CHRISTIAN SCRIPTURE AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

BUILDING A PATH TO SERVANT LEADERSHIP THROUGH FAITH

GARY E. ROBERTS

CHRISTIAN SCRIPTURE AND
HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

This page intentionally left blank

CHRISTIAN SCRIPTURE AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

BUILDING A PATH TO SERVANT LEADERSHIP THROUGH FAITH

Gary E. Roberts

palgrave
macmillan

To my Lord and savior Jesus Christ who is the author and finisher of our faith and the foundation of this book. I thank my wonderful wife Connie, my beloved mother and sister Joyce and Sharon, and my precious daughters Alyssa, Sandra, and Christin for their love and support. I dedicate this to my students and colleagues at Regent University with gratitude and humility.

This page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

This page intentionally left blank

TABLES

CHAPTER 1

SERVANT LEADER HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (SLHRM): THE "CITY ON THE HILL" FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLES OF ORGANIZATIONAL INTEGRITY

Human resource (HR) management is one of the foundational "windows on the heart" reflecting the individual and collective values and beliefs of leaders, managers, and employees regarding the "theology of work" and its relationship to human nature. Does the HR system honor biblical principles through shaping the values and incentives to serve, work, lead, and manage in truly a God-honoring and joyous, humble, and accountable fashion? Are we "hearers and doers" of the Word as stated in James 1:23, or do we forget to honor the principles of servant leadership as modeled by Jesus? As it states in Luke 12:48 (NRSV), "From everyone to whom much has been given, much will be required." This book is dedicated to assisting Christian leaders and managers to assume the mantle of servant leadership in human resource management (SLHRM), the God-directed and endorsed means for achieving our Great Commandment and Commission missions. Servant leadership is the approach to leadership promoted by scripture and provides the greatest opportunity to honor God and bless our employers.

Christian SLHRM love begins and ends with a dynamic and vital relationship with Jesus Christ. From a Christian theological standpoint, our salvation is the glorious result of an individual's decision to accept Christ. Our Christian growth and sanctification requires a combination of individual effort and communal fellowship and accountability. As Christians, we possess both individual and corporate responsibility for justice. God judges individuals as well as nations.

Why is servant leadership the foundation for this book? There are many approaches to leadership, but only servant leadership emphasizes the necessary balance among morality, mission achievement, and promoting the best interests and well-being of the key stakeholders (employees, clients, customers, and the community) (Northouse, 2013). Like yeast infusing bread, servant leadership influences the entire culture of an organization, promoting favorable outcomes on all levels. In essence, it is the Golden Rule in practice. The dual foundation of servant leadership is stewardship, which is achieving the mission by using moral, motives, means and ends, and servanthood, which promote the best interests and needs of the key stakeholders. Servant leadership manifests both religious and secular roots (Bekker, 2010; Sendjaya, 2010). It is the foundational leadership principle of Christianity as exemplified in the Old and New Testaments with the culmination in the ministry of Jesus as elaborated in the works of Wilkes (2008), Blanchard and Hodges (2005), and from a more secular perspective in the works of Greenleaf (1977). From an ethical standpoint, servant leadership is founded upon the integration of the three key ethical domains, that of deontological principles (moral laws), aretaic or virtue elements imbedded in moral character, and teleological or utilitarian principles that assess consequences (promote the greater good). There is no single agreed-upon conceptual or operational definition of servant leadership with a fixed and narrowly defined set of attributes. A review by Roberts and Hess-Hernandez (2012/2013) identified 39 attributes of servant leadership that includes a combination of character attributes (love, humility, and forgiveness), leadership practices (empowerment and active listening), and cognitive attributes (foresight and conceptualization). Research, however, has demonstrated that servant leadership is a distinct and unique leadership approach differentiated from the related domains of transformational leadership and leader–member exchange theories (Liden et al., 2008; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Peng, 2011). A more detailed analysis appears in table 1.1 with six global dimensions, the love-based servanthood elements, servant leader stewardship in completing the mission, servant leader character, servant leader behavior, servant leader reasoning abilities, and servant leader spiritual elements. Servanthood is the foundational element and includes the related attributes of altruism, serving others first, facilitating the success and growth of others, promoting healing, egalitarianism, and *agapao* love. Stewardship elements entail accomplishing the organizational mission using virtuous means, building community, and providing an inspiring vision. Key servant leader character attributes include moral integrity, empathy, humility, authenticity, trust, hope, courage, and forgiveness. Foundational servant leader behaviors include empowerment, active listening, goal setting,

