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Evolving from a military background of more than 20 years that saw administrative duties woven into nearly every fiber of the fabric of responsibilities to a church ministry position that included simultaneous seminary studies was an interesting life transition for me. Where before I commanded activity and expected it to be accomplished, I now had to request a volunteer to carry out a needed activity. Church volunteers are different, I discovered, than a subordinate sailor. As I began my seminary studies in the Christian Education School, however, I soon found that the basics of administration and leadership taught there were no different than what I had carried out in the military. Churches or religious nonprofits still had to plan, an organization was needed to accomplish the task, leadership had to train and motivate workers, and evaluation and follow up was a necessary element of ensuring progress.

Through my concentrated studies during the doctorate in church administration and higher education administration, an interesting phenomenon became apparent to me: most church leaders do not carry out their administrative duties very well. For my dissertation studies I focused on a large cross section of the ministers who make up the largest Protestant denomination in America. I studied their job satisfaction based upon the model of intrinsic satisfiers and extrinsic dissatisfiers that had been postulated by other researchers. In my study, 89 percent of the staff members were college graduates, 75 percent held master degrees, 62 percent were graduates of seminaries, and 72 individuals held doctorates—50 of which were pastors. Of the intrinsic satisfaction factors noted, receiving praise and recognition for work, performing creative work, and growth in skill were the highest predictors of satisfaction.

The extrinsic factors that tended to cause job dissatisfaction included absence of adequate salary, job security, interpersonal relationships with supervisor, and meeting family needs. When the position of senior pastor was partitioned out of the other 579 individuals in the study, these 91 individuals who identified themselves as the senior pastor of a church were the only group in the study that identified all of the extrinsic dissatisfaction factors as significant in playing a role in their satisfaction with their leader. These significant predictors included such factors as relationships with peers, supervisory personnel, and the techniques of supervision of subordinates. Working conditions and the presence (or absence) of policies and procedures also played a significant role.
The review of literature that spawned my dissertation research as well as many investigations and review of other research has caused me to come to the conclusion that the wounds ministers receive attempting to manage their church or parish are self-inflicted, the result of a poor preparation for ministry by the institutions that were charged to provide to the church competent leaders. This failure to prepare church leaders by seminaries could be attributed, I surmised, to the tenuous balance between a seminary providing a legitimate graduate level theological education as demanded by accreditation agencies and the need for a practical education as demanded by the local parishioner.

In the early 1990s a research class I was teaching conducted a walking survey of several hundred ministers attending a large Bible conference held in the eastern states. The students were to ascertain the ministry position of the individual and then ask two quick questions: “If you could choose only one minister from a list of associate pastor, minister of education, minister of music, minister of youth, minister of children, and church administrator, which would you choose first, then second, and third?” And, “If you could have any one minister with a combination of skills, what would that combination be?” The results of the survey were interesting. Most of the respondents were senior pastors. The single most chosen individual was youth minister (apparently pastors want someone else to handle the youth), followed by minister of music and then the education minister. When a combination was chosen, it was noted that the most given combination individual was music and youth. However when we looked at the dual roles that included the administrator, the administrative dual position was sought significantly higher than any other combination. In other words, whatever the second person on the staff was, it needed to combine the administration of the church.

In the July/August 1996 issue of Your Church magazine published by Christianity Today International, I wrote an article concerning the lack of administrative acumen of individuals who have been called and placed by churches as the leaders of their congregations.\(^1\) Admittedly, some of the article was based upon a hunch—but a hunch founded in the dialogue and conversations I had with numerous church leaders. And, some was based upon the interaction I had with colleagues in the seminary I serve whose philosophy for preparation was to fill the student to the brim with Greek, Hebrew, and the Scriptures and they will learn how to pastor/lead the church by the school of hard knocks.

When one reads the mission and purpose statements of institutions who prepare ministers for the local church, one encounters words like *graduate education, theological and doctrinal expertise, evangelical zeal, church growth, forward thinking, mission minded, parish/church leadership.* A problem exists with such statements in that the creators of these lofty academic
goals are usually not the developers of the curriculum that prepares the seminarian for pastoral or ministerial service. Those individuals are the professors of Greek, Hebrew, New and Old Testament, Church History, Ethics, Missiology, traditionalists who think their subjects are the most important for a founded education. Often lost, as an oh-by-the-way, is the practical ministry of administration.

Too often when seminary alumnae offices seek to find their graduates, they discover them in occupations other than in church leadership. Studies have been conducted through the years that indicated between one-third and one-half of a seminary’s graduates are not in church ministerial leadership positions a decade after graduation. One of the reasons given is that the minister did not feel that the administrative hassles of the job were what they were called into ministry to do.

In 1997 a nonscientific but comprehensive survey was conducted that asked alumnae of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, “What was it that you wish we had taught you that we didn’t teach you?” Over 85 percent stated they needed administrative skills to conduct their ministry. Almost an equal percentile asked for skills to develop relationships with the people they lead.

To prepare for this book, I felt that I should research my hunch, whether pastors are generally inept at administration because they are not instructed in those facets of the ministerial responsibility by the institutions that have been established to prepare them for ministry. The research involved going to the Web sites of about 200 institutions that are accredited by the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) and the Transnational Association of Christian Colleges and Schools (TRACS). The research developed a listing of 176 institutions that had a Web site that could be scanned to reveal whether or not they offered a primary degree in pastoral ministry training (the MDiv was used in all but three institutions); and, whether the Web site provided information that listed the content and discussion of the degree requirements.

Twenty-six of the institutions reviewed were Roman Catholic seminaries and two were Greek Orthodox institutions. Of these 28 schools only one required a church administration course, one required a leadership course, and two offered leadership as an elective option. Lack of training in this tradition is understandable when one considers the church is a hierarchy with appointed business leaders servicing the diocese. Priests are not expected to provide administrative leadership.

When these 28 Roman Catholic/Greek Orthodox seminaries are removed from the survey analysis, then the results of the remaining 148 institutions are modified:

- Twenty-one institutions required a church administration course.
Thirty-one institutions required a leadership course that had little to do with administration skills development.

Four institutions required both an administration and a leadership course.

Nine schools required an elective that could have included an administration course.

Two schools required an elective that could have included a leadership course.

Fourteen institutions offered a church administration course that could be taken as a free elective if the MDiv student chose.

The average semester-hour requirement of the MDiv is 94.5 with 90 hours as the mode. Using the 90-hour degree as a standard, these 148 institutions will require of their students about 13,320 hours of academic preparation (90 x 148). Yet only 25 institutions will require an administration course (0.563 percent of the course load assuming a three-hour administration course) and only 35 will require a leadership course (0.788 percent of the course load for a three-hour course). Another way of reporting the findings is that 84 percent of the institutions (25/148) will have no requirement for administration training, and 77 percent (35/148) will not require leadership as a portion of their academic curriculum. Only 2.7 percent (4/148) of the schools will require both leadership and administration of their MDiv graduates.

The bottom line is that overall seminarians attending these 148 seminaries in preparation for pastoral ministry will only spend slightly more than 1 percent (1.351 percent) of their total academic course preparation in study for the administrative or leadership responsibilities of the church; and, up to three-fourths of the others will receive none. This is an interesting balance of preparation requirements given that studies have demonstrated that a pastor spends between 50 to 75 percent of his time in administrative and leadership responsibilities in the church.

A general observation can be drawn from the Web site analysis, and the CTI study: the more liturgical the institution the less emphasis on administration or leadership. No particular denomination or group of institutions seems to provide a consistent pattern of preparation for dealing with the leadership of the church. Nor does size of the institution seem to effect whether administration is a part of the curriculum. Most institutions prepare individuals for ministry focus on the tenants of theological acumen and not upon pastoral leadership. Another way of stating this conclusion is that these institutions spend 97 percent of their academic preparation equipping an individual to do about 40 percent of their job and about 3 percent of the training in preparation for about 60 percent of their responsibilities.
In a study conducted by Christianity Today International and the Gallop Poll association and reported in Your Church magazine during the 1998 issues, it was found that the average pastor spent a workweek of 65 hours. In that workweek an average of 24 hours were spent in administrative activities, 6 hours in meetings, and 7 hours in miscellaneous activities that did not relate directly to pastoral duties. Only 10 hours a week were spent in sermon or teaching preparation, 6 hours in pastoral care, 5 hours in counseling, 6 hours in personal devotions, and 1 hour in evangelism. In other words about 57 percent of their ministry was tied up in strictly nonpastoral administrative duties.\(^2\)

In a major study conducted by the Hartford Institute for Religion Research at Hartford Seminary and reported in American Congregations 2008, the study found similar research results to the 1998 CTI study.\(^3\) A total of 2,527 congregations made up the sample survey. The survey results were divided into religion groups: Oldline Protestants, Evangelical Protestants, Catholic, Orthodox, and other world religions. Focusing on the results that apply to the Protestant groups and their leadership, the responses of questions directed to the pastors is summarized from the study's findings below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINISTRY ACTION</th>
<th>Oldline Protestant Clergy Leader</th>
<th>Evangelical Protestant Clergy Leader</th>
<th>Full-Time Paid Clergy Leader</th>
<th>Non Full-Time Paid Clergy Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and leading worship</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing promoting vision and mission</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral care</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching about the faith</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit and train layleaders</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the significant amount of time and attention that is given to administration. Note also that it is rather consistent across denominational groups and full-time and part-time clergy. Note also the low amount of time and attention given to recruiting and training layleaders, which seems to belittle the pastor-teacher role of Eph 4:12 (“for the training of the saints in the work of ministry”).
In a study of more than 1,000 pastors conducted in 2009 by LifeWay Research, titled “How Protestant Pastors Spend Their Time,” it was reported that 65 percent of pastors surveyed work 50 or more hours a week, with 8 percent saying they work 70 or more hours. “Meetings and electronic correspondence consume large amounts of time for many ministers, while counseling, visitation, family time, prayer and personal devotions suffer in too many cases.” The study found that evangelical pastors had a far greater emphasis on the leadership and administrative responsibilities of the church than did their counterparts in traditional and Catholic ministries.4

In the year 2000, the executive board of the largest Protestant denomination in America reported that nearly 1,000 (987) ministers were considered as “forced terminations” from their positions. The reasons often given were issues regarding who will run the church, poor people skills, pastoral leadership style perceived as too strong, the church’s resistance to change, and the church was already conflicted when the pastor arrived. The sad part of that report was the comment that of the 987 forced terminations, 444 (45 percent) did not return to ministry.5

In a 2001 article in Leadership Journal pastors were asked if they were ever forced to resign. Nearly 23 percent (one in four) had been terminated. The biggest single factor was a small fraction of 10 or so people causing the dismissal. Interestingly 62 percent of respondents said that the church had terminated other pastors before. And when asked if they would continue in ministry, 86 percent said they would.6

Also in Leadership Journal published by Christianity Today, Gordon MacDonald reported in a 2006 article titled “Many in Ministry Did Not Finish,” the reasons were stress/burnout, or conflict, inadequate people skills, insufficient leadership capability, poor work habits, family unhappiness, or mean-spirited congregants.7

Most seminaries and training schools do a wonderful job of equipping the minister theologically since these factors were not mentioned as reasons for termination. But, they apparently did a poor job of preparing them for pastoral leadership because these were the factors mentioned. In the LifeWay research, 444 individuals hung it up and said no more to their calling. While that may appear as a weakness in the ministerial call, it could also be perceived as poor stewardship of the calling on the part of the leaders who were responsible to ensure it didn’t happen.

In the pages that follow, this author will attempt to assist the reader in becoming a leader, a manager, and an administrator. Perhaps you are in seminary or in ministerial preparation in a college setting; this text will assist you in becoming familiar with the dynamics of administration as they relate to the church or religious not-for-profit organization. If you are in a position of
leadership already, the objective of the text will be to become a resource tool you can use to assist you in conducting your business. Whether you are in academic preparation or on the field, the objective of the text is the same: if you understand the tenants of general administration and the techniques of ministerial leadership, your job will be made significantly easier. With leaders prepared to carry out the mundane and often tiresome activities of administration, they can focus on the primary elements of their calls to ministry. Pastors can shepherd the flock, counselors can aid in healing the hurt, educators can disciple, musicians can praise and worship, and the church or organization can move forward in accomplishing its vision.

