Church and Protestant churches have rejected women's ordination on these grounds.

Rejection of women's ordination is not only the subject of biblical and theological debates; it is also the product of cultural and social prejudices. Cultural and social prejudices against women inherently relate to women's sexuality. "As in all the monotheistic religions, the negative images associated with priesthood of women are often derived from pagan rites (idolatry is thus adultery and prostitution)."⁷¹ As images of male priests were imagined as the only legitimated leaders of the church, images of priestesses were intentionally manufactured as prostitutes. As the body of the male priest represents Jesus, the body of the priestesses represents an idolater. Characteristics of female leaders in religious rites were often described as lascivious, lustful, manipulative, treacherous, wicked, devious, and so forth. As women's bodies were labeled unclean and unsacred, men's bodies were labeled as holy and sacred. For women to be accepted in religious circles, they had to remain as submissive, those who needed help and needed to be saved. Man became a savior to woman. Consequently, the roles of submissive "servants" are assigned to women—not as leaders but as followers. Even though Christian servant leadership is frequently practiced by women, their leadership is trivialized and recognized not as leadership but as followership only. Christian leadership is not service to others, but dominance over women when the Christian church fortifies the authority of the priesthood with the image of Jesus as male.

argument draws a connection between women's leadership as it existed in the Early Church and the need for its restoration today.

Looking into the New Testament, cultural traditions and modern debates, Ruth Edwards argues for women's ordination from the perspective of an Anglican. Examining the assumption that only a man can represent God and comparing the male images of God with female images of God, she claims that women and men are created as equals. She understands women's ordination as a new way to meet the needs of the church in current society under the continuous guidance of the Spirit.⁷⁵ Edwards introduces seven principles to support women's ordination: "1) the real equality of the sexes, 2) the complementarity of the sexes, 3) Christian ministry as service rather than the exercise of domination, 4) priesthood and ministry as belonging to the whole people of God, 5) women and men as equally "representing" humanity, 6) women and men as equally "representing" God, and 7) all ministry as by God's grace, not by right."⁷⁶ Reflecting on scripture, tradition, reason, and experience, she underlines the equality of women and men as the foundation of women's ordination. She points out that ordination functioned not as service to others, but as domination over others. She claims that Christian leadership should start from equality of women and men.

To prove a precedence of women's leadership in the Christian tradition, Elisabeth Behr-Sigel uses the Early Church Fathers' notion of egalitarianism, such as that of Gregory of Nazianzus, who proclaimed "the same creator for man and for woman, for both the same clay, the same image, the same death, the same resurrection."⁷⁷ From an Orthodox perspective, she believes that both men and women are derived from the same images of God, just as their priesthood derives from Jesus who is the only high priest on earth. Therefore, both women and men can fully participate in the royal priesthood.

All through the centuries, Christian women have been baptized, chrismated and invested with the fullness of the royal priesthood; they have confessed their faith in Christ, endured martyrdom, evangelised, prophesied, and attained the heights of holiness in the life of consecrated virginity as well as in married life.⁷⁸

Behr-Sigel lifts up the fullness of women's participation in images of God and in the royal priesthood. To show the fullness of women's royal priesthood, she focuses on Mary and her role as a priest. She indicates

Feminist Debates on Women's Leadership

Many feminist scholars critically analyzed these debates and fought for women's ordination. They understood the approval of women's ordination as approval of women's leadership in the church and beyond. From a sociopolitical perspective, it was a task for women to have equal power and accessibility to privileges of clergy positions in religious institutions. It was a restoration of women's human rights to obtain leadership positions in the church and to be granted equal benefits as clergy. It was a sociopolitical struggle for Christian women to be institutionally legitimated leaders in the church. From a religious perspective, it was a spiritual movement to restore women's equal participation in God's work as leaders. It was a restoration of divine calling for not only women but all humanity. The impact of the approval of women's ordination was felt, in fact, beyond the church. Women's ordination became the foundation for a restoration of justice and equality for all people, regardless of sex and gender, race, and religion. It was a consecrated religious fight, and it remains a resilient sociopolitical fight beyond mere Christian religious boundaries.

Tracing women's leadership roles from the Bible and the Early Church, and reinterpreting the images of maleness of God, many feminist scholars engage in this fight and challenge male clergy leadership in various ways. For example, some feminist theologians, such as Karen Jo Torjesen, debate the roles of women leaders in the Early Church, as others, such as Ruth Edwards and Elisabeth Behr-Sigel, try to argue the problems of biblical interpretation and theological hermeneutics for women's ordination. Torjesen starts her argument by critically reviewing the usages of *diakonos*, *apostolos*, *presbyteros*, *episcopos*, prophet, and teacher in the Early Church period and claims that women held these positions in the Early Church.⁷² As she analyzes the social context of the Early Church, she points out that women's leadership in the private sphere was certainly stronger. Before women leaders moved to the public domains of empire and city, they were core leaders in the Early Church. When women householders supported Early Church communities, women's leadership in the church took the form of prophets and deacons.⁷³ Torjesen believes that when the Early Church shifted from house church to basilica in the fourth century, women's leadership became invisible because women's presence in public was scandalous at that time. The social context did not allow women to be seen as leaders in public.⁷⁴ She insists that women need to reclaim their equal and rightful place to be leaders in the current society, remembering Jesus's message and practice for radical egalitarianism. Her