Table 1.1 Servant leader attribute literature summary

Servant Leader Attributes: Servanthood Motivational Elements

- **Altruism (2)**: Patterson, K. (2003); Reed, L. L., Vidaver–Cohen, D., & Colwell, S. R. (2011)
- **Altruistic Calling (1)**: Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006)
- **Calling (2)**: Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006); Sun, P. T. (2013)
- **Covenantal Relationship (2)**: Sendjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010); Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora (2008)
- **Egalitarianism (2)**: Mittal, R., & Dorfman, P. W. (2012); Reed, L. L., Vidaver–Cohen, D., & Colwell, S. R. (2011)
- **Healing (5)**: Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006); Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008); Spears, L. (1998); Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Hu, J., & Meuser, J. D. (in press); van Dierendonck, D (2011)
- **Agapao Love (3)**: Dennis R. S., & Bocarnea M. (2005); Patterson, K. (2003); Sun, P. T. (2013)
- **Serve Others First (4)**: Boone, L. W., & Makhani, S. (2012); Farling, M. L., Stone, A. J., & Winston, B. E. (1999); Greenleaf, R. K. (1977); Patterson, K. (2003)
- **Needs of Other Over Self (1)**: Laub, J. (1999)
- **Good of Followers Over Self–Interest (2)**: Hale, J. R., & Fields D. L. (2007); Wong, P. T. P., & Davey, D. (2007)
- **Positive Effect on Least Privileged (1)**: Greenleaf, R. K. (1977)
- **Put Subordinates/Followers First (3)**: Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008); Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Hu, J., & Meuser, J. D. (in press); van Dierendonck, D. (2011)
- **Servanthood and Do Others Grow/Succeed (8)**: Boone, L. W., & Makhani, S. (2012); Greenleaf, R. K. (1977); Laub, J. (1999); Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Hu, J., & Meuser, J. D. (in press); Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008); Spears, L. (1998); van Dierendonck, D. (2011); Wong, P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003)

Servant Leader Attributes: Stewardship Mission Elements

- **Accountability (1)**: 3 Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011)
- **Building Community (4)**: Boone, L. W., & Makhani, S. (2012); Laub, J. (1999); Reed, L. L., Vidaver-Cohen, D., & Colwell, S. R. (2011); Spears, L. (1998)
- **Creating Community Value (3)**: Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008); Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Hu, J., & Meuser, J. D. (in press); van Dierendonck, D. (2011)
- **Responsible Leadership (1)**: Wong P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003)
- **Stewardship (3)**: Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006); van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011); Spears, L. (1998)
- **Vision (5)**: Boone, L. W., & Makhani, S. (2012); Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005); Farling, M. L., Stone, A. J., & Winston, B. E. (1999); Patterson, K. (2003); Wong, P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003)

Servant Leader Attributes: Character Elements

- **Authentic Self (2) and Authenticity (5)**: Laub, J. (1999); Pekerti, A. A., & Sendjaya, S. S. (2010); Sendjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010); Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008); van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011);Wong, P. T. P., & Davey, D. (2007), Wong, P. T. P., & Page D. (2003)