Though this is an academic text, the author has attempted to interject example and personal experience where appropriate to place the topics discussed in a real-life context. Additionally, scriptural reference has been made to emphasize the biblical mandate for Christian leadership by individuals who fill positions of ministry and service in the local church, diocese or denominational office, or religious nonprofit organization. You will note several changes and additions to the text that were the result of numerous suggestions by colleagues, students, and professionals in fields that relate to church and nonprofit administration and leadership. To them I am grateful for a much-improved tool for church administration.
An Introduction to Administration

CHAPTER 1

But you should select from all the people able men, God-fearing, trustworthy and hating bribes. Place them over the people as officials of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens . . . they can bring you every important case but judge every minor case themselves. In this way you will lighten your load, and they will bear it with you.

Exodus 18:21–23

A Biblical Foundation for Organization

One day Jethro, Moses’ father-in-law, came up over a sand dune and looked down on a long line of people. It was an interesting group, and it was apparent that all were not happy wanderers. Fights, arguments, discord, and disenchantment are good words to describe this group of Israelites. Every once in a while an individual just got disheartened and left the line.

Jethro noted that at the head of the line was his son-in-law, sitting under a tent listening to the various people who made their way to him. So he went down to see what was going on. “Mo,” he said, “what is going on here?”

“Well, honored father-in-law,” Moses responded, “God made me these people’s leader. They have disputes, and I am here to listen to them and settle the problems. I sit here day in and day out listening to all these gripes, solving personal and marital problems, and trying to explain theological issues.”

Jethro was astonished. Had not Moses read Drucker during his years in the Pharaoh’s palace? In the kind words of a father-in-law, Jethro responded, “You’re crazy!” Having expressed his true sentiment, he went on to explain, “If you keep this up you are going to experience burnout in ministry. What will become of my daughter if you go over the deep end? But worse yet, what will become of the people? God has made you their leader. If you are not able to lead because of fatigue, then they will suffer tremendously and God’s purpose for them will not be achieved.”
Now Jethro was a Midianite priest, which made him a leader. Good leaders know you do not pose a problem without providing a resolution. So he told Moses, “Select some men who are prominent in the nation. Look for quality men who are moral in character and righteous in virtue. Place these individuals in charge of portions of the nation. Don’t overwhelm them. Assign the most capable person to groups of 1,000, then give them two lieutenants who can lead 500 each of that group. Keep dividing the group into smaller units with leaders of each subgroups of 100, 50, 10 or whatever. Now each subgroup leader is to be responsible to the leader above him. Let these various leaders solve problems at their level. If they can’t solve the problem, then they have someone over them who they can take it to. That way, you can reserve your decision making responsibilities to the biggies—responding only to the issues the leaders of the thousands bring to you, or, issues that God directs you. Now if you listen to my sage advice, not only will it be easier for you, but you will develop some leaders in the meantime.”

If you will excuse this author’s transliteration of Exodus 18 above, some interesting facts may be drawn from the passage:

- God appoints leaders.
- God expects those leaders to function effectively.
- No leader can do the entire job alone.
- Leaders who try to do the job alone either burn out themselves or wear out the followers.
- God often provides advisors to assist us in leadership.
- By delegating portions of the job, a leader can focus on the main issues.
- Delegation does not relieve the leader from responsibility, but it does remove them from carrying out the mundane and routine issues.
- Individuals who are delegated tasks must be qualified to do the job.
- Individuals who are delegated tasks must be given responsibilities to their level of ability—the more qualified, the higher the responsibility.

In the letter to the church at Corinth, Paul wrote to them about how the conduct of the affairs of the body would or should be carried out: “How is it then, brothers? Whenever you come together, each one has a psalm, a teaching, a revelation, another language, or an interpretation. All things must be done for edification” (1 Cor 14:26). Then Paul addressed the confusion that follows whenever all of these are being done at the same time, or whenever there is no order to the activities: “God is not a God of disorder but of peace” (1 Cor 14:33).

Vines in his *Complete Dictionary of New Testament Words* says that the word that has been translated “peace”—εἰρήνη in the Greek—means quietness, a harmonized relationship, a sense of rest and contentment."
Paul continued his instructions in 1 Corinthians 14 to speak to other issues that disrupt the orderliness and function of the church. While he encouraged a variety of forms of Christian expression, he cautioned in v. 40, “But everything must be done decently and in order.” The New International Version translates this phrase, “Everything should be done in a fitting and orderly way.” The Living Bible says, “done properly in a good and orderly way.” The Berkley transliteration says, “with propriety and in orderly fashion.” And the New Living Translation renders it, “Be sure that everything is done properly and in order.”

What Paul is saying is that when we “do church,” we are to do it in a proper and fitting manner. There should be order, not chaos. There should be sensibility, not insensitivity. There should be consistency, not discord. There should be guidance, not irresponsibility.

In the development of two major organizations of the Bible—the nation of Israel beyond the era of the patriarch fathers from Abraham and the local church beyond the era of the ministry of Christ—God chose significant leaders who were prepared for the task of leadership and organization. Moses, though born a Hebrew, was brought up in the household of the pharaoh of Egypt. At the time of Moses, Egypt was the ruler of the world. Thus, in his development in the court of the pharaoh, Moses had access to the literature, history, and languages of virtually the known world of his day. Egypt was a highly organized society with sophisticated systems of commerce, transportation, and government. Its military was next to none. Moses was taught all this as part of his preparations for leadership.

Paul (known before his conversion as Saul), like Moses also had a dual citizenship. Paul was a Hebrew, but he was also a Roman citizen. Saul was from Tarsus, the capital of the Roman province of Cilicia and home to a significant Roman university and school of philosophy. The Roman culture in the time of Paul was highly organized, much as Egypt was in the time of Moses. The Romans revered knowledge, skill, and craft. They embraced the academia of Greece, the science of the Mesopotamians and Egyptians, and the art of their own culture. As Rome conquered the world, they absorbed the best of each culture and organized it around Roman philosophy. It is obvious from his writing and later experiences that Paul received a significant education from the University of Tarsus.

Both Moses and Paul received divinely appointed calls from God to carry out His mission of leadership. From the burning bush, God called Moses to lead the Israelites from Egypt to the promised land. On a Damascus road, Christ blinded Paul and told him to form the *ekklesia* into the body called the church. Both received significant preparatory religious education—Moses from Jethro, a Midianite priest; and Paul from Gamaliel, one of the most important rabbis at the time.
And both were ordained of God to record God’s instructions in written form—Moses, drawing on his access to vast historical context and revelation; and Paul from his research, eyewitness account, and revelation. The documents these men wrote provided the foundation for the order and operation of the priesthood and the sacrificial worship system of the Old Testament as well as the organization of the church and the integration of the ministries (gifts) of the body of Christ in the New Testament.

In 1 Cor 12:28 we read, “And God has placed these in the church: first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, next, miracles, then gifts of healing, helping, managing, various kinds of languages.” Many other translations render the word managing as “administrations.” It comes from the Greek kubernetes, which has as its root the context of a helmsman steering a ship. Kubernetes is used uniquely in 1 Corinthians 12 and in Romans 12 in the listing of spiritual gifts.

Consider a sailing vessel. It is a hollow object with buoyancy that allows it to carry a cargo. It has a keel on the bottom that gives it stability. Sails give it mobility and power. Yet, for the vessel to be functional, it needs a rudder that is used to give it direction. The rudder is useless, though, without a helmsman moving it to provide direction and steering the ship to the desired objective. But the helmsman does not take the ship where he wants it to go; there is direction given by someone over him, the captain of the ship. The captain receives his direction from some superior authority who tells him that this is the strategic position that his ship will play in the overall objective of the fleet. The commanding officer of the ship consults his officers and directs the helmsman to move the rudder left and right to take the ship on course to meet the objectives set before them.

With this ship metaphor, as we consider the church, we see that the use of the term kubernetes is apropos for the context. The leadership of the church (the pastors) receives sailing orders from God through the Holy Spirit and Scripture. Pastors consult others in the leadership of the church and then direct certain individuals whom the Holy Spirit has empowered to carry out the mission and objectives of the church. All are not helmsmen, but each has unique responsibilities in meeting the goals set before the church.

In the New Testament significant passages relate to this description of administration in the church:

1. Administration is not practical versus spiritual (2 Cor 9:12–15).
2. Administration concerns the minister’s total task (Titus 1:5–9).
3. Administration is brought about by scholarly study (2 Tim 2:15).
4. Administration is an art to be practiced (Jas 2:14–18).
5. Administration is primarily concerned with persons, not processes (1 Cor 12:18–28).
6. Administration is the means to an end, the process that leads to a product (Phil 3:13–17).
7. Administration is an orderly process (1 Cor 14:40).
8. Administration is a preserver of peace, not a producer of conflict (1 Cor 8:7–13).

Throughout this text, additional passages of Scripture will be given for every topic introduced to demonstrate that the role of administrative leadership is found throughout the Bible. The objective is to validate from Scripture certain activities that ensure the viability of the New Testament church organization. Essential to this is an understanding by leadership of the administrative responsibilities of the church:

1. To define and set forth the purposes, aims, objectives, and goals of the church.
2. To lay down a broad plan for structuring the church organization.
3. To organize and recruit the executive staff outlined in the plan.
4. To provide clear delegation and allocation of authority and responsibility.
5. To provide standardization of all activities and programs in order to ensure goals and objectives are uniformly met.
6. To make provisions for committees, councils, ministry teams to achieve good coordination between all facets of the ministry.
7. To provide for evaluation and look ahead to ways of improving church programs, activities, and ministry.²

**Historical Philosophy of Administration**

“Be careful that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deceit based on human tradition, based on the elemental forces of the world, and not based upon Christ” (Col 2:8).

When man began to organize his society and order the culture is difficult to pinpoint. We know the history of mankind that is recorded in Genesis demonstrates numerous activities that indicate an intelligent and organized society. They had governments, they built cities, and they formed armies and carried out commerce and trade.

Prior to Abram (Abraham) leaving Paddan-Aram, first into Aram, and then the promised land, we know that the cultures of his home country of Mesopotamia were extremely sophisticated. In an ancient library found in Nippur of Babylonia hundreds of cuneiform tablets recorded a civilization of
history, poetry, commerce, taxes, and religion. Management systems were designed by the Sumerian priests to maintain and hold their vast tax system and to record and inventory loans and personal accounts.

In Genesis 41 we find Joseph conducting a very refined and extensive business in the house of the pharaoh. In fact Genesis 11–50 describes a civilization of refined organization and structure. Archaeological evidence demonstrates that at the time of the pharaohs, Hammurabi in Babylonia developed a code that addressed minimum wages, control of buying and selling, and management (leadership) responsibility. More than a thousand years later, records indicate Nebuchadnezzar instituted an inventory control system and an incentive wage system based upon worker production.

While other historical and archaeological evidence seems to point to structured cultures in Greece, India, China, and Southern Europe, organization and management philosophy seemed to remain a conceptual design of the dominant leader and had no fixed structure. Thus, while management and organization did exist, it was none-the-less nebulous and not well articulated. The principles used were derived out of necessity and functioned for the time of the leader.

In summary, three important models for organization existed:

1. The military with its generals and admirals who lead armies and fleets into battle for their ruler. There was a hierarchy of leadership, and this hierarchy was strictly (and often cruelly) enforced. Success was attributed to the brilliance of the winner, and failure was a function of poor leadership, poor equipment, or numbers of followers. Success was highly sought after since it meant living to fight another day.

2. The government with its emperors, kings, potentates, and rulers. Successful governments led the people. The consideration of the individual who made up the populace was usually not even made. Governments existed because the leaders had some type of “power” over others—whether military, taxation, ownership, or mystical.

3. The religions of the world with their priests and a hierarchal chain of command that flowed through a series of ecclesiastical and clerical levels. Often the organization called upon the follower to ascribe to some tenant of belief, ritual, sacrifice, or other type of commitment.

Organized management philosophy of the workplace is a latter-day arrival. Prior to the industrial revolution, much of society was built around self-reliance. You planted your fields and harvested what you needed. You traded or bartered away the excess to fulfill a need that you did not have the capacity to fulfill. Fishermen traded the daily catch for lumber to build or repair their boats. Farmers traded the produce of the field to the tanner for
leather to make implements. You built your own equipment, your own wagon, your own house.

