

SHIFTING IMAGES OF CHURCH INVITE NEW LEADERSHIP FRAMES

SHARON HENDERSON CALLAHAN

In their review of leadership literature and in their work in organizations James Kouzes and Barry Posner, organizational consultants, discovered one competency excellent leaders agree is essential. They named vision, the ability to articulate and gain support for a shared goal, as the primary gift a leader offers to an organization. Vision implies that the leader "sees" something for or about the organization. It also implies that the group responds in some way to the image the leader articulates. As Kouzes and Posner reflect, leaders "see pictures in their minds' eyes of what the results will look like even before they have started their projects. . . . Their clear image of the future pulls them forward."¹

Relating leadership theory to church-pastoring, Lovett Weems, president of the Saint Paul School of Theology, affirms that leadership can never be understood apart from its mission and vision. Weems suggests that leadership never exists for itself or for the glorification of the leader. Rather, he states that leadership "exists to make possible a preferred future (vision) for the people involved, which reflects the heart of the mission and values to which they are committed."² Similarly, Craig Van Gelder, professor of congregational mission at Luther Seminary, links vision or image of church to the kind of leadership required to bring the image to reality.³ Embracing the connection that Weems and Van Gelder posit, Sharon Callahan, ministerial leadership faculty and Director of Degrees at Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry, researched the connection between ministers' image of church and their preferred leadership styles.⁴

¹ James Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner, *The Leadership Challenge* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989), 9.

² Lovett H. Weems, Jr., *Church Leadership: Vision, Team, Culture, and Integrity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1993), 25.

³ Craig Van Gelder, *The Essence of the Church: A Community Created by the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000).

⁴ Sharon Henderson Callahan, *A Delphi Study of Competencies Needed by Leaders of Roman Catholic Faith Communities in Western Washington Through the Year 2000*, Doctoral Diss., Seattle University, 1996 (Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI, 1996).

The research presented in this article suggests that how one images church influences how one leads within it. Drawing from the work of theologian Avery Dulles,⁵ the article first outlines his models of church to develop the "pictures" of how believing communities organize themselves. Next, the article summarizes four frames of leadership as defined by organizational leadership consultants, Lee Bolman and Terrence Deal.⁶ These leadership "frames" collect a variety of skills and competencies together offering four distinct ways for leaders to achieve their visions. Finally, the article summarizes original research conducted in Western Washington. Callahan's research indicates that leader styles match their models, "visions", of church. Calling for more research, her findings suggest that seminary programs might connect studies in ecclesiology, or understanding of church, with education for leadership.

Models of the Church

In his seminal work, *Models of the Church*, Dulles considers the development of the Christian Church. As he reviews how Christian believers gather and organize, Dulles observes that throughout the history of the church people respond to tension between the impulse toward institutionalization and the impulse toward the Spirit. As he considers how the tension expressed itself in a variety of ways, Dulles suggests that different communities emphasize certain aspects of the Christian message while underplaying other aspects. He further postulates that certain denominations as a whole take on characteristics of a particular emphasis. Finally, he indicates that the ongoing history of the church in a changing world offers six models or configurations. Each "model" emphasizes a particular ideal around which a community of believers organizes its purpose, practice, and being. These models are named institution, sacrament, community, herald, servant, and disciple.⁷

⁵ Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1974); *A Church to Believe In: Discipleship and the Dynamics of Freedom* (New York: Crossroads, 1982).

⁶ Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, *Reframing Organizations* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991).

⁷ Dulles, *A Church*, 8-17.

These six models or images of church have become useful in assisting people in articulating their own image of the church and have been used to assist people in naming their expectations of the church and leadership or ministry within it. Zenobia Fox, a representative on the United States Catholic Conference Committee on Laity, uses Dulles' images in her research about Catholic lay ministers. She stresses since "many would say that our images are more powerful shaping forces than our ideas, this would have an impact on the way they [the people surveyed] function as ministers."⁸ Van Gelder affirms that it is "critical that we consider the nature of the church before proceeding to define its ministry and organization."⁹ The chart found in Appendix One summarizes each model's strengths, weaknesses, characteristics and implications for leadership.

Model One: Institution

Based on largely European structures of government, the institution model of the church resembles monarchical governments which vest all power in a supreme leader and subsidiary power in appointees who report to that leader. According to Andrew Greeley, a Catholic priest and sociologist, this model stresses

loyalty, the certainty and immutability of answers, strict discipline and unquestioning obedience, a comprehensive Catholic community, suspicion of the world beyond the Church, the avoidance of the reexamination of fundamental principles, and clearly defined models of behavior that were appropriate for the various levels of the church structure. . . . The whole set of beliefs, roles, and practices were all tied very closely together, and they were justified, for the most part, in terms of extrinsic loyalty to the Church, not in terms of their intrinsic rationality.¹⁰

⁸ Zenobia Fox, *A Post-Vatican II Phenomenon: Lay Ministries: A Critical Three-Dimensional Study*. Doctoral Diss., Fordham University, 1986, (Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI, 1986), 227.

⁹ Van Gelder, 24.

¹⁰ Andrew Greeley, "The State of the Priesthood," *National Catholic Reporter* (18 Feb. 1972): 7-18

While the institution model is considered to be almost exclusively Roman Catholic, the Reformation also invoked hierarchical styles of leadership that have impacted contemporary mainline Protestant churches. Indeed, the hierarchical culture of the Western world during the 1540s-1950s affected most organizations, including the church.

Based on the concept of a perfect society with organizational emphasis, the institution model maintains that the church functions as the means to salvation. Thus, the ordained hold the mission of sanctification, evangelization and authority. Within that purpose, some are ordained to preach, teach, and heal in order to save, and some are "the saved". The structure of the institution ensures stability as power and responsibility are delegated from the top of the structure to the lowest level. The ordained distribute and acknowledge gifts and determine the vision and the mission; the community receives instruction and salvation.¹¹

The model provides stability in a changing and challenged world context. It offers the community a strong sense of corporate identity and historical continuity. On the other hand, the institution model of church can lead to clericalism, juridicism, application of yesterday's theological thinking to contemporary issues, and legalism.