Table 1.1 Continued

- **Behave Ethically (3)**: Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Hu, J., & Meuser, J. D. (in press); Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008); van Dierendonck (2011).
- **Courage (2)**: van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011); Wong, P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003)
- **Credibility (1)**: Farling, M. L., Stone, A. J., & Winston, B. E. (1999)
- **Empathy (4)**: Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006); Mittal, R., & Dorfman, P. W. (2012); Spears, L. (1998); Sun, P. T. (2013)
- **Forgiveness (1)**: van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011)
- **Hope (1)**: Searle, T. P., & Barbuto, John, E. (2011)
- **Honesty (1)**: Wong, P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003)
- **Humility (6)**: Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005); Mittal, R., & Dorfman, P. W. (2012); Patterson, K. (2003); van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011); Sun, P. T. (2013); Wong & Davey (2007)
- **Moral Integrity (9)**: Erhart, M. G. (2004); Graham, J. W. (1991); Mittal, R. & Dorfman, P. W. (2012); Pekerti, A. A. & Sendjaya, S. S. (2010); Reed, L. L., Vidaver-Cohen, D., & Colwell, S. R. (2011); Sendjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010); Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008); Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010), Wong, P. T. P., & Davey, D. (2007)
- **Trust (3)**: Dennis, R. S. & Bocarnea, M. (2005); Farling, M. L., Stone, A. J., & Winston, B. E. (1999); Patterson, K. (2003);
- **Wisdom (1)**: Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006)

Servant Leader Attributes: Behavioral Elements

- **Active Listening (3)**: Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006); Boone, L. W., & Makhani, S. (2012); Spears, L. (1998)
- **Consulting and Involving Others (1)**: Wong, P. T. P., & Davey, D. (2007)
- **Empowerment (9)**: Boone, L. W., & Makhani, S. (2012); Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005); Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Hu, J., & Meuser, J. D. (in press); Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008); Mittal, R., & Dorfman, P. W. (2012); Patterson, K. (2003); van Dierendonck (2011); van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011);Wong, P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003).
- **Follower Development (3)**: Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007); Wong, P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003); Wong, P. T. P., & Davey, D. (2007)
- **Goal Setting (1)**: Laub, J. (1999)
- **Initiative (1)**: Laub, J. (1999)
- **Interpersonal Support (1)**: Reed, L. L., Vidaver-Cohen, D., & Colwell, S. R. (2011)
- **Influencing Others (1)**: Wong, P. T. P., & Davey, D. (2007)
- **Inspiring Others (1)**: Wong, P. T. P., & Davey, D. (2007)
- **Persuasion (1)**: Spears, L. (1998)
- **Relationship Building (1)**: Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008)
- **Serving and Developing Others (1)**: Wong, P. T. P., & Davey, D. (2007)
- **Shares Power (1)**: Laub, J. (1999)
- **Standing Back (1)**: van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011)
- **Values and Has Confidence in People (1)**: Laub, J. (1999)
- **Voluntary Subordination (2)**: Sendjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010); Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008)

Table 1.1   Continued

Servant Leader Attributes: Reasoning Abilities

- **Awareness (1)**: Spears, L. (1998)
- **Conceptualization (4)**: Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008); Spears, L. (1998); Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Hu, J., & Meuser, J. D. (in press); van Dierendonck (2011).
- **Foresight (3)**: Laub, J. (1999); Patterson, K. (2003); Spears, L. (1998)
- **Persuasive Mapping (1)**: Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006)
- **Philosophy (1)**: Spears, L. (1998)

Servant Leader Attributes: Spirituality Elements

- Transcendental Spirituality (3): Pekerti, A. A., & Sendjaya, S. S. (2010); Sendjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010); Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008)
- Transformational Influence (2): Sendjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010); Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008)

and relationship building. The reasoning ability elements center on the presence of foresight and conceptualization skills. The final dimension provides transcendental spirituality and transformational influence. The absence of a tightly defined set of attributes is both a strength and weakness. It is a strength in that servant leadership by conceptual definition is holistic, organic, evolving, and dynamic combination of heart, intellect, emotions, and spirit. By definition it cannot be distilled into a reductionist and mechanical conceptualization. Conversely, the broad and variable conceptual elements impede uniform measurement and methodological rigor to support reliable and valid measures. However, as empirical research expands in scope, a greater degree of methodological consistency will follow.

Clearly defining the elements of servant leadership is important. The adoption of servant leadership is fully justified on a deontological and aretaic (virtue) basis. However, demonstrating its empirical influence helps buttress its adoption from a utilitarian orientation. In essence, this research is essential in demonstrating that servant leader love and character virtue generates favorable organizational outcomes in terms of employee and community well-being and individual and organizational performance (Showkeir, 2002). In essence, is there an increase in the good from the practice of servant leadership?