In time, however, craftspeople came on the scene who could do something better than other people; their craft and skill became a sought-after item. In this context business management theory began to develop. It flowed out of the evolution of the craft trades and the master craftsmen who flourished in them. It was not until the late nineteenth century and through the twentieth century that administrative philosophy came to fruition.

Four major philosophies of management thought have evolved in the past century.

**The Scientific School**

This philosophy best embodies the concept of task management by administrators. It was most clearly expressed by the engineer Frederick Taylor in his *The Principles of Scientific Management*. Four principles are given:

1. **Discover the best way to accomplish a task.** This relied upon the master craftsman to analyze task in time-and-motion studies. How best to efficiently produce the product. How could equipment and resources be better used? Every stick of wood, every swing of the saw, every fastener used was accounted for.

2. **Discover the best worker to accomplish the task.** This expanded the apprentice and journeyman concept of the craft age to encompass the recruitment and coordination of others in the task. The wagon master recruited the blacksmith to make the wheels, brackets, and fasteners. The tanner provided the harness and cushions. Inherent in this discovery process was the training and development a worker received that provided for him opportunity for increased salary.

3. **Provide incentives for the workers.** Up to this point, salary was nonexistent. Individuals worked because of indentured responsibility, family responsibility, or the desire to learn a skill at the expense of remuneration for work accomplished. Taylor said that increased incentives increased productivity, which in turn resulted in higher production and profit.

4. **Provide close supervision by the manager.** Perhaps the most significant result of the Scientific School was the definition and demarcation between labor and management. Managers knew best how to do the job; workers did it. The worker had little say in how the task was to be accomplished. Management planned the work, provided the resources and tools, and management was responsible for marketing the products.
While the Scientific School was really not truly “scientific,” its Victorian moniker does illustrate that for the first time man was beginning to think about how he did his work and carried out business. Benefits to this philosophy were significant for the company because it meant increased productivity and profits. On the other hand, the scientific approach was a significant demoralizer for the common worker. The worker became a tool, a tool that could be manipulated and used. Managers assumed that the worker worked to earn money and that an inherent desire for identity or personal pride in a job well done were cast aside. The inhumane application of this approach led to the study of the worker and the second philosophy of management.

The Human Behavior School

This management philosophy came out of a growing need by organizations to create an environment for their personnel to have greater productivity. As the basis for the theory, most management scholars point to the Hawthorne studies conducted by Elton Mayo at the Western Electric Plant in Cicero, Illinois, in 1927. In his book, *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*, Mayo describes his studies of variance of light intensity and the effect that it had on production in the assembly areas. The basic question was, “What level of light intensity was necessary to ensure maximum productivity?” The basis of the study was the desire by the company to save the costs of electrical lights in the production area while at the same time ensuring maximum output.⁴

Mayo used a typical research study format of control group that got no variance of light intensity and an experimental group whose light intensity was changed every day. The objective was to lower lights until the production rate significantly decreased below the standard set by the control group.

What Mayo discovered in his results had nothing to do with light intensity; it had everything to do with human nature. He found it made no difference whether the lighting was poor or good; productivity in the experimental group increased. What impressed the researcher and the company was that when the control group discovered that the other segment of the production crew was being tested, they increased productivity—possibly for fear of losing their jobs because they might be perceived as producing less.

Mayo discovered that neither issues of physical fatigue, monotony, or an environmental issue such as lighting effected production. The important factors of increased productivity were the perception of the worker that management was paying attention to them and the pride of the worker by being placed in a special group—and conversely, the pride in workmanship despite being placed in a special category by the control group. It all focused on the individual, the worker—not the work.
The results of this experiment have been termed the Hawthorne Effect and have caused management to reconsider their attitude of a worker as merely a tool but as a social and psychological being who has needs, desires, and motivation that are intrinsic to their personal psyche.

One of the problems that emerged out of this theory and the desire for management to make application is that it is not as well defined as the Scientific School with its procedural-driven methodology. Douglas McGregor introduced in his book, *The Human Side of Enterprise*, the theory X and theory Y workers. McGregor’s thesis was that management must change the attitude and perception of the worker, assessing them for what their capabilities are and how best to address those issues. His theory X worker is a passive, low-risk taker who prefers job security. McGregor says that this worker needs to be administered with policies, rules, and close supervision. His theory Y person, on the other hand, is an individual who works best in a creative and reward-focused, incentive atmosphere. Their potential and capability needs to be considered; they require less supervision. Mayo’s and McGregor’s work has brought into tension the age-old question by management: when do we focus on the job, and when do we focus on the worker doing the job.

**The Management Process School**

While American and European businesses were scurrying to make application of the Scientific School to their organization in hopes for greater productivity (and profits), a French mining director began to consider how the theory could best be applied. Henri Fayol began as a mining engineer and worked his way through the organization to the directorship. Often considered as classical management theory, Fayol postulated that there existed a difference between the role that management played and that of the administrative supervisor—giving management a higher status.

Fayol divided business operations into six segments:

5. *Accounting*—taking stock of profit and costs.
6. *Managing*—the functions of guiding the organization.

Thus Fayol defined management as something someone did, not a title or a position. In his book, *General and Industrial Management*, Fayol described five functions of a manager:

1. *Planning*—examining the future and drawing up a plan of action.
2. *Organizing*—building up a dual structure of human and materials to achieve an undertaking.
3. **Commanding**—maintaining activity among the personnel of the organization.
4. **Coordinating**—binding together, unifying, and harmonizing all activity and effort.
5. **Controlling**—seeing that everything was accomplished in conformity with the established plan.

Fayol then set about to define 14 principles that describe how these functions could be carried out: division of labor, authority, discipline, unity of command, unity of direction, subordination of individual interest to the common good, remuneration, centralization, hierarchy, order, equity, stability of staff, initiative, and esprit de corps.

Fayol stated these are skills that can be learned and that management can become a vocation as a scientific discipline. For him, with these learned skills and with an understanding of the scheme as outlined in his five functions, the process could be applied in any organizational situation.

### The Quantitative School

In the last half of the twentieth century, management concepts became processes of technology. With the advent of the modern computer, calculations, including analyses, became less burdensome and more accurately derived. Capitalizing on statistical analysis, management processes became functions of an operations analysis network rather than a group of managers sitting in a conference room surrounded by charts and production estimates. The Quantitative School takes the problems faced by management and calls on experts from various disciplines to solve the problems using mathematical models. It takes advantage of the systematic approaches of Taylor and Fayol and adds to it the tools of modern qualitative analysis.

The school had as its birth the advent of the nuclear age and the U.S. Navy's desire to produce a nuclear-powered submarine. From start to finish, how long would it take to design, gather the resources, build, man with qualified personnel, and provide an operational weapon of war? Starting with lumps of iron ore, unprocessed uranium, and technologies yet to be developed, operations analysis explored every eventuality of the process and created a time line for completion.

The process took the utilization of specialists from physical science, engineering, accounting, human resources, economists, government, and industry. This group followed a six-step process:

1. **Formulate the problem**—address both the consumer's problem and the researcher's problems.
2. **Construct a mathematical model**—develop a formula that will represent the system under study. Express the effectiveness of the system as
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a function of a set of variables with at least one of them being able to control. These variables may fluctuate and may even be under the control of a competitor. The model should be outlined in some sort of visualization model like PERT or GANT charts, computer-generated flow sheets, or the like.

3. **Derive a solution**—from the model, find the values of control that maximizes the system's effectiveness.

4. **Test the model and solution**—evaluate the variables, checking the model's predictions against reality and comparing actual to forecasted results.

5. **Establish controls over the solution**—develop tools for determining when significant changes occur in the variables and functions on which the solution depends. Determine how to modify the solution in light of changes.

6. **Put the solution to work**—implement and evaluate actual results.

One significant advantage of the Quantitative philosophy was it brought management to the point that problems must be considered in a holistic sense, whereas other theories looked at the work, the worker, or the process. This system addressed all these factors.

**Historical Foundations for Administrative Theory**

Modern management theory continues to evolve with the introduction of numerous new theories or applications. Three are worthy of mentioning:

**The Systems Approach**

This approach of Koontz and O'Donnell and others describes management as a synergy whose whole is greater than the sum of its parts and operates in either an open (interacts with the environment) or closed (no environmental interaction) system. The Systems Approach encourages the manager to combine the concern for task, people, process, and problems in an approach that calls for a manager to integrate his style of management to fit the situation.

**The Contingency Approach**

This approach describes a system that varies with the situation or circumstances that are present. It allows the manager to ask the question, “Given the task to be accomplished and the individuals who I have to complete the task, the time constraints and other environmental issues, how best should the situation be managed?” The Contingency Approach has managers draw from the foundational theories described above and select the theory or combination of theories that best applies in the particular situation. This approach is best exampled in the work of Paul Hersey’s *The Situational Leader* and in Blanchard...
and Johnson’s *The One Minute Manager*. In both of these models, the manager is called upon to evaluate the context and content of the task and merge that with his assessment of the individual’s capability and motivation to accomplish an assigned task.

**The Total Quality Management Approach**

This method describes a systematic and structured approach to continuous improvement. The system had its birth with the work of Walter Shewhart prior to World War II with the utilization of control charts and sampling methods and the development of the philosophy of quality assurance. TQM is best associated with the work of W. Edwards Deming, who used the model to revive the Japanese economy after World War II. There are five principles associated with TQM:

1. **Remain customer focused**—what does the customer want?
2. **Systems thinking**—consider the activity from beginning to end.
3. **Leadership**—must remain focused to the service or product.
4. **Continuous improvement**—at every phase of the operation
5. **Shared decision making**—at all levels (worker to manager) in the organization

These three facets of the model—quality control, the participative work environment, and customer-driven products—form the basis for management decisions.

**Administration Defined**

To understand how modern administration is carried out in the local church or nonprofit organization, it is necessary to define the terms *management* and *administration*. Many authors will use these terms synonymously, often making no differentiation between the focus of each. As has already been discussed in this chapter, early managers were in fact both decision-makers and supervisors of the work. But, as management theory evolved, there became a definite demarcation between the manager, decision-maker, and the individual or individuals who actually accomplished the work.

In a modern corporation today you will find that differentiation. There will be a group we will call the owners of the company. They have provided the capital and impetus to form an organization. This ownership may be vested in a few individuals or many people, such as stockholders. This group of owners selects from among themselves individuals who will give leadership to the company—we will call them the board. This board selects from among themselves officers and a treasurer and reports to federal and state security and exchange commissions (SEC) the formation of their company and obtains legal status for their company and product. It is not the intent of the board to become the
individuals who produce the products, so they hire a chief executive officer (the president) to run the business. The CEO is given the authority to employ other individuals who will supervise or actually produce the product.

Management is a technical term that describes the leadership given to an organization and the process for providing the personnel, physical, and fiscal resources to meet defined goals. Administration is described as the process of utilization of the personnel, physical, and fiscal resources in order to meet the organization’s objectives and goals.

- Managers tell you what to do; administrators tell you how to do it.
- Managers see that the right work is done; administrators see to it that the work is done right.
- Managers provide leadership in identifying the objectives of the organization and setting goals to reach them; administrators supervise in getting the work done to meet those goals.

Administration is thus defined as the art and science of planning, organizing, leading and controlling the work of others to achieve defined objectives and goals.12

- **Art**—it is an art because it will call upon the individual to develop and nurture through learning, experience, and training the abilities necessary to accomplish the work
- **Science**—it is a science because it calls for process, analysis, decision, evaluation, and report. It is pragmatic in its focus.
- **Planning**—considers the futurity of circumstances and the course of actions necessary to achieve set objectives.
- **Organizing**—draws together the human, physical, and fiscal resources into a cohesive element.
- **Leading**—becomes the direction given to accomplish the goals. It is the necessary training, motivation, and coordination of activities.
- **Controlling**—is the evaluation of the process to ensure the goals were met and the organization is moving toward established objectives.
- **Work of others**—identifies the understanding that administration processes involve the integration of supervisor and worker to accomplish a task.
- **Objectives**—are the overarching statements of mission of the organization.
- **Goals**—become the elements established to meet the objectives of the organization.

Thus managers provide leadership; administrators supervise the work.
Interpretations of Administration in the Local Church

How this philosophy relates to the local church is found in several passages in the New Testament. This comes about with an understanding of the term church. The church is a living organism.