The leader-follower dynamic implicit in this model resembles that of the transactional leadership style defined by leadership expert Douglas McGregor in 1960.¹² Prevalent in most organizations before the 1960's, this style allocates to the leader knowledge, power, and wisdom. In contrast the followers are perceived as ignorant, dependent and in need of guidance.¹³ Since in this model, the church functions as the means to salvation, leaders hold power, knowledge and wisdom, while, as Greeley states, the people know their places, and all is ordered so that the mission of saving souls can be accomplished with organizational dispatch.¹⁴

¹¹ Dulles, *Models*, 43-45.

¹² Douglas McGregor, in *The Professional Manager*, eds. Caroline McGregor and Warren G. Bennis (New York: McGraw, 1967).

¹³ Bernard M. Bass, *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, & Managerial Applications*, 3rd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1990), 43; James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership*, (New York: Harper, 1978), 39, 40.

¹⁴ Greeley, 17.

Model II: Sacrament

Dulles' second image of church, sacrament, is closely related to the notion of the "people of God" concept promulgated by Vatican II. It is evident in many of the more liturgical churches. In this model the emphasis on sacramental celebrations as the mediator of grace helps connect the institutional inheritance with the newer emphasis on community. Dulles based the image on theologian Karl Rahner's proposition that Jesus is the *Sacrament* of God and that the church is the *Sacrament* of Jesus incarnating God. Therefore, as sacrament, the church loves as Jesus loved. The sign of the church effects the grace of God in the world, thus drawing the whole universe into a new reality of grace.

According to Dulles, in this model people gather as Mystical Body to mediate God's grace and presence to the world, transforming the universe from profane to Sacred. In this context a commitment to social justice emerges as redemptive and important to the whole church and world. Community, ritual and mission to incarnate God in the world become very important. Liturgical roles remain a priority and to the extent they are exclusive, they keep a distinct barrier between ordained and non-ordained. This model relates the community model to the institution model, linking the work of the Spirit to the work of institutionalizing. On the other hand, it can become inward looking, and can lead to an unhealthy divinization of the church.

Leadership in this model is more relational, inclusive and shared. According to Fox¹⁵ and Barbara Fleischer, Director of the Master of Ministry program at Loyola New Orleans, this model requires leaders who employ collaborative leadership styles which encourage shared responsibility and calling forth the gifts of the people.¹⁶ In this model, the leader operates out of a well-defined vision and demonstrates the communication skills of listening, conflict negotiation, and team building. In addition leaders need to demonstrate skills in creating symbolic gestures, preaching and bringing people together ritually.

¹⁵ Fox, 225-228.

¹⁶ Barbara J. Fleischer, *Ministers of the Future: A Study of Graduate Ministry Students in Catholic Colleges and Universities* (New Orleans: AGPIM, 1993), 35.

Model III: Community

Dulles' third image, the community model, emphasizes the church as "the communion of the members with one another and with God in Christ."¹⁷ Like the sacrament model, this image stresses the relationship of persons in the community. Baptism and Eucharist bind the people together. In this model the Church is a living organism. The leader must attend to the care of each person, provide a welcoming and reconciling environment often achieved through team ministry, empowering the gifts of all the members, and encouraging shared decision-making.

Grounded in New Testament Scriptures, the community gathers together to break open the Word, share at table and care for each others' lives (1Cor 12; Rom 12; Jn 15). The organization relies on the bonds of the Spirit, who is the interior grace of Christ. Spiritually animated by charity and faith, members' communion with each other in Christ leads them to the divine. The members of the community engage in mutual service.

This model is more ecumenically fruitful than the sacrament model because it accents the personal relationship with the Spirit and those relationships are not hierarchical. It includes insights from Bonhoeffer and Tillich, and can include Anabaptist understandings of community as a spiritual communion divorced from the institution. Leadership in this model requires the abilities to listen, to call forth and appreciate gifts of the people in the community, and to give and receive feedback.

Model IV: Herald

Dulles names the fourth model herald. Radically centered "on Jesus Christ and on the Bible as the primary witness of him . . . It sees the task of the Church primarily in terms of proclamation."¹⁸ Dulles observes that this model clearly emerged during the Reformation and proved foundational in the formation of many of the Protestant churches. In this model the mission of the church is to proclaim. Rooted in the prophetic tradition, this model challenges the institution model in much the same way that the Jewish prophets chal-

¹⁷ Dulles, *Models*, 61.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 71.

lenged the Israelite monarchy. Thus this model draws from Isaiah, Jeremiah and Amos, John the Baptist and Paul. Luther, Calvin, Knox, Zwingli, and Wesley, initiate this model during the Reformation. Barth and Hans Kung carry forth the tradition in more contemporary times. Roman Catholics rediscovered this image of church after the explosion in biblical studies initiated by Pope Pius XII's 1943 encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu*. The recent growth of small faith communities, gathered around the Scripture and committed to proclamation and action, indicate that this model lives in the United States, Asian countries, Central and South America, and Africa.

Like John the Baptist, the herald church proclaims Jesus, not itself. Since it acknowledges its own emptiness, the church is not a stable entity that becomes the object of faith. The dominant theology of the herald model is that of the cross. Because church is not identified with Christ, it is not divinized, not an object of faith in itself, and not the kingdom realized on earth. Rather, the church witnesses the message of Christ, calling people to salvation and faith. Embracing the mission to proclaim and witness through the word, the herald model fuels multiple missionary movements.

Leadership in this model is visionary and dynamic, outward looking, rooted in and demanding knowledge of the Scriptures.¹⁹ In the contemporary church the phenomenon of small faith communities reflects the characteristics of this model of church. Theologian Edward Kilmartin notes that the leadership competencies of the Latin American and African base communities would also include courage and political acumen for moving toward systematic change.²⁰ A new study of small Christian communities, published by theologian Bernard Lee of Loyola New Orleans, indicates that leadership in these communities includes outreach to social justice issues and attention to the larger community, both civil and sacred.²¹

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Edward J. Kilmartin, "Lay Participation in the Apostolate of the Hierarchy," *The Jurist* 41 (1981): 488, 489.