There is a burgeoning body of literature demonstrating the positive influence of servant leadership on a host of attitudinal, behavioral, and performance outcomes (Parris & Peachey, 2013). A review of the empirical literature demonstrates robust, consistent, and compelling evidence on the favorable influence of servant leadership on job attitudes, leadership effectiveness, work behaviors, performance, character formation,

desirable personality attributes, and quality-of-life outcomes. Mayer (2010) proposes that servant leadership attributes increase follower need satisfaction in the key elements that comprise self-determination theory (SDT), that of autonomy, relatedness, and competence (Deci & Ryan, 1985), thereby generating favorable attitudinal, behavioral, and performance outcomes.

Table 1.2 provides a detailed summary of published literature that supports Mayer (2010) and the other servant leader models. Servant leadership is associated with higher levels of organizational commitment, job trust, job satisfaction, procedural justice, and engagement levels, among others. In terms of the leadership outcomes, servant leadership is correlated with higher levels of leadership competence, commitment to supervisor, and leader trust. In terms of behaviors, servant leadership promotes higher levels of organizational citizenship, employee creativity and helping behavior, and lower levels of organizational turnover. The favorable influence on productivity is equally impressive with multiple studies indicating higher levels of team effectiveness, team potency, goal and process clarity, and firm performance. Servant leadership enhances essential character attributes such as hope, integrity, and loyalty. Finally, servant leadership promotes a positive work climate, enhances quality of work life, leads to employee well-being, and reduces burnout and work–family conflict. Only one study demonstrated no consistent influence of servant leadership on organizational performance (de Waal & Sivro, 2012). In conclusion, the conceptual and empirical evidence for the positive influence of servant leadership on a host of outcomes is very consistent and positive. However, there are several important caveats. The number of studies is small and their methodological scope and breadth limited, especially when contrasted with other areas of leadership research. There is also potential publication bias for servant leadership.

Studies in closely related domains are consistent with positive servant leader empirical findings. For example, a meta-analysis of emotional intelligence (EI), which incorporates many of the behavioral elements of servant leadership such as empathy, found that EI was a significant and major predictor of job performance (O'Boyle et al., 2011). Another interesting study on companionate love in a long-term care facility found a favorable influence on employee outcomes including job satisfaction, teamwork, absenteeism and emotional exhaustion, as well as beneficial patient effects related to mood, quality of life, satisfaction, and fewer emergency room visits (Barsade & O'Neill, in press).

Table 1.2 Servant leader empirical literature summary

Organizational Studies Supporting Favorable Influence/Correlation of Servant Leadership: Job Attitudes

- **Affect and Cognitive Trust**: Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K., & Peng, A. C. (2011); Senjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010)
- **Commitment**: Cerit, Y. (2009); Ehrhart, M. G. (2004); Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007); Han, Y., Kakabadse, N. K., & Kakabadse, A. (2010); Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009a); Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009b); Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008); Pekerti, A. A., & Sendjaya, S. (2010); Schneider, S. K., & George, W. M. (2011); van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011); van Dierendonck, D., Stam, D., Boersma, P., de Windt, N., & Alkema, J. (2014);
- **Commitment to Change**: Kool, M., & van Dierendonck, D. (2012); Taylor, T., Martin, B. N., Hutchinson, S., & Jinks, M. (2007)
- **Disengagement**: Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Perry, S. J., Witt, L. A., Penney, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013)
- **Empathy**: Washington, R., Sutton, C., & Feild, H. (2006)
- **Engagement**: De Clercq, D., Bouckenooghe, D., Raja, U., & Matsyborska, G. (2014); Parris, D. L, & Peachy, J. W. (2012); Prottas, D. J. (2013); van Dierendonck, D., Stam, D., Boersma, P., de Windt, N., & Alkema, J. (2014)
- **Interactional Justice**: Kool, M., & & van Dierendonck, D. (2012)
- **Interpersonal Trust**: Chatbury, A. A., Beaty, D. D., & Kriek, H. S. (2011)
- **Organizational Trust**: Chan, S. H., & Mak, W. (2014); Jones, D. (2012b); Jones, D. (2012a); Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2005); Reinke, S. J. (2004); Rezaei, M., Salehi, S., Shafiei, M., & Sabet, S. (2011); Senjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010); Uru Sani, F. O., Caliskan, S. C., Atan, O., & Yozgat, U. (2013); Washington, R., Sutton, C., & Feild, H. (2006)
- **Procedural Justice**: Chung, J. Y., Jung, C. S., Kyle, G. T., & Petrick, J. F. (2010); Ehrhart, M. G. (2004); Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010)
- **Satisfaction**: Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006); Cerit, Y. (2009); Chan, S. H., & Mak, W. (2014); Chung, J. Y., Jung, C. S., Kyle, G. T., & Petrick, J. F. (2010); Jenkins, M., & Stewart, A. C. (2010); Jones, D. (2012b); Mayer, D. M., Bardes, M., & Piccolo, R. F. (2008); Mehta, S., & Pillay, R. (2011); Prottas, D. J. (2013); Schneider, S. K., & George, W. M. (2011); van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011)
- **Self-Efficacy**: Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010)