- In 1 Cor 3:16 and 6:19, the believers are the temple in which the Spirit dwells and the sanctuary of the living God in 2 Cor 6:16.
- In 1 Pet 2:5 the believer is the priest of that temple.
- The church is described as a building with Christ as the cornerstone in Eph 2:21 and 4:15 and also in Col 2:19.

The church is an organized organism.

- In Rom 12:3–8 and repeated in 1 Cor 12:4–11, all individuals who make up the body of Christ (the church) have spiritual gifts.
- In 1 Cor 12:12–26 the body parts are interdependent; and in Rom 12:4 they have different functions.
- In Eph 4:11–12; 1 Cor 12:27–28; and Rom 12:6–8, certain gifted individuals are to take leadership roles in the church.
- Paul identifies certain titled individuals in 1 Timothy 3 who are to carry out the role function of providing leadership to the church.

This division of responsibility in the church is probably best seen in the situation of Acts 6. In this passage of Scripture, we find the church faced a problem. Some widows were not being ministered to adequately. The church leaders (the apostles) became aware and provided a solution whereby the church selected individuals from among themselves to minister to the widows. Verses 2 and 4 are key: “It would not be right for us to give up preaching about God to wait on tables. . . . [W]e will devote ourselves to prayer and to the preaching ministry.” The apostles’ role responsibility was to provide leadership to the early church, but they were integral in the formation of a solution by directing the provision of the personnel resources from among the body to accomplish the task.

Most church historians give credit to Clement of Rome for the first use of the term layman. Clement (c. AD 95) implies in 1 Clement 40.5 that the layman was a full participant in the life and work of the church, including the liturgy, and was not merely an observer. Early records of the church indicate that baptism came to mean ordination into the royal priesthood in which every person so baptized was set apart with the people of God to be a witness to the Christian faith. It was not considered out of order for any professing baptized Christian to perform any of the liturgical rites of the Christian community.

Through the second and well into the third centuries, even though certain persons were being set aside as leaders of the congregation to perform leader-
ship roles, Tertullian (AD 160–230) reported that it was not uncommon for lay-
persons to fulfill those roles in their absence.

In the early church, it was taught that the Christian priest was not a
replacement of the Old Testament Jewish priest but a designate who was totally
different. Christ came as the completion of the old dispensation priest, paying
once for all the sacrifice for sin. The priesthood of the Christian was one of wor-
ship and service. Ministry in the early church was:

1. the recognition of ability, and
2. appointment by the Spirit.

The local congregation selected from their own membership individuals they
felt endowed and prepared to lead them. The recognition of this was an affirm-
ation by symbolic ordination (laying on of hands).

As these local bodies became larger, it became the custom for the church to
begin to support or pay their leaders. Paul had addressed this topic in 1 Tim
5:17. Soon, however, the terms of deacon, elder, and bishop, which in the early
church related only to the local body leadership, began to take on a hierarchical
significance.

Clement of Rome draws the analogy of the Jewish ministry of high priests,
priests, and Levites to illustrate the orderly differentiation in the church
between the order of the ministry and the laity in general. Ignatius states that it
is the privilege of the membership to share the communion of the Eucharist,
but it is the bishop who represents Christ in that celebration.

Tertullian asserted that the Christian church, with its orders, succeeded
the Jewish priesthood when Christ was crucified by the Jews. The bishop was
the high priest, and the Christian community in general was a royal priesthood
with direct access to God. Tertullian was clear, however, in his assertion that
there was in the Christian community a separate ministry and a priestly disci-
pline that was charged with the priestly functions of the church.

Probably no one influenced the concept of church organization from the
late third century onward as did the lawyer Cyprian. He began to interpret the
church in light of civil government and the clergy in light of civil authority. For
him the bishop was head of the congregation and held authority over lesser
clergy. Through ordination, the bishop is empowered with power to absolve sins
and exact penance. He felt that the bishop had the right to select lesser clergy. It
was Cyprian who saw the clergy as a mediator between God and man and the
example by the layman of their true repentance for sin as demonstrated in some
decreed penance.

With Cyprian the idea of apostolic succession became a fixed doctrine of the
Western church. For Cyprian, bishops were apostles in the same sense as the first-
century apostles; they represented Christ. The bishop became the authority over
the church; wherever there was a bishop, there was a church. The lesser clergy, the deacons and elders, became assistants to the bishop.

Cyprian set off the clergy from the laity with authority of office. He gave them an official dress to signify their office. These individuals of authority were given an official residence and official functionaries to assist them in their work. Thus, by the end of the third century, the monarchical episcopate had become the universally recognized system of church government.

Thus, as the church moved into the Dark Ages, the fixed separation between the laity and clergy widened as the church sought to expand its hierarchical orders with subcategories of leadership as sub-deacon, acolytes, doorkeepers, exorcists, readers, etc. The deacon was no longer an administrator of the church—the local body—but an administrator for the church—the church catholic.

Through the Middle Ages—until about AD 1200—the concept had been that authority rested with the clergy. The role of the layperson was to protect the feudal society the church had established about itself and to keep silent. The poor were prevented from any association with the church.

In the early thirteenth century, Francis of Assisi launched a lay movement of witness and service to their neighbors. Though the papacy insisted that Francis be ordained a deacon and many of his friars also ordained, the Third Order of the Franciscans maintained a historic lay movement model.

In the late fourteenth century, Gerald Groot formed the Brethren of the Common Life, a lay order dedicated to preaching to and conducting charitable work among the poor and downtrodden. This group focused on education of their following. Among significant individuals who attended their schools were Erasmus of Rotterdam and Martin Luther.

During the period of the Renaissance, the authority of the church came into deep question. With the scientific discoveries and humanistic—love of man—philosophy that ensued, the church found its power over the laity eroding. No movement attacked the schism that existed between them like the Reformation that followed. Out of the sixteenth-century Reformation came three distinct groups of laymen who helped form the changes that would occur in the church: the lawyers, the merchants, and the scholars. Martin Luther and Calvin fell into this latter category.

Out of the Reformation came Luther’s basic concepts of the church and the laity:

1. Before God all Christians have the same standing, a priesthood that they enter by baptism and through faith.
2. As a comrade and brother of Christ, each Christian is a priest and needs no mediator except Christ. He has access to the Word.
3. Each Christian is a priest and has an office of sacrifice, not of the Mass, but the dedication of himself to the praise and obedience of God and to bearing the cross.

4. Each Christian has a duty to hand on the gospel that he has received.

One group that emerged out of the Reformation that is of interest to us is that which is often called the Radical Reformers. This group reconstituted their church offices much as those of the first-century church. Offices were functional in character and held no authority. In fact, the entire body was subjected to the discipline, to the enforcement of all rules, and to witness. Littell states that “it has sometimes been wrongly said that the Anabaptists, Baptists, Quakers, Mennonites, Brethren and like groups have no true doctrine of ordination and frequently no clergy at all. A more perceptive over-simplification would be to say not that they have no clergy but that they have no laity.”

In the United States it is interesting that new denominations usually come into being generally as the result of a doctrinal emphasis or an emphasis on some form of church polity. Marvin Judy in *The Multiple Staff Ministry* points out an interesting “life cycle” of such groups:

- They usually start with an “unordained” clergy.
- Ordination, when done, is local and simple.
- Schools and institutions are created to produce individuals who are capable of ordination.
- The group develops a formal requirement for a trained clergy with increasing emphasis upon ordination.

In discussing the response to trained clergy, we need to redefine what the “employed” staff means. We are familiar with the titles *senior pastor, associate pastor, minister of music, minister of education, youth pastor/director, children’s/preschool director, hostess, building supervisor, and janitor.* Special talents and professional training make for different positions in the church staff.

The word *professional* is the key to differences of positions in the church. The word comes from the root *professed,* which originally described one “who has taken a vow of the religious order.” By 1675 the word had been secularized to mean “the occupation which one professed to be skilled in and to follow . . . a vocation in which professed knowledge of some branch of learning is used in its application to the affairs of others, or in the practice of an art based upon it.” In the seventeenth century, it applied to the military, law, medicine, and the clergy. A professional professes to know better than others certain facets or matters relating to a vocational exercise.

Historically, the profession was practiced after some degree of demonstrated skill and examination and was duly licensed. Around these professions came guilds or unions. For instance, the guild of the educator was the university; the guild of the doctor was the medus (medical school); and the guild of
the theologian was the seminary. These guilds began to develop fundamental philosophies concerning their practice, the requirements for acceptance, standards for practice, and ultimately a constitution and bylaws. The professional stood in judgment of his or her fellow professionals. Today the American Medical Association (AMA) dictates who is qualified to practice medicine, what must be the criteria for continued licensure, and they discipline errant members. Similar societies or guilds do the same: American Chemical Society, American Bar Association, American Society of Nuclear Engineers, and such.

The professional clergy also comes under some type of scrutiny. This is usually exercised in the denomination in the mainline Protestant churches and the Catholic Church and by the local body in other democratic polity bodies. Regardless of the source of establishment of professional status, three basic criteria usually underlie the preparation for becoming a recognized minister in a given denomination/church:

1. A genuine sense of calling on the part of the candidate; a feeling of purpose.
2. Formal training. This varies from a few courses by correspondence, attendance at a Bible school, to the attendance and/or completion of graduate seminary training.
3. Some type of in-service training or internship in which the candidate demonstrates his gifts, graces, and potential as a useful minister.

As we have seen with other professions, the ministry too has become diversified in the past few decades. Beginning with a minister of education at First Baptist Church in Dallas, Texas, in the 1950s, today most churches that have a regular attendance of more than 200 on a Sunday will have some form of additional staff that assists the senior pastor in equipping the church for ministry.

As these new professional ministry needs have developed, seminaries have instituted curriculum schemes that will prepare these individuals for competent service. In some instances, new ministerial organizations have come into existence. For instance, the National Association of Church Business Administration, the American Theological Society, the National Association of Professional Christian Educators, the National Association of Pastoral Counselors, the Religious Education Association, and the Southern Baptist Religious Education Association.

Thus, the church staff has evolved as a group of professional persons, presumably competent in their respective fields, who blend their services together to perform a ministry as a whole to the congregation. Each may have definite functional roles for ministry leadership, but each works together to help the individual Christian fulfill his or her responsibility in worship, nurture, and work.
In the fourth century Jerome wrote in his *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* that “there can be no church community without a leader or a team of leaders.” At the risk of comparing the church to a secular organization, consider these analogies to the company organization discussed earlier:

- Christ owns (is head of) the church and provides direction via the Holy Spirit to leaders in the church.
- Those identified leaders are the “bishops, presbyters, elders, pastors, teachers, deacons” or whatever term a specific church chooses to use.
- This board of leaders provides the management decisions that lead the church in accomplishing the objectives and goals (mission) of the church.
- These leaders designate a particular “senior-minister” through which the organization (the church) functions to carry out the mission of the church. This individual acts like a CEO/president but is in fact a chief staff officer (CSO) and is usually given the title senior pastor.
- The other professional clergy and paid and lay leadership become the “staff” who assist the CSO in carrying out the mission of the church.
- The church member becomes the worker (minister) who carries out the “works of ministry” of Eph 4:12 to meet the objectives and goals of the church.

**Chapter Review**

For administration to work in the local church or any religious nonprofit organization, long-held misconceptions must be dealt with. From the information developed in this chapter, formulate a response to the following often-stated objections to administration in the church:

- The church is a spiritual environment and should not have a business atmosphere.
- Administration is an unspiritual activity and has little to do with the ecclesiastical processes and ministry of the church.
- Administration takes a minister (or any leader) out of their primary role and places him in a position where he becomes a “desk jockey” or having his ministry controlled by a group of boards or committees.
- The church is fit together by the Holy Spirit and needs no human help or intervention. All members of the body will “naturally” sense their call and become an active element of the function of the church without administration or leadership.

While on their initial appearance these objections to effective administration in the church seem weak or inappropriate, they nonetheless are valid misconceptions held by the clergy and laity alike and must be considered and effectively dealt with by the leadership of the church. The material in the
following chapters will not only validate the scriptural necessity of efficient church administration but will also provide the leadership and administrators effective tools to meet the mission and purpose of their church or organization.
Basics
for Administration

CHAPTER 2

Two are better than one because they have a good reward for their efforts. For if either falls, his companion can lift him up; but pity the one who falls without another to lift him up. Also, if two lie down together, they can keep warm; but how can one person alone keep warm? And if somebody overpowers one person, two can resist him. A cord of three strands is not easily broken.