²¹ Bernard J. Lee, "Small Christian Communities in the U.S. Catholic Church," Executive Summary (Chicago: Loyola Institute for Ministry, Loyola University, 2000), 14-18.

Model V: Servant

Dulles described the servant model as appropriating "the most fundamental mission of the church . . . that of reconciliation, the overcoming of the various alienations that vex humanity today . . . altruistic service toward the poor and the oppressed. This service can include prophetic criticism of social institutions."²² The servant model emphasizes the importance of *diakonia* as the way of being. Based in New Testament images such as Jesus' feet washing in John's Gospel, and Paul's "I am all things to all people", the servant church proclaims and stands with the "last who shall be first." Articulated by many faith traditions in this century, this image of church becomes the model of human service to the world.

Leadership theorists cite Greenleaf's efforts at elevating the concept of servant leadership.²³ His leadership theory matches the models emphasis on skills of listening, serving, and calling forth the gifts of all the people in the community. Carol Becker, church leadership researcher and author, cautions women leaders who identify with servant models that the image of servant leader can perpetuate women as "less than."²⁴ She urges women, therefore, to thoroughly understand and explore the implications of this leadership style. Similarly, Eric Law, multicultural church leader consultant, proposes that leaders who are marginalized might claim more voice while leaders in dominant groups might more fully embrace servant leader images and practices.²⁵ Callahan also discovered dissonance around this image both in her Delphi study and in her work with students in pastoral leadership. She concurs with the cautions raised by Becker and Law.²⁶

Model VI: Discipleship

After publishing his first five models, Dulles continued to reflect on the organization of the Church. Eventually he suggests a sixth image, discipleship. Capturing the notion that the church walks forward on a journey, the model views the

²² Dulles, *Models*, 104.

²³ Robert K. Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership* (New York: Paulist, 1977).

²⁴ Carol E. Becker, *Leading Women: How Church Women Can Avoid Leadership Traps and Negotiate the Gender Maze* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996).

²⁵ Eric. H. F. Law, *The Wolf Shall Dwell with the Lamb: A Spirituality for Leadership in a Multicultural Community* (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 1993).

²⁶ Callahan, "Delphi Study."

People of God as learners (disciples), open to the Spirit, and committed to the way of Jesus. Rooted more in the story of the disciples on the road to Emmaus (Lk 24), this model envisions the church as an alternative society.

This image builds in room for failure, since it posits the need to learn and grow. It calls disciples to remain attuned to the ongoing revelation of God in their lives and in the world. This model places more emphasis on the community as the group that discerns the movement of God, rather than investing discernment totally in individual revelation. Baptism is the sacrament of ministry, reconciliation helps the community grow and move forward while matrimony and orders assist the mission of the Church. Using Bonhoeffer's language concerning the cost of discipleship, Dulles considers this model a contemporary development that pulls together many aspects of the other models.

The disciple model reflects language similar to the newly developing theories of transformational leadership which incorporate lifelong learning and organizational transformation. Peter Senge, an innovative leadership theorist and consultant, appropriates Scriptural language such as "*diakonia*," "*koinonia*," and "*disciple*" to engage leaders in contemporary society in leading as lifelong learners utilizing multiple intelligences.²⁷ Margaret Wheatley, an organizational development consultant and author, also contributes to the notion that the organization changes according to an inward dynamism that orders and shifts as needs and resources vary.²⁸ Drawing from the insights of quantum sciences, Wheatley encourages leaders to develop lifelong habits of learning and flexibility. These habits resemble those of disciples who attend to God's activity in life and the universe, transforming themselves and others.

Summary: Models of Church

Avery Dulles defined six models of church, each with implications for how leaders and followers might vision needs, mission, and community dynamic. Since the 1950's, the

²⁷ Peter Senge, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* (New York: Doubleday, 1990).

²⁸ Margaret J. Wheatley, *Leadership and the New Science* (San Francisco: Berrett, 1992).

church has undergone changes in emphasis. Using Dulles words of "Institution" and "Spirit", John Shea, Catholic theologian and storyteller, summarizes the tension of change in the Catholic Church:

The Catholic Church in general and the local parish in particular are in transition from a hierarchical to a community model. This means not that one model replaces the other, but that the values of both models are held in tension so that the mission of the Church can be carried on more effectively. Ideally, the values of the Pauline vision - recognition of diversity of gifts, service, mutuality, cooperation, emphasis on the local church - interact with the values of the hierarchical model - direction, authority, correction, emphasis on the universal church - to create a new embodiment of the Church in history.²⁹

This notion of movement from one dominant model (institution) to a variety of models (more infused with Spirit) ultimately invites more ecumenical exchange. The benefits that Shea listed in the community models are gifts offered to the church since the Reformation. Moreover, more theological exploration is surfacing additional models and understandings of church. Theologians such as Catherine Mowry LaCugna, Shirley Guthrie and Miroslav Volf offer new insights grounded in Trinitarian theology. Their theological exploration impacts understandings of communal models of church.

Similarly, the Western world has shifted its reliance on hierarchical models of leadership. Describing the organization as an organism seeking equilibrium, Wheatley warns that once the organism attains that stability, it teeters in the moment between life and death. She notes that if the organization opts for stability it dies; if it follows the challenge to new order and embraces chaos, it finds life.³⁰

The tension of equilibrium resembles the dynamism between Institution and Spirit as Dulles defined it. As a living organism, the church finds itself caught in moments of tension that spell life or death. It is precisely this dynamic tension

²⁹ John Shea, "Foreword," in *Leadership in a Successful Parish*, by Thomas Sweetser and Carol Holden (Kansas City: Sheed, 1992), ix-xi.

³⁰ Wheatley, *New Science*, 76-78.

which moves the church from one image or model to another.³¹ This tension demands multiple leadership skills and intelligences, as Bolman and Deal have carefully described. It is this tension that invites contemporary leaders and followers to dream their visions and to develop the kind of communities that can realize them.