that Mary's life has been used as an idealized symbol of womanhood. In Christian history, it is assumed that she is a role model for all women. Mary represents all women, and all women are encouraged to follow her and her submission. Her submission to God becomes women's submission to others. However, the virgin mother is an impossible concept that ordinary women cannot follow. Even though women are encouraged to follow Mary, Mary is not the woman whom women can identify and follow. Again, women remain unredeemable. The more Mary is described as the model of all women, the more Mary is apart from all women. Her leadership is untouchable and unfollowable. Mary's obedience is used to escalate the oppression of women. It has been used to fortify all women's obedience and submission to others. However, as Behr-Sigel analyzes this vicious circle, she uses this logic and changes it with a different interpretation. She sees Mary as "a symbol of the mystery of women," "the new Eve," "the new beginning of the dignity of woman, of all women, of every woman."⁷⁹ As Mary becomes an archetype of all women, she becomes a symbol of the perfect woman for every woman. Mary represents all women who can be perfect. Behr-Sigel describes Mary as birth-giver of God, and inseparable from Christ. "Mary is the image and personification of the spirit-bearing church, the womb of the new humanity."⁸⁰ Now she represents not only women but men, the whole of humanity and is in solidarity with all humanity. Behr-Sigel finds the validity of women's ordination in the notion that Mary was "God's first coworker"⁸¹ who has a woman's face and body. As the office of bishops traces the apostolic tradition and the Early Church as the root of their ordination, Behr-Sigel traces Mary and her priestly ministry in the church as the foundation of women's ordination.

The issue of women's ordination has still not been completely resolved in various churches, even though there are many churches that ordain women. Many feminist/womanist/Asian women/Latina theologians have developed numerous approaches to support women's ordination. There are two prominent approaches for this issue. First, as the maleness of Jesus and the maleness of God are revealed as the focal point of this issue, countless women theologians, such as Elizabeth A. Johnson, Susan Thistlethwaite, Rita Nakashima Brock, Sallie McFague, Merlin Stone, Carol P. Christ, Jacquelyn Grant, Mary Daly, Rosemary Radford Ruether, and others, see the problems of patriarchy originating in the maleness of God, reconstruct images of God, and redefine the meaning of these images. The concepts of trinity are also redefined and reconceptualized by these

women theologians. Second, as the church legitimates the authority of male leadership from the apostolic tradition, many female biblical scholars, such as Katheryn Pfisterer Darr, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Delores S. Williams, Phyllis Trible, and others, rediscover the existence of women leaders and their activities in the church from the Bible and the Early Church. They reclaim the leadership of biblical female prophets in the Hebrew Bible and female leaders of the Early Church. Through a critical rabbinical and feminist perspective, Darr reconstructs the stories of Ruth, Sarah, Hagar, and Esther and redefines the meaning of their leadership.⁸² Critically analyzing the story of Hagar, Williams uncovers significant problems of a cross section between race, gender, and class focused on white and black relations from the perspective of an African American woman, especially in relation to the experience of slavery.⁸³ Reconstructing Christian origins, Fiorenza claims "women's history as the history of the discipleship of equals" and "women as paradigms of true discipleship."⁸⁴ As all of these biblical scholars reconstruct the stories of female leaders and prophets, they try to show equality of women and men from the beginning of Christian history and validate women's leadership in the church from its origins.

Establishing gender equality in the Bible, the Early Church, and the early Christian history is the main starting point for women's ordination. To uncover this equality, many female scholars choose different strategies. From reimagining images of God to reconstructing biblical, theological, social, political, anthropological, economic, and cultural contexts and texts, they develop various approaches to advocate women's ordination. Women's ordination is a task to restore human rights and divine calling for all people. The legitimization of women's leadership supports the legitimacy of all people's leadership. Because of this implication, it becomes one of the most critical paradigm shifts of leadership in Christian history. As women's ordination has been approved, the landscape of Christian leadership has been greatly changed.

Women's Leadership in a Church Context

The first woman formally ordained in an established denomination was Antoinette Brown, who was educated at Oberlin College and "called to a small Congregational church in South Butler, New York, in 1853."⁸⁵ By the end of that century, Disciples, Unitarians, Congregationalists, Universalists, and Northern Baptists started to ordain women, whereas

Presbyterians, several Holiness denominations and Methodists had just opened this issue.⁸⁶ Most mainline Protestant denominations approved women's ordination around the middle of the twentieth century. The Presbyterian Church (USA) ordained its first female minister in 1956. Presbyterians celebrated 60-years-of women teaching elders as they celebrated "110 years of women deacons and 85 years of women ruling elders" in 2015–2016.⁸⁷ "The UMC and its forerunner has ordained women for five decades; the ELCA (Evangelical Lutheran Church in America) and its predecessor has for almost 40 years, and the Episcopal Church has ordained women since 1976."⁸⁸ Feminist movements have brought dramatic changes for women's equality and social positions, and they have had great influence on women's ordination.