Ecclesiastes 4:9–12

The above passage of Scripture came to life to me several years ago as I was completing my qualifications using underwater breathing equipment (SCUBA) in the Navy. The final qualification was an ocean dive that occurred off the coast of Jamaica. There, deep—200 to 300 feet—freshwater wells boiled up from the ocean bottom fed from island rivers that had gone underground only to surface several hundred yards off shore. Similar to the sinkholes of the southern U.S., these depressions had unusually clear water. The marine life was unique. My diving instructor chose a dive of about 150 feet.

As we entered the water and began our descent, I noted the beautiful marine growth on the walls of the well. Because of the clarity of the water, the colors of the growth remained vivid for several feet down. I noted that at the bottom of the well were several sharks. There was no concern because they looked to be only a few feet in length—far smaller than the many sharks I had dived with off the coast of Florida. As we continued our descent, I put the sharks out of my mind. At about 110 feet, I again looked down, and the sharks had gotten bigger! About that time a shark swam by a metal chair that had sunk to the bottom of the hole. Judging from the size of the chair, the shark was about 10 to 12 feet long. And he had many equally large friends.

I must have let out a stream of air in my moment of excited discovery because one of the sharks looked up and took note of the four tempting legs hooked to two bodies dangling down like a meal. And they begin to circle up toward us. My diving instructor tapped me on the head and pointed to his writing pad with this
message: “Place your back to mine and clank your diving tank on mine as we go up.” I liked the “go up” part but didn’t understand the clanking part. The body must acclimate to changes in pressure as the diver rises. At every 32 feet you must stop and wait. We would have four stops on the way up.

The trip up was long and agonizing. We pushed off sharks every once in a while with our probe sticks. And of course we clanked. The last pressure stop seemed like an eternity, but just as soon as it was OK, I popped out of the water in one motion and into our rubber raft. After getting my composure back, I was able to relive the adventure with my diving instructor. “That was a good idea banging our tanks to scare them off,” was one of my comments. My instructor’s response caught me off guard.

“That clanking noise probably made them mad. The reason I had you clank your tank against mine was to let me know you were still there looking after my backside. If you hadn’t clanked, I would have assumed you had gotten eaten and I would have to go to plan B.”

As in every venue of ministry, there must exist some semblance of organization—a plan A and a plan B—in order to move forward. Ministers are called to minister. Simplistic in statement but difficult to achieve without an understanding of how to go about carrying out that ministry. Church leaders do not function in isolation; they are surrounded by boards, committees, councils, teams, deacons, and other staff members. Effective and efficient ministry requires the institution to form some principles of administrative organization.

Dynamics of Administration

For years managers, administrators, and supervisors have rallied around a process for getting the job done. For discussion, we will give this process the title of the “modern process of administration.” It involves a consideration of four principal functions: planning, organizing, leading, and controlling. In each of these functions certain activities will take place as the task is accomplished.¹

What is described below is a process. It is not a series of steps that slavishly require the leader to move from room 1 to room 2. It must be viewed holistically. It is like a hamster on a four-colored tread-wheel that has 19 rungs. As the wheel spins around, the hamster steps on the rungs of each of the four quadrants several times. Sometimes it bypasses a rung because the wheel is in motion, and that rung no longer represents a critical stepping-stone. As the wheel moves faster, the functional areas seem to blur into a uniform color. In the process of administration, each of the functions and their activities must be considered, some very briefly and some agonizingly long.
Determining Mission and Purpose

Before we begin a discussion of the modern process of administration, we must lay the foundation for administration in the church. In Matt 28:18–20, we read a literal translation in the Greek passage that Jesus says, “‘Given to me was all authority in heaven and on earth; having gone, then, disciple all the nations (baptizing them—to the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all, whatever I did command you), and lo, I am with you all the days—till the full end of the age.’” Called the Great Commission, this, as well as other parallel passages in the New Testament quoting Jesus after His resurrection, provides the impetus for what we do as both individual Christians and as a church—make disciples, bring them into the body, and teach them. While the terms mission, vision, and purpose have often been used synonymously, there is, in fact, a difference as church leadership considers its responsibility to the Great Commission.

The Holman Bible Dictionary describes the church as a covenant community of believers who function as the body of Christ until He returns and establishes the kingdom of God. Thus all believers and all churches have one purpose for existing—and that is expressed in the Great Commission statutes of Jesus. Our common mission (commission) statement is to proclaim the gospel to make disciples, to bring them into the body of believers called the church, and then to teach them as Christ instructed in the Scriptures.

Paul, no better than any other Christian, understood this. Called out by Christ to preach the gospel and draw all who would believe in Jesus to the church, Paul admonished all churches he established to do the same. His mission, his purpose, and his focus never changed. His life, however, is an excellent example of openness to the Holy Spirit’s leading to different venues and different methods. For example, in Acts 16:9–10 Paul was in Troas where “a vision appeared to Paul in the night: a man of Macedonia was standing and appealing to him, and saying, ‘Come over to Macedonia and help us.’ When he had seen the vision, immediately we sought to go into Macedonia, concluding that God had called us to preach the gospel to them” (NASB). As Paul received a vision through the Holy Spirit, He also gives to churches visions for ministry.

So while the purpose of each church is the same as given in the Great Commission, the Spirit gives the leadership of the church vision to carry out this mission. Every church should be able to articulate its mission and purpose; but more importantly, every church should be able to provide definitive visualizations for accomplishing the mission. This plays out in the process of administration we will discuss in this text.
Administrative Planning

“For which of you, wanting to build a tower, doesn’t first sit down and calculate the cost, to see if he has enough to complete it? Otherwise, after he has laid the foundation and cannot finish it, all the onlookers will begin to make fun of him, saying, ‘This man started to build and wasn’t able to finish’” (Luke 14:28–30).

Planning is the work we do to predetermine a course of action. Planning is concerned with the futurity of present decisions—that is, what will happen in the future with the decisions we make now. This means three things to the church planner:

1. What alternative courses of action are open?
2. What will be the cause-and-effect chain of events resulting from certain decisions?
3. What activities and actions will be required to implement that choice?

Planning is reasoning about how a church or organization will get where it wants to go. A basic task of comprehensive planning is to visualize the mission as the pastor and other leaders envision it and to see the church moving in the future. When we consider planning, we must remember three important facets:

1. It is a process.
2. It takes time.
3. It involves people.

There are seven administrative activities that leaders must consider as they move through the planning process:

1. **Estimating the Future**—the work we do to anticipate what tomorrow is going to be like. The smart administrator will constantly consider the future and its eventualities. Futurists tell us that the rate of change is such that nearly every year the body of knowledge of the world more than doubles. Demographic characteristics of the culture change dramatically daily. There was a time we could look to a future of 5 to 10 years with some degree of accuracy and reasonableness, but this is not the case today. Astute administrators will constantly correlate the historicity of the church or organization with the present events and draw an estimate of what the future will look like within the next few years—and what type of organization it will take to move the church there. Forecasting the future is not planning for the future; it is only providing a database to make those plans.

2. **Establishing Objectives**—the work we do to determine goals or targets. Based upon how the administrator foresees the future as it relates to the organization, decisions should be brought forward to address those issues. This is the time when brainstorming and prayerful discussion seeks to discover just exactly
how the organization should address what should be accomplished. These objectives then become the focus for administrative efforts and resource allocation. Objectives are statements of ultimate end toward which the church or organization aims its activities. This is often called the vision of the church and is expressed in mission statements and master plans. Out of these objectives will be developed goals and strategies for accomplishment. For example, your church may set as a mission objective to evangelize your community for the Lord. A goal in attaining that objective might be to start an apartment outreach in a section of town near the church.

The development of objectives is an important step and must be made in consideration of:

• the mission and purpose of the church or organization;
• the specific results expected;
• who will be expected to accomplish the objective; and
• the where, when, and how it is to be done.

3. Developing Policies—The creation of or formulating standing answers to recurring questions. A policy is a command decision from top management to perform in a specified manner. It establishes definite limits of authority. Policies do not spell out the end itself but specifies a means to accomplish the end described in the objective. In every organization certain concepts of management must be established to reduce confusion and ensure uniformity:

• What is meant by policy?
• Who will formulate and recommend policy?
• How will the policy be made known to those it affects?
• How will we measure performance against the policy?
• How do we go about changing policy?

The greatest threat to effective policy making is the failure to keep policies current, applicable, and legally defensible. Policies state how the church or organization will function. We will address the development of policies and procedures in the next chapter.

4. Developing Implementing Procedures—Plans that implement the policies of the church or organization. Procedures become guides to action rather than guides to thinking. They detail the exact manner a certain activity will be carried out—a chronological listing of what must be done and by whom to get the job done. Procedures are best developed by the individuals who must implement the policies regulating action.

A simplistic example might be: *It is the policy of the church that the hall carpets be always kept clean.* The procedures for vacuuming the hall carpets might be:

• Every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday the custodians will vacuum the carpets.
• The carpets will be vacuumed at 9:00 a.m. on Monday and Wednesday and after working hours on Friday.
• The carpets will be vacuumed with the upright floor vacuum.

The church administrator determined the policy, and the lead janitor developed the procedures to ensure the policy was met.

5. **Programming**—the establishing of the priority and sequence of activities for the accomplishment of the objectives and goals. Simply put, programming is setting up a sequence of events that will lead to objective completion. Often programming is interrelated with the development of procedures. It is part of the process, however, because it determines major steps to accomplishment, establishes priorities for accomplishment, and then determines the overall time frame in which the objective will be met.

6. **Scheduling**—putting a time factor on your program and inserting into the church or organization calendar the program with dates, hours, and minutes. Scheduling gives a beginning date. In programming we developed a time frame for accomplishment. From that estimate of time to completion, we can establish an ending date.

7. **Budgeting**—the application of all of your resources. This calls for a determination of how much manpower, finances, and facilities will be utilized to achieve the objective. Budgets are frequently expressed in dollars and cents, and, sadly, become the driving force that determines the extent of completion of the objective. On the other hand, in reality, budgets include a variety of resources—human, fiscal, and property. Budgeting becomes an easier task if an administrator has effectively prioritized the objectives because it then becomes a simple matter of allocating resources to accomplish the activities. Effective fiscal management will be discussed in the chapter on church finances.

**Administrative Organizing**

“Find some capable, honest men who fear God and hate bribes. Appoint them as judges over groups of one thousand, one hundred, fifty, and ten. These men can serve the people, resolving all the ordinary cases. Anything that is too important or too complicated can be brought to you. But they can take care of the smaller matters themselves. They will help you carry the load, making the task easier for you” (Exod 18:21–22 NLT).

Administrative organizing is the work of grouping people and the resources so that the work can best be performed. We have noted that the elements of planning are conceptual in nature and in practice are not discrete functions but pervade the entire fabric of administration. So, too, the concepts of organization cannot be separated out as sequential activities that must precede or succeed any other of the steps to the administrative process.
It is obvious that, as one plans, the organization to accomplish that plan is foremost in the mind of the administrator.

- The facet of estimating the future is organization driven—what kinds and who will be the people who will be integral to the ministry.
- In the church, one cannot set objectives and goals without first considering the people (organization) they will effect in carrying out the mission.
- Programs require people.
- Policies and procedures must be considered and made with the individuals involved in mind.
- Budgets provide the resources to build the facilities, pay the salaries, and facilitate the programs people use.

As we consider the three elements of administrative organization—the structure, the process of delegation, and building relationships—it is obvious that the conceptualization of the church organization will be fluid. In a later portion of this book, we will address the factors necessary to establish an intentional structure that will define personnel goals and roles. We will assume that the planning phase has provided a clear outline of the activities that will implement the objectives and goals of the church.

1. **Organizational Structure**—the blueprint or pattern in which we will relate people roles one to another. Structure is the framework to getting the job done. Its purpose is to create an environment for human performance. Consider the building of a skyscraper and the metal framework that forms the structure on which all the building is built. Depending upon the characteristics of administrative philosophy of the individuals that are used in building the structure, the organization can take on several forms. One of the first tasks that must be considered is to determine the philosophy for organization of the church or institution. In a later section of this book, specific formats for church organization will be discussed.