Bolman and Deal Leadership Frames

Through their work with organizations, Bolman and Deal developed a theory of leadership frames to assist people in identifying how to be more effective leaders in a variety of situations. They surveyed organizational and leadership theories and offered the four frames as ways to organize skills, competencies and natural qualities in response to specific situations. They defined the four frames as structure, human resource, political and symbolic. A summary found in Appendix Two lists the basic gifts and weaknesses of the leadership frames.

Frame I: Structure

The structure leadership frame emerged out of time management studies. The structure frame emphasizes organizational roles, goals and technology. It looks at the purpose and the environment of the organization asking questions concerning how the work actually gets done. Structure leaders offer clarity, fixed division of labor, predictability and stability. In its worst incarnations this frame can resemble the power distribution articulated by Douglas McGregor as Theory X. The implications for leaders and followers closely resemble those of the institution model of church.

Frame II: Human Resource

During a time of church renewal (late 1950'-70's), general leadership theories also shifted toward more communal models. Organizational development theories and evolving psychological theories challenged the confinement of old structures. These leadership theories connected the disciplines of leadership, psychology, group dynamics, and quantum science. During this time, theorists began to observe that people used more than one style of leadership. Thus Blake and

³¹ Dulles, *Models*, 27.

Mouton developed a grid that described two dimensional leadership-followership relationships built on achieving task while maintaining relationship. Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard moved the model of task-relationship further. Norman Shawchuck³² adapted their language and examples for church leadership, thus creating a tool for evaluating styles of leadership directly related to church ministry. As the research on the two aspects of group interaction increased, more work emerged articulating the human relation aspect of leadership. Bolman and Deal cluster much of the human relation work into their human resource leadership frame. This human resource frame emphasizes interdependence between people and the organization. Leaders using this frame start from the premise that peoples' skills, insights, ideas, energy and commitment are an organization's most important resource. Those who operate out of this framework ask why people behave as they do and what can they can do about it. According to the values espoused in this frame, the leader identifies peoples' gifts and seeks to fit gift to task. As a result leaders operating out of the human resource frame assume benign intent and competence of their associates. The human resource frame, incorporating communication skills, listening, interpersonal feedback and conflict negotiation most closely aligns with the sacrament and community church models.

Frame III: Political

Leadership theorists such as Warren Bennis, James MacGregor Burns, Max DePree, Beverly Forbes, John Gardner, Robert Greenleaf, James Kouzes and Barry Posner have developed more refined analyses of leader qualities, skills and competencies.³³ They have contributed to a body of leadership theory calling for transformational leaders. These theorists agree that leaders need to demonstrate competency in com-

³² See Norman Shawchuck and Roger Heuser, *Leading the Congregation: Caring for Yourself While Serving the People* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1993).

³³ See, for example, Warren Bennis, *Organization Genius: The Secrets of Creative Collaboration* (Reading: Perseus, 1997); Max DePree, *Leadership is an Art* (New York: Dell, 1989) and *Leadership Jazz* (New York: Doubleday, 1992); Beverly Forbes, "Profile of the Leader of the Future: Origin, Premises, Values and Characteristics of the Theory F Transformational Model," photocopy (Seattle: Seattle University, 1992); John Gardner, *On Leadership* (New York: Free Press, 1990).

munication skills, listening, interpersonal feedback, shared decision-making and conflict negotiation. In addition, they suggest that leaders can train themselves to develop vision for an organization, to speak and motivate others toward organizational mission, and to formulate and preside over organizational ritual.

Bolman and Deal acknowledge the contribution of these and other theorists as they formulated the final two frames, political and symbolic. These frames begin to move leadership out of a two dimensional dynamic toward a multidimensional endeavor. They address issues and leader intelligences that were often ignored in previous leadership theories. The political frame recognizes the importance of power in the leader-follower relationship. It posits that communities compete for scarce resources. Since scarcity demands that organizations vie for the resources, political leaders rely on highly developed conflict negotiation skills. This frame suggests that people and organizations operate in a network of interdependence. Within this framework, communities respond to great visions for change. Often charismatic leaders articulate a strategy for achieving the vision, and they are extremely skilled at building coalitions and networks. On the other hand, leaders who operate exclusively in the political frame can underestimate the significance of rational and collaborative processes and that can lead to cynical and pessimistic organizations.

The leader in the servant church model utilizes skills from the political frame as well as from the structure and human resource frames. In the political arena, for example, servant leaders must know where power is and how to work within its confines as people of integrity. Similarly, servant leaders might examine ways to effect systemic change for the common good and draw upon structure frame skills of identifying job descriptions, allocating authority, and determining efficient flow of resources to need.

Frame IV: Symbolic

Finally, Bolman and Deal articulate a fourth frame grounded in the culture of the organization. The symbolic frame names gifts and abilities that assist a group in describing and appropriating meaning together. In this frame, the leader cre-

ates images, stories, and rituals to root the organization in a shared history. Drawing on cultural and social anthropology, the leader assists the group in interpreting and illuminating the basic issues of faith and meaning. Accepting ambiguity, the leader addresses what decisions, visions, mission, and life for the group mean.

Leaders comfortable in this frame see life as fluid. Max DePree's two texts, *Leadership as an Art* and *Leadership Jazz*, suggest the kind of leader that uses the symbolic frame well. In these, DePree notes the power of the story of the organization to shape the future. He also depicts a successful company that attuned itself to that reality, and developed strategies for initiation and renewal that called upon the power of ritual, story telling, and image. When used appropriately and well, leaders operating out of a symbolic frame can unify a group through shared participation in the history and identification with the process. The leader's use of story and ritual can lead to creativity and a highly developed sense of mission. At the same time, reliance on the traditional rituals and stories without attention to their capacity to renew, can also deaden a group and condemn it to *status quo* thinking, thus blocking adaptation and learning.

This frame relates to each of the models of church. Indeed, this leadership frame relates to the Judeo-Christian renewal processes that begin with the great Shema (Deut 6:6-9) and the Israelite renewal events patterned after Joshua 24. That ritual reinitiated the entire Jewish community as they heard the story and made it their own. The Christian Church relies on this principle as it celebrates the Paschal mystery. The rituals of the more liturgical churches more emphatically embody this frame, thus the sacrament, institution, and community models draw more explicitly from this leadership frame. On the other hand, the herald, servant and disciple models require the story-telling and tradition holding elements of the symbolic leadership frame.