However, women in general are still underrepresented in leadership positions, especially in the church. Though many churches approve women's ordination, female clergy and their leadership are not widely appreciated. Regardless of the church or denomination, female clergy commonly experience discrepancies in salary in comparison with male clergy, difficulty in finding positions, and limited choices that lead them to work for small congregations. They often receive harsh treatment from church members because of their gender. In general, female clergy are rarely called by congregations as senior pastors in many mainline denominations.

From the early 1990s through 1999 just 5% of the Senior Pastors of Protestant churches were female. Since that time the proportion has slowly but steadily risen, doubling to 10% in 2009. . . . Women in the pulpit are generally more highly educated than are their male counterparts. . . . Despite their higher educational attainment, though, female pastors typically have smaller compensation levels than do male pastors. The average package for female pastors in 2009 is \$45,300. The median compensation for male pastors is \$48,600. As striking as the gap may be, it has diminished somewhat over the last ten years. The Barna study noted that while male pastors have experienced a substantial increase in compensation packages since 1999—up 21%—female pastors received an even greater jump, growing by 30%. In other words, the difference in compensation has been cut by more than half, from \$6,900 per year to about \$3,300 annually. One of the reasons for the discrepancy in pay rates between male and female pas-

tors is the size of the congregations they lead. Male pastors lead congregations that average 103 adults in attendance on a typical weekend compared to 81 adults at churches led by female pastors.⁸⁹

Whereas denominations such as the United Methodist Church and Episcopal Church led by the office of bishops must assign women as senior pastors, several Protestant denominations, such as the Presbyterian Church (USA) and the Congregational Church, that have a calling system do not have to assign women as senior pastors or to any pastor position in the church. For this reason, women in the Presbyterian Church (USA) and Congregational Church have a harder time getting a call from the church. As previously mentioned, only 10 percent of senior pastors were female in Protestant churches in general. Even in denominations such as the United Methodist Church, a few women are assigned as senior pastors in larger congregations. HiRho Park conducted research through the Lead Women Pastors Project with Susan Willhauck in 2009 and found critical discrepancies between women and men pastors of one thousand or more membership churches in United Methodist Church. Among these 1,154 mega churches, only sixty-four churches had women pastors.⁹⁰ Moreover, in comparison with mainline churches, women in non-mainline churches have fewer opportunities to have pastorate positions.⁹¹ In the case of ethnic minority female pastors, there are almost no cases reported because traditional ethnic churches such as African American congregations and immigrant congregations only call ethnic male pastors as senior pastors. Many ethnic minority female pastors must confront their own ethnic cultural and patriarchal barriers and Western Christian patriarchal walls simultaneously.

Eunjoo Mary Kim and Deborah Beth Creamer in *Women, Church, and Leadership: New Paradigms* point out that "a change in gender roles within the church" is the first element of challenges to the current church leadership.⁹² In fact, the presence of female pastors itself becomes a change in gender roles in the landscape of church leadership and its practices. Though female pastors have fewer opportunities to be pastors, especially senior pastors, in the church, growing numbers of female pastors and lay leaders demonstrate nontraditional but outstanding styles of leadership and challenge the configuration of church leadership.

As described in the previous chapter in the section on feminist/collaborative leadership theory, many women, including female clergy and

lay leaders, practice collaborative leadership in their churches. Instead of using an authoritarian approach, they lead the collaborative process and share power together. "Leading with others" equally,⁹³ many female clergy and lay leaders try to decenter top-down hierarchal leadership structures and encourage collaboration between laity and clergy. The emphasis on a horizontal relationship with others in leadership is one of the most distinctive features of women's leadership in the church. Susan Willhauck and Jacquelyn Thorpe call this leadership "web leadership,"⁹⁴ while Eunjoo Mary Kim calls it "shared leadership," meaning "a collaborative ministry between leaders of the church and its members."⁹⁵ Kim understands the original model of the Christian ministry is the shared ministry between traveling apostles and local church leaders before the institutionalization of the church. Grounded on the shared leadership in the Trinitarian structure of God, she invites all people to the pulpit and encourages them to share their experiences of witnessing God's redemptive power.⁹⁶

Just as Kim, Willhauck, and Thorpe describe, many feminist theologians and pastors intentionally invite church members to the pulpit and want to share leadership together. Their leadership is often described as a "flexible," inclusive, "ever-changing," "loosely construed," decentered, sensitive to the needs of others, collaborative, "not either, but both" type of leadership.⁹⁷ Many female pastors and lay leaders see themselves as leaders who are not higher than laity. They recognize themselves as moderators, mediators, supporters, facilitators, conductors, gardeners, "influencers, collaborators, or contributors."⁹⁸ They practice inclusivity and nurture hospitality as a new model of leadership. Because of their different styles of leadership, they have challenged not only traditional church leadership but also the traditional church structure itself.

PART II

LEADERSHIP AND ITS CHALLENGES IN US CULTURE