2. **Delegation**—the assigning of things (work or a task) to individuals. Jethro told Moses to delegate the lesser tasks so he could focus on the major issues of leading the nation of Israel to the promised land. Delegation involves three important elements:
   1. Clearly assigning the **responsibility** the individual is entrusted with.
   2. Granting the necessary **authority** and **ability** to accomplish the task assigned.
   3. Holding the person **accountable** for the completion of the assigned task.

Delegation is not giving an unpleasant task to someone, nor is it getting rid of work to make your workday less than responsible. It is, however:
• Sharing the work with individuals who have the capability so that you may concentrate on more challenging or more difficult assignments.
• Providing a format whereby individuals can mature and learn through on-the-job work.
• Encouraging others to become part of the organization by participative task accomplishment.
• Allowing individuals to exercise their special gifts and abilities.

An important element of the organizational structure of the church is the granting of authority to accomplish the task. Authority is the right to invoke compliance by subordinates on the basis of the formal position in the organizational structure and upon the controls the formal organization has placed on that position. Authority is linked to the position, not the person. Authority is derived in various ways:

• Position
• Reputation
• Experience
• Expertise

Authority and responsibility are directly linked. When you give someone responsibility for a task, then the individual should be given the ability to see to it that the task is accomplished. Responsibility and accountability are also directly linked. If the individual is given the responsibility for a task as well the authority/ability to see to its accomplishment, then it is the manager or administrator's responsibility to hold the individual accountable to complete the task in the manner assigned and planned. Elements of describing the use of organizational authority include:

1. The use of an organizational chart that establishes the chain of command.
2. The use of functional authority, assigning to individuals in other elements of the organization the authority to administer and control elements of the organization outside their own.
3. Defining span of control, defining within the task assignment specifically what elements of the organization the individual has authority over.

3. Relationships—as leaders of the church or organization, we are developers of people. While it often appears we are managing “things,” we are in truth managing the people who get the things done. The establishment of effective relationships with the people involved in accomplishing a task is difficult and becomes impossible without a thoroughly thought-through philosophy for leadership. It demands a sensitivity to the individuals in the process. Effective relationships do not break down the differentiation of leaders and workers; they build it up.
In recent years management styles that have embraced the worker have become popular. As mentioned earlier, TQM or the Japanese model invites the worker to participate with leaders. This is best exemplified by a TV commercial by a major automotive company that depicts an assembly line worker reaching up to pull a lever that stopped the entire production line. His reason was that he had discovered something in the process that could be improved. The commercial shows both his fellow workers as well as management congratulating him for his contribution to a more effective car. He was given the responsibility to produce an effective car and the authority to exercise his skills and abilities in building that car. Leadership, whether in the church or other type of organization, needs to be sensitive to the desire to contribute to the process and completion of objectives set.

**Administrative Leading**

Paul, speaking to his young student Timothy, exemplified leadership in his letter: “Timothy, my child, I am giving you this instruction in keeping with the prophecies previously made about you, so that by them you may strongly engage in battle, having faith and good conscience. . . . First of all, then, I urge that petitions, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for everyone” (1 Tim 1:18; 2:1).

And again in 1 Timothy, Paul says, “you should be an example to the believers in speech, in conduct, in love, in faith, in purity. Until I come, give your attention to public reading, exhortation, and teaching. Do not neglect the gift that is in you . . . . Practice these things; be committed to them, so that your progress may be evident to all. Be conscientious about yourself and your teaching” (4:12b–16a).

Administrative leading is the work we do to inspire and to impel people to take specific action. Note in the passage above Paul, having selected Timothy to represent him to the newly formed Christian churches, praised Timothy, he motivated Timothy, and he instructed Timothy.

Administrative leading is frequently termed as *directing* by some management/administration writers. We choose to use the term *leading* because it best describes a shepherd leader who moves ahead of the flock rather than driving them from behind. As earlier noted in both administrative planning and organizing, these activities do not stand alone. We will also note that leading permeates all of the process of modern administration.

The concept of administrative leading can be likened to a symphony conductor. It is the responsibility of the conductor to know the music, to know the instruments, and to know the capability of the instrumentalists. The role of the conductor is to blend together the work of the orchestra members to produce the symphony that the writer of the music envisioned. At the appropriate time,
the conductor calls into play the instruments that are needed for correct interpretation of the piece of music. He directs the intensity, volume, and meter.

Thus, it can be said that leading is not simply or solely directing. It is, instead, a planned and organized communication to create an environment conducive to participative action. Unplanned, disorganized activities are meaningless; thus, as administrators, we should orchestrate our leadership toward the end of productive output.

The administrative function of leading has five basic administrative activities: decision making, communication, motivation, selecting people, and training or developing people.

1. **Decision Making**—problem identification and problem solving. Decision making is a process that involves a situation that demands, or seems to demand, action. It usually has a compressed time frame and the requirement to investigate and gather data, and there exists the strong likelihood that some consequences will result based upon the decision that is made.

Wise decision makers do not solve nonproblems! They discover the real problem and work on it. Decision making is the art of identifying alternatives and selecting the best solution. It also means that a contingency course of action should be held in the event the initial response requires modification or restructuring.

In the administrative environment, two types of decisions are made nearly every day: (1) Programmed decisions are those that are routine and are usually answered by a set of established procedures and criteria for operation. No new process is required, only the decision to do it or not. (2) Nonprogrammed decisions are nonroutine and must be made based upon a unique or new situation. In these processes the individual must decide a course of action.

Good administrators focus on the important nonprogrammed decisions. When a situation arises, they will ask:

1. Is this a problem, and if so, can it be dealt with?
2. Might the problem resolve itself?
3. Is this my decision to make?

A close relationship exists between the problem-solving process and the decision-making process. A simple five-step strategy for decision making includes:

1. Identify and describe the situation, specifically the problem and cause.
2. Gather alternative solutions. How could this problem be solved?
3. Compare the various alternatives. What solutions seem to best address the problem?
4. Calculate the risk for each alternative. What are the cause and effect of each solution?
5. Select the best alternative and implement. Which solution best addresses the problem while remaining within the parameters of church polity and policy?

An old adage says, “If there is a possibility of anything going wrong, it probably will.” What may have seemed a good decision at the time it was made may turn to a can of worms later. Considerations that might prevent this include:

1. The timing of the announced decision. Are details worked out?
2. The manner in which the announcement was made, from the pulpit or through a memorandum
3. The individuals to whom you made the announcement. Have all important individuals been involved or informed?
4. Planning that will be required to implement the decision. How much more work is involved?

2. Communication—the work in which we engage to arrive at an understanding between ourselves and other people about mutual needs and goals. Communication is the interchange of thought or information to bring about mutual understanding in confidence or good human relations. It is words, letters, symbols, or messages. It is facts, ideas, opinions, or emotions. In many instances the informal communication—the body language, emotions, and context of the communication—will speak more powerfully than the spoken or written communication.

Communication involves (1) the exchange of facts and information, (2) the expression of attitudes and values, and (3) the provision of warmth, acceptance, and support of others. Principles for effective communication include:

- Clarity—communicate in commonly understood language.
- Attention—giving full attention to transmitting and receiving information and data.
- Integrity—making communication a means to effective administration, never the end.
- Strategic use of the informal organization—plugging into the grapevine. It is ensuring the rumor mill is accurate and supports the organization’s goals and objectives. Administrators will learn a wealth of information from the member and parishioner alike; it doesn’t take a committee to discover a problem.

As was seen in the decision-making process above, effective leadership requires a broad-based communication process.

3. Motivation—the work we do to cause people to want to do what needs to be done. Effective motivation comes from within. It frequently stems from personal needs that outweigh other, even more attractive, modes.

A synthesis of research has indicated that people do things because of three general reasons:
1. **External reasons.** They do work because they are told to do it by an authority figure or there is an external, tangible reward.

2. **Social reasons.** They accomplish objectives because of social, moral, or peer pressure.

3. **Internal reasons.** They have an internal self-motivation to do a task. They *want* to do it.

The same research also indicates that the most effective motivation is that internally driven desire to do something worthwhile or that satisfies an inner longing. A Christian administrator’s role is to build a climate in which a person can fulfill his or her needs in a way that brings internal satisfaction and joy. This environment for motivating work can be established numerous ways:

- The administrator can create an organization that fosters participation and teamwork.
- Policies, procedures, and organizational goals need to be clear and well communicated.
- Work should be organized to create a challenge while at the same time provide a sense of satisfaction in success.
- Leaders should give affirmation and support. Respond when asked but allow the individual autonomy in the work.

4. **Selecting People**—the work we do to appraise people’s God-given capacities and the opportunities to use them in working environments. Selecting people is an attempt to predict somebody’s job performance on the basis of standards of previous work history, test scores, interview impressions, or other standards.

   When selecting people:
   - Define exactly what you are looking for.
   - Do some comparative shopping.
   - Allow sufficient time before selection.
   - Check for quality.

   Selecting personnel for a task is a process that should be carefully considered. In a later chapter we will discuss personnel issues that relate to effective human resource processes.

5. **Developing People**—the work we do to upgrade the capacities for work and service that have been provided. Smart management teams are in a constant state of growth. They are maturing; few, if any, have achieved complete potential. The prime job of the administrator is to create a work climate that encourages individuals to develop and broaden their fullest capacities and at the same time to shoulder their individual responsibility for achieving the objectives of the organization.

   The administrator can call upon three basic activities to assist in the process of developing people:
1. *Performance Appraisal*—evaluating the performance and capabilities of the individual supervisor and the individuals who work with him. Actual on-the-job evaluation should be made based upon definitive job expectations.

2. *Performance Counseling*—the actual discussion of the supervisor’s evaluation of task performance, allowing the individual to be a participant in resolving weaknesses.

3. *Performance Development Activities*—helping the individual to develop his potential as well as meet the expectations of the job. This can be done through a variety of activities:
   - Example—letting them see the proper way by doing it.
   - Coaching—on-the-job training.
   - Job rotation—finding the best position in the organization.
   - Training courses and seminars—continuing education.

**Administrative Controlling (Evaluation)**

Do you not know that the runners in a stadium all race, but only one receives the prize? Run in such a way that you may win. Now everyone who competes exercises self-control in everything. However, they do it to receive a perishable crown, but we an imperishable one. Therefore I do not run like one who runs aimlessly, or box like one who beats the air. Instead, I discipline my body and bring it under strict control, so that after preaching to others, I myself will not be disqualified. (1 Cor 9:24–27)

Paul wrote later to his young mentee, Timothy, “I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith. In the future, there is reserved for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me on that day” (2 Tim 4:7–8).

While the management world uses the term *control*, we will substitute the term *evaluation* because it better describes the activities that are carried out in administrative control in the church or Christian organization.

Administrative evaluation is the work we do to ensure that results conform to plans. It is focusing events to contribute to preconceived plans. Remember when we considered the *planning* phase of administration we looked at the elements of developing policies, programming, establishing procedures, scheduling, and budgets. These are all elements of an evaluation to come. When we considered the *organization* phase, we developed a structure that gave control over positions, the use of delegation that called for responsibility and accountability. Then we considered *leading* and noted that in the elements of decision making, communicating clearly, and scheduling activities that provided developmental opportunities were the essentials of administrative evaluation.
It becomes obvious, as in the three previous elements of administration, that administrative evaluation is not a discrete operation but one that must be considered throughout the entire administrative process.

Several years ago George Odiorne introduced in *Management by Objectives* a philosophy that became an important statement of how organizations should be run; there should be a reason for doing what you are doing. The success of Odiorne’s MBO process was phenomenal. Soon, leaders were looking at ways of integrating the aspects of MBO into the nonprofit organization. In the church venue it was met with little success, not because of any fallacy in the concept of administration but in the negative connotation that “control” implies—authority and constraint. Free-spirited church leaders did not want to set goals and then be held accountable to achieve them. Nor did they want to become the agents of management that directed others to meet goals and objectives. Formal business controls, they contended, required first of all a dedicated set of employees. Everybody knows that a church is a volunteer organization, and you cannot control volunteers. Controls also call for measuring the results based upon management objectives. Christians should not be placing themselves as judges over people.

Through the years, however, Christian administrators have taken the precepts of the MBO process and have retranslated them into terminology that is acceptable to the church. Thus, when we talk of controls, we are not talking about the autocratic principles of monitoring work but preestablishing evaluation processes to ensure the job is done. All evaluation systems have four common elements:

1. Measurable characteristics for which standards are known.
2. Means of measuring these characteristics.
3. A methodology for comparing actual results to the standards.
4. A process for effecting changes to adjust the characteristics.