Frame Summary

Ultimately Bolman and Deal argue that excellent leaders must demonstrate ability to utilize skills, competencies and knowledge bases from each of the frames as needed. While acknowledging the gifts inherent in each style or frame, they

assert that leaders in this century will move organizations to new realities. They urge leaders to develop the facility to move freely within the frames in order to guide organizations into their visions.

Research Connecting Models of Church and Leadership Frames

The research reported in this article was conducted in two ways. First, the author conducted a stratified random sample three-part Delphi survey in Western Washington. Second, the author collected data from students in her classes in Pastoral Leadership at Seattle University's School of Theology and Ministry. The two efforts offer both quantitative and qualitative data toward the thesis that ministers' images of church relate to their valuing particular leadership styles and competencies. Relying on Dulles' models of church and Bolman and Deal's frames of leadership, the research effort compares ministers' models of church to their stated ranked competencies.

In 1995 the author asked 176 leaders in the Archdiocese of Seattle to identify competencies for leadership of the Catholic Church as they envisioned it in the year 2000. Using a Delphi method to structure a "paper conversation", each participant named five competencies they felt were essential to leaders-ministers in parish communities. After a team of experts collated the competencies submitted in response to the first questionnaire, the participants used a second and third questionnaire to rate the competencies and comment on them. The Delphi methodology uses this series of questionnaires with written dialogue over a short period of time (six weeks) to generate consensus about disparate items. The group of respondents reported in this research article identified and ranked thirty-five leadership competencies. Of the thirty-five listed in the study, twenty-three are used in this article. These twenty-three all received rankings of four or higher on a scale of one to five. Based on their standard deviation, they also represent the most consensus among the respondents. They are listed in rank order in Appendix Three. In addition, the researcher ascribed leadership frames to each of the competencies. The delineation of frames by competency is included in the table in Appendix Three.

As part of the first questionnaire in the Delphi study, each

participant identified both their current model of church (1995) and the model they felt would be operational by the year 2000. This article reports the findings based on the images of church the participants in the study predicted for 2000 (Table One). As the table records, over ninety percent of the participants, who completed all three questionnaires (n=111), chose either servant or disciple models. This research affirmed other research conducted at national levels among various Roman Catholic populations from 1985 through 1997 by Fox, Fleischer, Louise Bond,³⁴ director of the National Association of Lay Ministers, and Philip Murnion of the National Pastoral Life Center.³⁵ The findings in each study confirmed that the predominant images of church currently held by lay leaders in the Roman Catholic church in the United States are those most closely related to community, disciple, and servant. This fact creates important challenges for seminaries and universities as they attempt to form and educate the future leaders of this changing church.

Table 1
Delphi Respondents Model of church
(n=111)

Image No.	Image Name	Image 1995	Image 2000
1	Institutional	21	2
2	Community	24	8
3	Sacrament	7	7
4	Herald	2	5
5	Servant	12	22
6	Disciple	40	63
Total		106	107

³⁴ Louise C. Bond, *An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Lay Ministry Training in the Roman Catholic Church of the United States*, Doctoral Diss., The Catholic University of America, 1990 (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1990).
³⁵ Philip J. Murnion, *New Parish Ministers: Laity and Religious on Parish Staffs* (Cincinnati: Saint Anthony, 1993).

Subsequent to the Delphi study of 1995, the researcher sought to discover if the models of church and their implications for leadership development affected the catholic ecumenical student body enrolled at the School of Theology and Ministry. Using a tool designed to assist people in identifying their images of church as defined by Dulles, students determined their preferred model of church. As part of the class structure, the ministry students were then divided into subgroups according to their preferred models. Each group was asked to write a definition of leadership and to draw an image that expressed their vision of church. While over sixty students have participated in this exercise, the material used in this article reflects the most recent class group of eighteen students (Table Two) enrolled in Pastoral Leadership in Fall, 1999.

Table 2
Pastoral Leadership Class
Model of Church
(n=18)

Image No.	Image Name	Image 2000
1	Institutional	0
2	Community	6
3	Sacrament	3
4	Herald	2
5	Servant	3
6	Disciple	4
Total		18

Institution and Structure

In the Delphi study this author conducted in 1995, the move from institution to other models of church is so startling that it suggests a paradigm shift in understanding church in Western Washington.³⁶ Only one person enrolled in the past two sections of pastoral leadership (n=40) self-identified with the institution model of church. Interestingly, this person was preparing for ordination in the United Church of Christ. Table

³⁶ Callahan, 87, 257.

One reveals that only two respondents in the Delphi study imaged the church of 2000 as institution. The numbers in both areas of study are too small to demonstrate correlation between the image of church and the leadership frame.

Table Three reveals the rank order of the top sixteen leadership competencies as rated by the Delphi respondents (see Appendix Three for the top twenty-three competency statements). The first column lists the rank order from competencies one through sixteen with the leadership frames identified by name and abbreviation. Each subsequent column lists the competencies by number as they appear in Appendix Three, but in the rank order as the respondents within that model of church rated them. A quick glance reveals that respondents who identify different models of church vary in their valuing of the common competencies they surfaced as a whole. The limited number of respondents in the institution model preclude careful consideration of the data in the table related to that image of church.

Sacrament Model and Human Resource and Political Frame

As previously discussed, the human resource frame of leadership by its nature attends to relationship-building in an organization. The sacrament model of church emphasizes the mission of the church as sign to the universe. Relationships within the community and the distinct role of the leader as ritual celebrant combine elements of relationship-building and symbolic presence.

Those Delphi respondents choosing the sacrament model ranked fifteen competencies higher than the rest. A close examination of the data in Table Three reveals that among these leadership competencies, nine are directly related to the human resource frame of leadership, while five are connected to the symbolic frame. This suggests close congruence between their vision of church and their expectations of leaders within that model. As discussed earlier, the sacrament model posits the church as symbol of Christ on earth. Sacramental and liturgical celebrations become key to embodying this reality. Thus the symbolic frame with its emphasis on ritual, myth and story readily enhances the leadership role within this model of church.