Organizational Studies Supporting Favorable Influence/Correlation of Servant Leadership: Leadership & Supervisor Attributes

- **Commitment to Supervisor**: Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010)
- **Leader Competence**: Mayer, D. M., Bardes, M., & Piccolo, R. F. (2008); McCuddy, M. K., & Cavin, M. C. (2008); Washington, R., Sutton, C., & Feild, H. (2006)
- **Leader Development**: Melchar, D. E., & Bosco, S. M. (2010)
- **Leader Trust**: Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2005); Reinke, S. J. (2004)
- **Satisfaction with Supervisor**: Ehrhart, M. G. (2004)
- **Supervisory Support**: Ehrhart, M. G. (2004)

Table 1.2 Continued

Organizational Studies Supporting Favorable Influence/Correlation of Servant Leadership: Work Behaviors

- **Collaboration**: Garber, J. S., Madigan, E. A., Click, E. R., & Fitzpatrick, J. J. (2009); Irving, J. A., & Longbotham, G. J. (2007); Sturm, B. A. (2009)
- **Community Citizenship**: Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008)
- **Employee Creativity and Helping Behavior**: Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006); Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009b); Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2008)
- **Empowerment**: de Waal, A., & Sivro, M. (2012); Taylor, T., Martin, B. N., Hutchinson, S., & Jinks, M. (2007)
- **Organizational Citizenship**: Ebener, D. R., & O'Connell, D. J. (2010); Ehrhart, M. G. (2004); Güçel, C., & Begec, S. (2012); Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2011); Long-Zeng, W., Eliza Ching-Yick, T., Pingping, F., Ho Kwong, K., & and Jun, L. (2013); Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2008); Vondey, M. (2010); Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010); Wu, L., Tse, E. C., Fu, P., Kwan, H. K., & Liu, J. (2013); Yoshida, D. T., Sendjaya, S., Hirst, G., & Cooper, B. (2014); Zehiri, C., Akyuz, B., Erin, M. S., Turhan, G. (2013)
- **Organizational Learning**: Choudhary, A., Akhtar, S., & Zaheer, A. (2013)
- **Servant Follower Development**: Parris, D. L, & Peachy, J. W. (2012)
- **Turnover**: Babakus, E., Yavas, U., & Ashill, N. J. (2011); Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Perry, S. J., Witt, L. A., Penney, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013); Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009a); Jones, D. (2012b); Prottas, D. J. (2013); Schneider, S. K., & George, W. M. (2011)

Organizational Studies Supporting Favorable Influence/Correlation of Servant Leadership: Performance Outcomes

- **Firm Performance**: Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006); Jones, D. (2012a); Peterson, S. J., Galvin, B. M., & Lange, D. (2012)
- **Goal and Process Clarity**: Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2011); Taylor, T., Martin, B. N., Hutchinson, S., & Jinks, M. (2007)
- **High Performance Attributes**: de Waal, A., & Sivro, M. (2012)
- **In-Role Performance**: van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011); Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008)
- **Profit**: Jones, D. (2012b)
- **Team Effectiveness**: Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2011); Irving, J. A., & Longbotham, G. J. (2007); Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2005); Reinke, S. J. (2004); Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K., & Peng, A. C. (2011); Senjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010)
- **Team Potency (Confidence or Efficacy)**: Chung, J. Y., Jung, C. S., Kyle, G. T., & Petrick, J. F. (2010); Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2011)