Administratively, we can divide the evaluation process into four activities:

1. **Establishing Performance Standards**—we agree with the person or persons working with us as to what quality of work is going to be accomplished before it is begun. Standards establish criteria against which performance (outcome) can be measured. Without standards:
   - Individuals have no way of knowing what is expected of them in a task assignment.
   - They have no way of knowing if what they are doing is what is desired.
   - Supervisors have no way of knowing if their employees are progressing toward goal/objective accomplishment.
   - Unreasonable demands can be made upon the individual who has received the task assignment.
   - How will you know when you are finished?
Our modern society calls for us to compare ourselves to preconceived standards. Women should be beautiful; men should be macho, etc. It is often called peer/culture pressure. In the church environment, it is absolutely necessary for administrators to create both effective and fair standards. Certain criteria will help the Christian administrator in establishing effective and fair standards:

1. Standards should be developed that present a challenge to the person.
2. Standards that are competitive in nature are effective motivators.
3. Standards should consider both the task and individual goals and needs.
4. Standards should be simple and straightforward.
5. Standards should be clearly communicated.
6. Standards should have a measurable, quantitative outcome.
7. Standards should be perceived as fair.

2. **Performance Measuring**—someone is measuring the work. To be effective, performance measuring requires quantitative as well as qualitative standards—how can you measure a nebulous or unknown objective? Performance measuring is most effective when the process includes:

   - Standards based upon mutually agreed-upon expectations.
   - Standards for commencing the work or phases of the work.
   - Standards for monitoring the work, guideposts of accomplishment.
   - A statement of termination/completion.
   - A process for predicting problems or future outcome.

Some common performance measuring techniques include budgets, time-completion charts, audits, reports, inspections and inventories, questionnaires, and numerical evaluations.

3. **Performance Assessment**—appraising the work. It involves establishing the degree of success of an individual's work in light of established standards and the techniques used to measure those standards. It is also evaluating completion toward the total goal of the church or organization.

   The evaluator asks the question: “Based upon what has been accomplished, has the goal that was established in the plan been met?” Performance assessment calls for the evaluator to not only determine whether goals have been met, but if they have not been met, how far off the mark has the work been done. An important aspect of assessment is to know the degree of tolerance allowed to declare the goal as having been met. Throughout this text various schemes will be introduced to allow the administrator to practically assess that facet of ministry through reports, audits, and inspections.

4. **Performance Correcting**—correcting mistakes that have been made and coaching to provide the person(s) the “how” to bring performance in line with the planned standards. Methods for carrying out performance correcting include:
1. **Identify the real problem.** What really caused the unsatisfactory performance, not what are the manifestations of the problem?

2. **Establish clear criteria that any solution must satisfy.** Frequently the planned goal was not clearly stated, and the performer may have misunderstood it. Sometimes, the planners themselves misunderstood the objectives and, thus, the goals that lead to accomplishing those objectives.

3. **Arrive at alternatives to accomplishment.** Maybe the goal was missed because the method was unable to produce success. How else could this be accomplished? The wise administrator will involve the individuals who made the first attempt to participate in determining alternative methods.

4. **Select an alternative.** Choose the best response to the completion of the task. Build in implementation. Having chosen an alternative way to go, implement it. This more than likely will involve redirection, retraining, reworking, and reevaluation. Smart administrators should be prepared to actively participate in the activity of restructure.

5. **Evaluate the decision.** If the action corrects the problem, great. If not, reevaluate or maybe start over again.

As a summary and review of the process of administration, let’s look at a practical application.

The pastor of Church-in-the-Town has noted a growing problem that has surfaced since the church replaced its sanctuary last year when fire destroyed most of the historic old wooden structure. Before, the pastor was involved with maybe two or three weddings a year, mostly by church members. Now many in the community want their weddings to be performed in the new, and more “lovely,” sanctuary. The pastor and the church don’t seem to mind. Lately, however, the pastor feels that he has lost control of groups that are not members of the church. Deacon Jones, the chairman of the building committee, thinks a policy is needed on this sort of thing. The pastor feels that a wedding policy and procedure manual is in order because he does not foresee a change in the desire to use the building for weddings. The **objective** then is to describe how both members and nonmembers can use the church for weddings.

In reviewing existing church policy, they discover that the ministry statement of the church is that they will be a “lighthouse” to the entire community. The building committee decides to take to the church a **policy** statement that says the church can be opened to the community given certain stipulations: that the pastor or someone appointed by the pastor be present during use of the building and that only the church janitor can arrange for and clean up after the wedding.
One other stipulation is that the bride must pay the janitor’s salary for the setup and cleanup costs. The pastor, his wife (because she is really good at wedding planning), and the janitor sit down and write out a set of procedures for meeting this policy decision by the church. The wedding manual begins to take form as they describe the sequence of events (programming) that a bride must go through in the planning process. They determine that weddings can take place at anytime there is not a regularly scheduled church service (scheduling). Since the church provides the building free, the pastor suggests to the stewardship committee that maybe they better increase the heating and cooling budget a little to cover the additional use of the building.

The pastor determines that he will spend an inordinate amount of time in this wedding planning process, so he asks the associate pastor/counselor to add to his organizational responsibilities the monitoring of the wedding manual and process. Internally, the associate pastor will work with the bride and the pastor’s wife in planning the wedding and doing marriage counseling. The church secretary will schedule the wedding, and the janitor will set up for it. Having set an organization that delegates certain responsibilities to individuals to carry out the wedding manual provisions, the pastor then decides that each wedding will require a meeting (relationship building) with the staff, his wife the wedding planner, and the bride and groom to ensure that all plans are understood and that the wedding goes off without a hitch.

The pastor is now satisfied that the wedding manual will become a routine standardized decision maker for him and has hope that it will communicate answers to all the questions a bride may have. Only in unusual circumstances will he have to make decisions, and the meeting with the team will ensure everybody knows what is happening. As the manual takes shape, individuals involved become excited (motivated) that the church will have a way of reaching effectively to the community and at the same time preserve the new sanctuary. In the future, the pastor may want to add to (select) the individuals involved in premarital counseling, but for right now the church counselor can handle that. He realizes that when that time comes they will have to develop a training program for premarital counseling that teaches biblical concepts of marriage.

As the first proof of the manual comes out of the printer, the pastor and other members of the group (associate pastor, the wedding planner, the janitor, and the secretary) look it over. “Does the manual meet our objectives (standards)?” is asked. Are the steps set forth workable? How do we determine when changes are needed? It is decided that annually the implementation group will meet with the building committee and discuss the manual and question (measure) how it is working. This assessment will naturally involve discussions with the pastor, associate pastor, wedding planner, secretary, and janitor as well as committees that relate to finance and building. They may even ask a bride or
two how their wedding went and whether she suggests changes. Unless something urgent comes up, the group decided that changes (corrections) to the procedures of the manual would only come out during the annual church business meeting in January.

And there you have the Wedding Hamster on the treadmill. Notice that some rungs needed a pause and work, while others the hamster just bounded right over.

**Dynamics of Leadership**

This saying is trustworthy: “If anyone aspires to be an overseer, he desires a noble work.” An overseer, therefore, must be above reproach, the husband of one wife, self-controlled, sensible, respectable, hospitable, an able teacher, not addicted to wine, not a bully but gentle, not quarrelsome, not greedy—one who manages his own household competently, having his children under control with all dignity. (If anyone does not know how to manage his own household, how will he take care of God’s church?) He must not be a new convert, or he might become conceited and fall into the condemnation of the Devil. Furthermore, he must have a good reputation among outsiders, so that he does not fall into disgrace and the Devil’s trap. (1 Tim 3:1–7)

I exhort the elders among you: shepherd God’s flock among you, not overseeing out of compulsion but freely, according to God’s will; not for the money but eagerly; not lording it over those entrusted to you, but being examples to the flock. (1 Pet 5:1b–3)

The word translated in the 1 Timothy passage above is *episkopoi* and relates to those “bishops” of the early church. Vines’s Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words identifies these individuals as “those who, being raised up and qualified by the work of the Holy Spirit, were appointed to have the spiritual care of, and to exercise oversight over, the churches.” The related term *presbuteroi*, translated “elder,” indicates the nature of their work as having mature spiritual experience. In the Peterine passage above, the *presbuteros* (elder) is linked to shepherds (*poimen*) who pastor the flock (church).[^1]

**Elder, bishop, presbyter, overseer, pastor**—all are terms that relate to the individual who is God-called and Spirit-empowered to lead the church. A study of Scripture leaves little doubt that God had a plan for leadership in the church through called-out leaders. This call to leadership and the character of the leader are clearly defined.

Christ is the model leader:

- He was a servant leader (Luke 22–27).
Followership is a function of service (John 12:26).
We follow Christ as little children (Matt 18:1–5).
Leading is not lording over (Mark 10:42–45).
We are to follow Christ’s example in our leadership (1 Cor 11:1)
We are to be servants of Christ (2 Cor 4:5).
Our leadership considers those above us as well as the admonition for work (Titus 2:15–3:1)
Leaders are to set an example for others (1 Pet 5:2–5).

In *Leadership: Strategy for Taking Charge*, Bennis and Nanus state, “Leadership is what gives an organization its vision and its ability to translate that vision into reality. Without this translation, a transaction between leaders and followers, there is no organizational heartbeat.”

Kotter, in *What Leaders Really Do*, states that leadership is the “development of vision and strategies, the alignment of relevant people behind those strategies, and the empowerment of individuals to make the vision happen, despite obstacles.”

Remember, management:
Involved devising new systems as well as keeping the current system operating through the functions of planning, organizing, leading, and evaluation.
Usually works through a hierarchy and in-place system.
Brings about order and consistency.
Attempts to provide as much as possible a fail-safe and risk-free environment.

Managers are leaders. They provide leadership by:
Influencing, guiding in direction, course of action, and opinion.
Introducing change; creating and coping with change.
Translating vision into an organization that produces activity and production.
Motivating, inspiring, and developing relationships.

Christian leaders are vision catchers and vision casters. By remaining attuned to the Holy Spirit and through Scripture, leaders receive direction concerning the vision that should be implanted in the church.

In Joel 2:28–29 we read, “Then after I have poured out my rains again, I will pour out my Spirit upon all people. Your sons and daughters will prophesy. Your old men will dream dreams. Your young men will see visions. In those days, I will pour out my Spirit even on servants, men and women alike” (NLT). Luke recorded in Acts the beginning of Peter’s sermon at Pentecost by citing this passage as a fulfillment of the prophesy.

The King James Version of Scripture translates Prov 29:18 as “Where there is no vision, the people perish: but he that keepeth the law, happy is he.” The
New International Version renders the same passage as “Where there is no revelation, the people cast off restraint; but blessed is he who keeps the law.” And the New Living Translation gives “When people do not accept divine guidance, they run wild. But whoever obeys the law is happy.”

Vision is God-inspired guidance, a “God thing.” It is a mystical happening dreamed in the hearts of God’s servants by the Spirit. For leaders to be receptive to vision from God, they must consider vision as a three-dimensional concept:

- An upward dimension—an insight of who God is and that He alone provides the vision.
- An inward dimension—a realization that human frailty prevents us from doing a God-sized job.
- An outward dimension—an understanding that vision is to be played out in ministry.

Leaders have two roles in the church with regard to the vision: (1) to translate and interpret the vision of God in the hearts and minds of the church, and (2) to equip the people to carry out the vision through the mission of the church. The mission generates the planned activities that are made to carry out the vision. It is vision instituted and leader directed.

**Theories of Leadership**

The approaches to the study of leadership have taken three specific patterns: trait, situational, and behavioral.

**Trait Theories**

These theories focus on key traits that separate leaders from followers and successful leaders from unsuccessful leaders. Frequently termed “the Great Man Theory,” this concept of leadership espouses that leaders are born, not made.

Five general characteristics identify these leaders:

1. *Intelligence and scholarship.* Trait leaders are somewhat more intelligent, perform better at academic tasks, and possess superior judgment and decision-making ability.
2. *Personality.* These leaders are self-confident, honest, creative, and have high levels of integrity and initiative.
3. *Social status and experience.* Leaders appear to possess good personal interaction skills and are able to inspire and motivate team effort.
4. *Task orientation.* Trait leaders assume responsibility and provide self-initiated direction to accomplish tasks. They are highly motivated individuals who set challenging goals.
5. *Physical prowess.* Trait leaders are usually more attractive and healthier.
Studies have indicated that these characteristics are inconsistent, but their presence makes for development of the creation of characteristics that may contribute toward leadership potential.