The students in the Pastoral Leadership course confirm this emphasis. One group (n=3) out of six identified itself as imaging church as sacrament. The students in this group were Roman Catholic (n=2) and Unitarian Universalist (n=1). Their drawing depicted a partial body with arms outstretched in a

Table 3

Delphi Study
Leadership Competency Rankings
By Models of the church

Total Respondent Ranked Competencies See Appendix Three (n=111)	Institution (n=2)	Sacrament (n=7)	Community (n=8)	Herald (n=5)	Servant (n=22)	Disciple (n=63)
Comp #/Frame (Structure=str)	Comp # Frame	Comp # Frame	Comp # Frame	Comp # Frame	Comp # Frame	Comp # Frame
1. Symbolic (Sym)	1. Sym	1. Sym	1. Sym	1. Sym	1. Sym	1. Sym
2. Symbolic (Sym)	2. Sym	7. Sym	2. Sym	4. HR	2. Sym	2. Sym
3. Human Resource (HR)	11. HR	2. Sym	3. HR	2. Sym	5. HR	3. HR
4. Human Resource (HR)	3. HR	4. HR	4. HR	3. HR	3. HR	4. HR
5. Human Resource (HR)	14. HR	5. HR	8. HR	7. Sym	6. HR	5. HR
6. Human Resource (HR)	20. Str	14. HR	11. HR	6. HR	13. HR	7. Sym
7. Symbolic (Sym)	4. HR	18. HR	13. HR	9. Sym	8. HR	6. HR
8. Human Resource (HR)	5. HR	8. HR	15. Pol	10. HR	4. HR	13. HR
9. Structure/Sym (S/S)	7. Sym	9. S/S	19. Str	11. HR	10. HR	8. HR
10. Human Resource (HR)	9. Str	10. HR	6. HR	13. HR	17. Str	9. S/S
11. Human Resource (HR)	10. HR	11. HR	9. S/S	18. HR	12. M	17. Str
12. Multiple (M)	15. Pol	12. M	10. HR	19. Str	16. Pol	11. HR
13. Human Resource (HR)	16. Pol	24. Sym	12. M	5. HR	7. Sym	14. HR
14. Human Resource (HR)	19. Str	3. HR	5. HR	15. Pol	14. HR	15. Pol
15. Political (Pol)	22. Pol	6. HR	7. Sym	16. Pol	18. HR	10. HR
16. Political (Pol)	23. Pol		17. Str	20. Sym	15. Pol	12. M

ritual expression of inclusion and prayer. Their definition included words such as "invites . . . nurtures . . . accepting . . . loving . . . welcoming . . . including." These descriptors are consistent with Bolman and Deal's competencies collected in the human resource frame. They also reveal the weaknesses inherent in both the model and the leadership frame. The drawing and words don't describe an external mission but concentrate on the intimacy within. And as Bolman and Deal warn about the human resource frame, the attention to peoples' needs can lead to unrealistic optimism about the ability of the organization (church) to respond to those needs. Both the Delphi group and the Pastoral Leadership group value the leadership competencies closely connected to the model of church they espouse.

Community and Human Resource

While only eight respondents in the Delphi study identified themselves as imaging church as community, their choices and ranking of leadership competencies indicate consonance with their image. Table Three demonstrates that they ranked competencies related to the human resource frame highest and most consistently with half of the top sixteen in this category. One quarter of the top sixteen competencies were connected to the symbolic frame and one eighth of them reflected the structure frame.

Two groups of students (n=6) in the Pastoral Leadership class imaged church as community. Comprised of one Episcopal, one Scientologist, two Roman Catholic, and two United Church of Christ students, these two groups drew images that corresponded in very striking ways. One group drew a heart filled with hearts, while the other drew a clock with a heart in its center. Their definitions included words such as: "love. . . trust. . . hold the group together. . . awakening the Spirit . . . enable. . . use gifts." These words and images embody the very descriptors Bolman and Deal use to name some of the characteristics of human resource frame.

Herald and Multiple Frames

Few Roman Catholics (n=5) in the Delphi study surfaced as imaging church as herald. According to Table Three, the Delphi respondents who identified with the herald model

chose eight human resource competencies, five symbolic, two political and one structure related competency. Since the model itself suggests a more prophetic role critical of institutional structure, one might assume the political competencies. The model's emphasis on word and faith suggests that the ratings of symbolic competencies for leadership enhance the power of the herald. New ideas about missiology and theologies of inculturation might support the high value around human resource since they urge evangelists and heralds to make friends, understand cultures, and acknowledge God in people before the word is proclaimed.

Only one group of two students (one Catholic and one United Methodist) surfaced as self-identified heralds in the Pastoral Leadership course. Their artwork depicted people enclosed in a heart. Their definition of leadership embraced the human resource frame with words such as "empowering others . . . love . . . relationships . . . caring." Other words suggest the model without correlating to a specific leadership frame: "integrity . . . involvement . . . commitment . . . deep passion . . . sincerity." They did not mention the Word, mission, nor witness over action. Their image included people holding hands, which could signify the kind of interdependence that Bolman and Deal suggest as part of the political frame. The small sample suggests interesting possibilities with no conclusive results.

Servant and Combination of Leadership Frames

While all the models of church require exercise of multiple leadership skills and intelligences, the servant model and subsequently the disciple model by their nature require more complex sets of gifts and skills. Twenty-two respondents in the Delphi study identified the servant model as their image of the contemporary church. Table Three reveals that nine of the top seventeen competencies they chose related to the human resource frame, while only one related to the structure frame. These respondents named three competencies in the symbolic frame, two political related competencies and one reflecting multiple leadership frames. This distribution of leadership competencies seems consonant with the model.

Within the Pastoral Leadership course, one group (n=3) identified themselves as imaging the church as servant. All men, they represented two traditions: United Church of Christ

and Unitarian Universalist. Their drawing depicted a world carried by people working together. Their definition identified the leader as "empowering others to realize a vision." The images and words indicate a movement outward from the community, with connection between world and church. The image and definition describe the need for cooperation inherent in human resource frame, and the shared interdependence and empowering resources consistent with the political frame.