Organizational Studies Supporting Favorable Influence/Correlation of Servant Leadership: Character Elements

- **Hope**: Searle, T. P., & Barbuto, John E., Jr. (2011)
- **Integrity**: Washington, R., Sutton, C., & Feild, H. (2006)
- **Loyalty**: Ding, D., Lu, H., Song, Y., & Lu, Q. (2012)

Table 1.2   Continued

Organizational Studies Supporting Favorable Influence/Correlation of Servant Leadership: Personality Attributes

- **Agreeableness**: Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Perry, S. J., Witt, L. A., Penney, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013); Washington, R., Sutton, C., & Feild, H. (2006)
- **Extraversion**: Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Perry, S. J., Witt, L. A., Penney, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013)

Organizational Studies Supporting Favorable Influence/Correlation of Servant Leadership: Employee Quality of Work Life & Health Related Outcomes

- **Burnout**: Babakus, E., Yavas, U., & Ashill, N. J. (2011);
- **Employee Wellbeing**: van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011); Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009b); Reinke, S. J. (2004)
- **Health**: Prottas, D. J. (2013)
- **Life Satisfaction**: Prottas, D. J. (2013)
- **Positive Work Climate**: Black, G. L. (2010); Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009a); Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2008)
- **Stress**: Prottas, D. J. (2013); Rivkin, W., Diestel, S., & Schmidt, K. (2014)
- **Vitality**: van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011)
- **Work/Family Conflict**: Prottas, D. J. (2013)
- **Work/Family Enrichment**: Zhang, H., Kwan, H. K., Everett, A. M., & Jian, Z. (2012)

Organizational Attributes and Studies Not Supporting Favorable Influence/Correlation of Servant Leadership

- **Firm Performance**: de Waal, A., & Sivro, M. (2012)

Limitations and Critiques of Servant Leadership

One key element of the discussion is to rebut the varied and conflictual stereotypes and misinformation regarding servant leadership. Three of the most common are that servant leadership is "soft" management with lower degrees of leadership influence and direction, a reduced emphasis on employee discipline, and that servant leaders possess a martyr complex. Servant leadership is love-based, but entails a 360-degree version of love that incorporates grace and accountability, forgiveness and discipline, autonomy and clear boundaries. One cannot be a servant leader and not achieve the mission and discipline the workforce. In effect, servant leaders cultivate a culture of performance excellence that *increases* demands on employees (Reinke, 2004; Irving & Longbotham, 2007; Prosser, 2010; Sendjaya, 2010). Servant leaders facilitate the meeting of true employee needs, but do not cater to their desires and wants that are contrary to their well-being and mission integrity. Finally, servant leaders are not martyrs. They actively promote self-care and work life harmony and balance. In the pages to come, we will more fully define servant leadership in its full balance and harmony.

From a methodological standpoint, there is an absence of agreement on the specific elements and core dimensions of servant leadership (Northouse, 2013). However, this reflects the inherent complexity of servant leadership and its holistic and unique combination of leadership motivation, character, behavior, and reasoning abilities. Hence, it will take many years of sustained study to confirm the basic attributes and the many moderator and mediating relationships.

The explicit prescriptive, normative, and moral emphasis of servant leadership is another source of conflict (Northouse, 2013). It is utopian in essence. However, all theories and approaches of leadership promote a worldview of values, norms, and moral principles. They range from the secular to the religious and spiritual. Hence, there is no neutral or values-free form of management; therefore, they are all similar in this regard. For many who embrace servant leadership, it is a deontological moral imperative, hence the absence of motivation for empirical research. However, a full understanding of servant leadership recognizes the elements of stewardship and mission achievement, hence the need for promoting excellence of performance and character. Empirical research on servant leadership is moving forward and becoming more robust.