**Situational Theories**

These theories depend upon the relationship that exists between the organizational situation, the leader’s style, and the follower’s motivation and ability to follow. The goal of a situational leader is to predict the most effective style of leadership under varying circumstances.

In *The Situational Leader* Paul Hersey’s Maturity Level is the best example of this theory. He states that the most effective leadership style should vary with the maturity (later termed development level) level of the subordinate. In this model the leader gains intimate knowledge of the follower’s needs, abilities, and task aptitude and then modifies their leadership style to meet those requirements. Subordinate development level is a function of the assessment of their ability to accomplish a task and their commitment (motivation) to do it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT LEVEL</th>
<th>LEADERSHIP STYLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-1 The individual has limited ability to accomplish the task. While initially motivated to do the work, commitment will wane as the magnitude of the task reveals itself.</td>
<td>DIRECTOR The leader must take the responsibility for providing the information that will accomplish the task. Little effort is given at this point to establishing a working relationship until the subordinate begins to develop some of the basic skills to accomplish the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-2 The worker has developed competence enough to begin to understand the task and the magnitude of the work. Skill ability has improved enough to allow him to participate in determining how a task might be accomplished</td>
<td>COACH The leader, while still directing the activities that lead to task accomplishment, begins to establish dialogue that will increase the confidence in the subordinate that the task is achievable. More often than not the leader’s style will allow them to begin to relinquish more of the task through delegation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-3 The worker has competence and ability to complete the task but lacks the motivation to continue. This is often the situation with individuals who are burned out in ministry or who lost interest in the work.</td>
<td>SUPPORTER The leader no longer has to provide instruction and direction because the subordinate has most of the requisite skills to complete the task. What is needed is a higher level of interaction and motivation. The leader allows the subordinate to become the primary source of task resolution and becomes a supporter and advisor to their actions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D-4 The subordinate has both the ability and commitment to accomplish the task.

DELEGATOR The leader delegates to the subordinate the task. Remembering that delegation calls upon the delegator to remain in charge, the leadership that will be called for will be monitoring, providing assistance only when needed, and motivating through praise, recognition, and granting of higher levels of authority and responsibility.

**Behavioral Theories**

These theories focus on a set of divergent leadership styles: those focused on the subordinate and those focused on the task. These theories take as their tenant that successful leadership is oriented on an employee-centered axis. Four important research projects picture this model:

1. McGregor’s Theory X/Theory Y in which the theory X subordinate is considered naturally lazy and the necessary leadership style is one of direction and controlled coercion. The theory Y individual desires to be effective and efficient in the task accomplishment, and therefore leadership will have to exert little effort in getting the job done.⁸

2. Lewin’s Leader Continuum identifies three types of leaders: autocrat, democrat, and laissez-faire. Both the autocrat and laissez-faire are deemed as poor leaders. The democratic leader will share in decision-making responsibilities and maintains open communication lines with the subordinate.⁹

3. Blake and Mouton’s Managerial Grid identifies five leadership tendencies that an individual possesses, based upon learned and environmental circumstances. The model calls for the best leader to be one who will take into consideration both the organizational task to be accomplished and the goals and needs of the individual who is to accomplish the task.¹⁰

4. Likert’s Four Systems identifies the most effective leaders as those who focus their primary attention on the human aspect of their subordinates’ problems and on endeavoring to build effective work groups with high performance goals. In order of least effective to most effective, these leaders are termed:
   - Expletive-authoritative has an autocratic, task orientation.
   - Benevolent-authoritative uses rewards instead of fear as a motivation tool.
   - Consultative leaders maintain control at the top, but, goals are discussed with the subordinate.
   - Participative leader’s motivation comes from ego and group involvement. Extensive interaction and involvement of the subordinate occurs.¹¹
The tension between being the leader God wants you to be and the leader the people want you to be is often voided by our actions. Paul concludes his first letter to the church at Thessalonica with an interesting exhortation:

Now we ask you, brothers, to give recognition to those who labor among you and lead you in the Lord and admonish you, and to esteem them very highly in love because of their work. . . . [W]arn those who are lazy, comfort the discouraged, help the weak, be patient with everyone. . . . Rejoice always! Pray constantly. Give thanks in everything, for this is God’s will for you in Christ Jesus. Don’t stifle the Spirit. Don’t despise prophecies, but test all things. Hold on to what is good. Stay away from every form of evil. (1 Thess 5:12–14,16–22)

If a minister does not accept the adulation and respect shown as a leader with the humility of servanthood that God expects, then problems will arise.

McIntosh and Rima in *Overcoming the Dark Side of Leadership* and Shawchuck and Heuser in *Leading the Congregation* discuss the consequences of a leader’s personality and motivation when less than effective leadership mannerisms are projected upon the congregation. They, as well as other researchers of leadership style, have identified five dysfunctional styles of leadership that must be analyzed and overcome by the leader. They describe a narcissistic/dramatic, a paranoid or suspicious, a detached/codependent, a depressive/passive-aggressive, and a compulsive leader whose leadership mannerisms that are projected on the congregation cause a dysfunctional organization.

Applying the concept that poor leadership mannerisms will affect the church or religious nonprofit organization ability to function and carry out its mission, we will identify four dysfunctional styles that are prevalent in the church today.

**The Showman**

1. This individual often has an inflated view of his leadership position and ability. He tends to focus on his own needs without consideration of the individuals he is leading. He perceives himself as “God’s-appointed man for the hour.” Everything he does must be larger than life, grandiose. His egotism and self-centeredness drives him to fail to consider the church or organizational entity.

2. Churches/institutions led by this individual tend to outgrow their structure. Plateau and decline often follows the charismatic growth the Showman brings to the entity. If for some reason the leader is not there, the church or organization flounders because of the total reliance they have placed on the Showman-leader.
3. This leader is a macromanager, involving himself in the routine matters of the organization—not so much because he has the “answer” to all of life’s questions but because he must be the center of all activity. He inserts himself through spontaneous, unstructured leadership. He even may take on a CEO mentality, expecting all to accept his decisions without question.

4. Members of these churches tend to be hero worshippers, whether it is with the present leader or not. They exhibit a strong need dependency formation.

5. In these organizations the leadership is totally the leader’s ideas, intuitive impressions, and impetuous ventures. Decision making does not include the staff of the organization, and the members are not consulted for opinions or desires.

**The Doubting Thomas**

1. This leader has not developed the ability to rely upon the individuals he leads. Often he appears to the follower as uncaring and detached. This type of leader will demand proof of loyalty of those he leads. He garners as much data as he cans and often conceals this information from others in the organization for fear he may loose the authority he needs. He is highly suspicious of anyone who questions him.

2. Churches and institutions with this type of leader will position all power at the top—the leader. This leader often finds himself reacting to situations and eventualities rather than creating a plan of ministry that looks to the future. Because the leader must involve himself in all that happens in the organization, he often becomes bogged down in details. When this happens, both the leader and the church or organization frequently forgets the mission or the goals set to accomplish that vision.

3. Members/workers tend to be boss-pleasers. The work environment is one of uncertainty, hostility, insecurity, and distrust. Significant effort is expended in determining what the leader has in mind and then developing a response that appears to meet that interpretation.

4. Within the organization much effort is spent around the time-consuming assignment of data gathering to satisfy the information needs of the leader. Because the Doubting Thomas must make all decisions, action becomes delayed for fear of making a mistake.

**The Monk**

1. This type of leader is an individualist. He prefers to function in his leadership role with little or no interaction with other individuals in the church or organization. In many respects this is a nonleader because he would rather isolate himself from the structure and allow the institution to function without his
input. He often does not or cannot establish working relationships with the individuals he leads.

2. More often as not this leader has had some event occur in his ministry that causes him to withdraw from the leadership role. It may be burnout or an unfortunate hurtful situation that causes this detachment.

3. Leadership in the church or organization is often expressed at the next levels of control within the organization. Because of this, political infighting and position taking are made. Members tend to take sides, and the competing forces often cause disruption.

4. It is not uncommon in a church or organization with a Monk leader to have subordinate groups formed and developing power within themselves. Without centralized leadership, these groups may dominate elements of the church or organization such as budget, meeting times, and calendaring. If these groups do not form, often the church or organization will lapse into a period of status quo.

5. When the Monk does vest authority to act in his behalf, it will be to a few trusted individuals who he feels can accomplish the job without the necessity of involving the leader.

**The Control Freak**

1. This leadership style is often characterized by a strong, dominant leader. This individual differs from the other dysfunctional leaders discussed so far in that he is a know-it-all—or at least he thinks he has all the answers.

2. The Control Freak creates an organization that centers him at the top and in a hierarchical system of delegated responsibility will ensure the organization functions exactly as he dictates. To ensure this, the leader will establish a series of formal rules, controls, and regulations that ensure all the internal operations follow an exact pattern that he has either created or approved.

3. In this Orwellian organization, the staff and membership become functionaries of the leader, clones or robots of the system that has been established.

4. Because in this church or organization the leader has established himself as the controlling source of expertise, innovation, and creativity, the subordinates and members alike loose a sense of creativity and innovation for ministry. Little effort is given to learn new and better methods of ministry.

Every leader, administrator, and minister must assess their own tendencies for leadership and develop a philosophy for effectively accomplishing the task through people. In *The Power of Ethical Management*, Kenneth Blanchard and Norman Vincent Peale suggest the individual evaluate his motives for leading by asking three important questions:

1. Is this legal? Will I be violating civil law or church polity?
2. Is this balanced? Is it fair? Does it promote a win-win relationship?
3. How will I feel about myself? Will I be proud? What if the decision was widely known?\(^\text{14}\)

To these three questions Shawchuck and Heuser in *Leading the Congregation* add:

4. Is this suitable material for prayer—can I talk to God about this?
5. Does this support my ordination vows? How would it reflect on my ministerial colleagues?\(^\text{15}\)

Paul Utnage, writing in *Church Executive* magazine, calls the dysfunctional pastor a “tsunami leader” and cautions that at some point decisions need to be made for continuance of service with such a leader. Disassociation with such a leader should be considered when (1) the relationship places the staff member in a compromising position ethically, (2) the relationship creates frustration that leads to professional burnout, and (3) the relationship creates such stress that your physical or emotional health is jeopardized.\(^\text{16}\)

Because most ministers are both leaders and supervisors of the administrative process, it is important for them to develop sensitivity to and the knowledge of appropriate processes that will combine both their personal skills with the needs to express the spiritual gifts of the parishioners they serve. This philosophy of “doing church” is best expressed in a written document. We have a manual for our religious expression: the Bible. In Exod 24:3–4 we find, “Then Moses came and recounted to the people all the words of the L\(\text{ord}\) and all the ordinances; and all the people answered with one voice and said, ‘All the words which the L\(\text{ord}\) has spoken we will do!’ Moses wrote down all the words of the L\(\text{ord}\)” (NASB). In the next chapter we will explore an important facet of the basics of administration: the creation of written documents that detail the philosophy of leadership/administration in the church or organization.

**Chapter Review**

The chapter has introduced two important dynamics that form the basics for effective administration in the local church or nonprofit organization—administrative processes and leadership principles. While the material is conceptual in design, the application will meet nearly every practical venue in the church or institution. The reader should be able to respond to the following:

- The process of administration is comprised of four basic functions with attendant administrative activities that define and describe the elements of that function. Describe how a minister might go about instituting a program of outreach through a Vacation Bible School in a church that has never had a VBS by identifying each functional area and activities involved in developing that program.
- Christian leaders are expected to provide guidance in the affairs of the church. This guidance includes both the spiritual guidance as provided
through the Holy Spirit and the practical guidance that comes about through the application of the principles of dynamic leadership. Describe how the minister wears both the hat of leader in providing spiritual management of the mission of the church while at the same time integrates principles of effective administrative leadership in accomplishing that mission.

- Evaluate your tendency for leadership. What are your strengths and weaknesses? Are you described in any of the failed forms of leadership given in the chapter? What is a proper form of leadership that meets the biblical role of an administrator in the Christian institution?