Disciple and Combination of Leadership Frames

Since Dulles himself considered the disciple model to be a composite, it is no surprise that those who identify with this model also embrace a mixture of leadership frames. The Delphi study respondents overwhelmingly (n=63) chose this model of church. As they evaluated the necessary leadership to guide this future church, they ranked nine competencies related to the human resource frame in their top sixteen competencies. As Table Three shows, they split the rest of the competencies almost evenly between the symbolic frame (three) and structure (two) frames. They ranked only one political frame related competency in the top sixteen. Ultimately Bolman and Deal urge leaders to draw from each of the competencies, intelligences, and frames to successfully lead an organization. The data reveals that the Delphi respondents recognized the composite nature of the model and valued the combination of multiple leadership frames.

One group (n=4) embraced this model in the Pastoral Leadership class. All women, this group included Mennonite, Unitarian Universalist, United Church of Christ and Episcopalian students. Their drawing includes a road set in mountains and forests. Indicating graphically the biblical notion of disciple-journeyer, their definition includes words such as "courageous . . . vulnerable . . . willing to be seen . . . able to risk . . . multiple paths . . . operates out of transcendent source which touches all decisions and relationships." The very complexity of their definition and drawing matches the complexity of this composite model of church and it embraces the multiple leadership frames that Bolman and Deal define.

Summary

Recently Craig Dykstra,³⁷ of the Lilly Endowment, spoke about the need for seminaries to develop curriculum that helped ministers achieve and utilize multiple intelligences for leadership. He urged leaders in seminaries to seriously consider how institutions of learning prepare the future leaders of the church. He wondered aloud about the artistic imagination that excellent leaders bring to creative endeavors. He called for leaders within the educational institutions to imagine a Christian Church that lived its mission and to align educational efforts toward endowing the church with leaders that demonstrated multiple intelligences for transformation and reconciliation.

The research in this article suggests seminaries might attend to the connection between ecclesiology (models of church) and leadership competencies (leadership frames). The Bolman and Deal leadership frames offer multiple possibilities for discussing the leadership abilities, attitudes and skills that leader-ministers need to demonstrate if they are to function in the church today. Dulles' models of church suggest that congregations organize themselves with specific attention to mission based on their understanding of the scriptures as lived through tradition in today's context. While these models are excellent for the research reported in this article, they might be expanded by integrating the newly emerging work of theologians and leadership theorists. As ecumenical dialogues continue to produce ecclesial agreements between denominations (Lutheran and Episcopalian, Presbyterian and United Church of Christ, United Church of Christ and Christian Church Disciples of Christ, etc.), leaders will need to hold multiple faith cultures and models of church together in a single congregation. At the same time, those leader-ministers will be moving the congregations and denominations toward new realities. Gareth Morgan, professor of organizational change at York University, suggests that organizations that move forward toward the twenty-first century will be those that

³⁷ Craig Dykstra, "Pastoral Ministry & Pastoral Imagination," Forum Presentation to Theological School Programs for Strengthening Congregational Leadership, The Fund for Theological Education, Inc., 4 January 2001.

build a competence mind set into everything they do, focusing on what it takes to be effective to reach the cutting edge and stay there! They will use this focus to remain open, dynamic, and evolving, invigorating and renewing themselves as they go along. These organizations will have a strong learning orientation, which they will use to develop capacities for self-review and self-renewal.³⁸

In this time of challenge for leadership in the church, it is appropriate to ask about ways to prepare leaders to envision church expansively and to draw forth the gifts that realize the vision.

As the data in this article reveals, leaders envision a church that is more relational (community), serves the whole universe (servant), and learns as it transforms itself and the universe (disciple). Bolman and Deal have provided leadership frames that separately address particular aspects of each model, but when they are combined, they invite the leader to access and employ multiple intelligences in an artistic way that incarnates the vision. Margaret Wheatley speaks about this interaction of competencies and intelligences when she states that

to weave here and there with ease and grace, we will need to change what we do. We will need to stop describing tasks and instead facilitate process. We will need to become savvy about how to build relationships, how to nurture, grow, evolving things. All of us will need better skills in listening, communicating and facilitating groups, because these are the talents that build strong relationships. It is well known that the era of the rugged individual has been replaced by the era of the team player. . . The quantum world has demolished the concept of the unconnected individual.³⁹

Thus, she summarizes the shift from emphasis on structure (describing tasks) toward the interweaving of leadership frames. While embracing the gift of structure, new church

³⁸ Gareth Morgan, *Riding the Waves of Change: Developing Managerial Competencies for a Turbulent World* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988), 170.

³⁹ Wheatley, *New Science*, 38.

leaders will attend to the relationships and gifts of humans (human resource), build networks to defy the notion of scarcity with the promise of shared abundance (political) and celebrate the reality of our shared grounding in Christ (symbolic). The research demonstrates that leaders in the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Seattle in Western Washington are ready to embrace the complexity of the task. It also suggests that ecumenical ministry students in the School of Theology and Ministry at Seattle University are eager to learn the multiple intelligences needed in today's complex church and society.

The research is limited in its applicability. Nevertheless, it invites others to explore the connections, develop curriculum, and measure effectiveness.

Appendix One
Dulles' Models of the church

MODEL OF CHURCH	INSTITUTION	COMMUNITY	SACRAMENT	HERALD	SERVANT	DISCIPLE
Strengths	Organization Stability Continuity Identity	Spirituality & prayer at center Mutuality	Community & institution related Mission= sign of Christ Emphasis on life & communion;	Clear identity Mission= Word Rich theology of Word	Makes peace between church & world; Sees church in dialogue; Strong mission; Humble caring; Socially active; Transforms power to service	Lifelong learners; Room for failure; Organic- changes as need to; Emphasizes community as discerning together.
Weaknesses	Rigidity Juridicism Patriarchy Emphasizes blind obedience Authority located in few	Lines between spiritual and human unclear Lack of outward mission Emphasis on Spirit- harder to identify structures	Unhealthy divinization of church; Narcissistic	Theology of Incarnation; Theology of grace; Values witness over action	Loses distinct contribution of the Church; Salvation in the world without the church; Can lead to political absorption.	Tension between Spirit and Institution not clearly resolved
Characteristics	Functions= teach, sanctify, govern	Create intimacy Face-to-face	Power invested in liturgical leader; Communion	Church hears and responds to WORD in faith; Can be singular- not as tied to community	Church with a mandate to establish in this world Christ's reign of peace, justice, love, & reconciliation	Follow Jesus; Circle within circle apart from world working in world to bring "Good News"; Learners-teachers
Leadership frames	Structure Theory X;	Human Resource Symbolic Structure	Human resource Symbolic	Human Resource Symbolic Political	Human Resource Political Symbolic	Human Resource Political Symbolic Structure

Appendix Two
Bolman And Deal Leadership Frames

FRAMES	STRUCTURE	HUMAN RESOURCE	POLITICAL	SYMBOLIC
CHARACTERISTICS	<p>Emphasize org. roles, goals, technology;</p> <p>Look for way to develop structures that best fit org. purpose & environment</p> <p>Ask why & how systems work;</p> <p>Specialize tasks to permit higher levels of performance & expertise;</p> <p>"the structural perspective focuses on how to find some arrangement- a pattern of formal roles and relationships- that will accommodate org. needs as well as differences."</p> <p>(50)</p> <p>Design: How divide? How coordinate?</p>	<p>Emphasizes interdependence between people & org.</p> <p>Starts from premise that peoples' skills, insights, ideas, energy and commitment are an org most critical resource.</p> <p>Exist to serve human need</p> <p>Seeks good fit between individual and organization.</p> <p>Concerned w. relationship</p> <p>Asks: what happening? why do people behave as they do? what can I do about it?</p>	<p>Sees power, conflict and distribution of scarce resources as main issues.</p> <p>Images organizations as jungles</p> <p>Uses power, coalitions, bargaining and conflict negotiation to achieve cooperation</p> <p>Values interdependence: people cannot simply ignore each other.</p> <p>Acknowledges people need each other's assistance, support and resources.</p>	<p>Focuses on problems of meaning; Relies on images, drama, magic, supernatural to bring measure of order;</p> <p>Draws on social & cultural anthropology;</p> <p>Celebrates ritual, stories ceremonies, heroes, myths.</p> <p>Seeks to interpret & illuminate the basic issues of meaning & faith.</p> <p>Accepts ambiguity</p> <p>Convinced that what is most important is not what happens but what it means.</p>
STRENGTHS	<p>Stability;</p> <p>Clarity;</p> <p>Fixed division labor;</p> <p>Predictability;</p> <p>Efficiency;</p>	<p>Concerned for employees, Achieves low turnover;</p> <p>Uses groups and teams to increase responsibility and communication;</p> <p>Focuses on fit between humans & organizations</p>	<p>Sets Agendas</p> <p>Strategizes to achieve vision for change</p> <p>Networks & builds coalitions</p> <p>Attends to real dynamics of power and conflict</p>	<p>Sees org life as fluid</p> <p>Defines member identity through values, initiation, practices, artifacts, pattern of beliefs</p> <p>Develops high sense of mission</p> <p>Fosters Creativity</p>
LIMITS	<p>Not as good with why systems DON'T work;</p> <p>Can be connected to Theory X</p>	<p>Assumes peoples' needs connected to org needs;</p> <p>Too optimistic about ability to respond to needs;</p> <p>Underplays power, conflict, scarcity.</p> <p>Can undervalue structure</p>	<p>Underestimates significance of both rational & collaborative processes;</p> <p>Cynical & pessimistic;</p> <p>Often amoral & raises questions of values.</p>	<p>Can cement the <i>status quo</i></p> <p>Can block adaptation and learning.</p>
THEORISTS	Weber, Taylor, Minstzberg	McGregor, Argyris, Maslow	Kotter, Fischer & Ury	DePree, Fulghum

Appendix Three
Competencies for Pastoral Leadership
 (Delphi 1996)

Ranked #	Frame	Ranked Competency Statement
1	Symbolic	Committed to prayer and discernment, able to reflect on action of God in own life, the lives of the people served, and in the world.
2	Symbolic	Demonstrates commitment to live gospel values with integrity.
3	H.R./ Political	Ability to communicate effectively (i.e., Listening skills, negotiating conflict, facilitating processes, etc.).
4	H.R.	Ability and willingness to: listen to, know, and love the people of God in their communities.
5	H.R.	Demonstrates compassion, empathy understanding, and patience.
6	H.R.	Ability to work collaboratively through team ministry and sharing control and power.
7	Symbolic	Recognizes connections between spirituality and every day life and can share them.
8	H.R.	Demonstrates sense of personal strengths and limitations which the person expresses in behavior that is well balanced physically, mentally, emotionally and spiritually.
9	Structure	Knowledge and appreciation of Catholic theology, history and Tradition
10.	H.R.	Ability to laugh at self and the comic elements of life.
11	H.R.	Knowledge and ability to understand human nature.
12	Multi-frame	Ability to be flexible and open to change tempered by care for the pastoral needs of the community.
13	H.R.	Ability to relate to and include all people in the community of faith (e.g., men, women, youth and children of different cultures, sexual orientation, handicapping conditions).
14	H.R.	Demonstrates humility by being open to learning from others in and beyond the faith community.
15	Political	Ability to make wise judgments based on life experiences.
16	Political	Ability to risk and stand up for principles even in the face of ambiguity.
17	Structure	Ability to inspire, prepare, mobilize, self and others to accomplish goals, objectives and strategies consistent with a given vision and mission.
18	H.R.	Demonstrates understanding of and desire to be a servant leader.
19	Structure / Political	Demonstrates commitment to institutional church to see and celebrate the lord's presence in Word and sacrament in a way that nourishes and strengthens the faith commitment of people.
20	Symbolic	Knowledge of Scriptures and the ability to translate them into daily life.
21	Political	Ability to acquire and retain knowledge through lifelong learning both personal and professional.
22	Political	Ability to preach, proclaim and bear witness to the good news both within and beyond the faith community.
23	Political	Ability to sound a prophetic voice around issues of justice that can be heard and received by the community of faith.