Another issue relates to the interface between contextual and cultural elements, leader and follower attributes, and follower receptivity (Northhouse, 2013; Liden et al., 2008; van Dierendonck, 2011). In other words, do employees manifest a universal desire and/or receptivity to servant leadership? Given the contingent nature of leadership (Northhouse, 2013) and inherent human variability, clearly the answer is no. There is limited empirical evidence on the subject, but Meuser et al. (2011) found higher levels of performance and organizational citizenship when subordinates desired servant leadership and lower levels when subordinates lacked interest. For both leaders and followers, the underlying motivational element is critical given the obstacles and challenges associated with servant leadership. Ng and Koh (2010) provide a "motivation-to-serve" model incorporating personality traits, such as agreeableness and conscientiousness, which are positively associated with servant leader motivation, while neuroticism is negatively correlated with servant leader motivation. The second element of the model is the value orientation with self-transcendence (benevolence, equality) promoting the motivation-to-serve while self-enhancement (power, achievement, hedonism) attenuates the altruistic motives associated with servant leadership.

Clearly, the receptivity and effectiveness of servant leadership is maximized by a compatible organizational culture fully integrated into the HR system through its mission, vision, and values. In essence, the HR

system's decision-making process links personnel decision making to servant leader mission, motivation, character, and behavior. Laub (2005) and Herman (2008) assessed the organizational culture of one hundred organizations, classifying them into autocratic, paternalistic, and servant leader (Laub, 2010). Only 14 percent of the studied organizations received classification as servant leader oriented, as most were a mixture of paternalistic (55%) and autocratic (31%) (Laub, 2010). However, even in those situations in which the culture and employee attributes conflict with servant leadership, the astute servant leader adjusts his or her leadership approach to honor and accommodate subordinate preferences, while not violating key principles such as promoting the best interests of employees. Hence, the leader maintains the core elements of servant leadership while patiently adjusting to organizational climate. Over time, servant leadership can increase trust and build relationships, thereby changing subordinate attitudes, as the vast majority of employees desire dignified and fair treatment. In essence, an organizational microclimate of receptivity to servant leadership organically develops.

Global Theological and Cultural Scope of Servant Leadership

One final question relates to the international religious and comparative scope of servant leadership. Servant leadership practice is global in scope, finding support in a variety or religious and philosophical worldviews (Bekker, 2010). Research indicates cultural differences related to power distance, but a high level of consensus on the Golden Rule dimensions (Irving, 2010).

The universality of servant leadership is reflected in the theology of the world's major religions as well as in the international conceptual and empirical research. This comports with Christian theology and the notion of "common grace." Common grace is the principle presented in scripture that God has written his law of Golden Rule conduct in the heart of humanity (see Romans 2:14–15). These principles of interpersonal treatment include many servant leadership elements, thereby enabling society to function with the essential degree of peace, harmony, and cohesiveness across all cultures and time periods, regardless of their direct knowledge or belief in the Christian Trinitarian God. The following section summarizes key servant leader principles that are found in Judaism, Islam, and Hinduism/Buddhism. These include foundational principles such as effective leadership beginning with service, group and mission interest over self-interest, promoting the greater good, personal character virtue as reflected in the ethicality and morality of decision making and behavior,

ongoing introspection to ensure righteous motives, means and ends, and rejecting interpersonal comparison and competition.

From an intercultural research standpoint, the growing empirical and conceptual literature reinforces the centrality of servant leadership. Of the 57 empirical studies published on servant leadership as of press time, 33 or 58 percent utilized international samples outside of the United States. (See table 1.3 for a complete summary.) The leading countries excluding the United States include China (8), Turkey (4), and the Netherlands (4). From a regional standpoint, most were in Asia (14), followed by Europe (8) and the Middle East (6), and Africa (3). Hence, the empirical evidence reinforces that servant leadership promotes favorable workplace attitudes, behaviors, and performance levels across cultures and regions of the world. The next section addresses key religious elements.

Table 1.3   Frequency count of servant leader studies: Country and continents of origin

Country and Continent of Origin	N	%
United States	27	45.0
China	8	13.3
Turkey	4	6.7
Netherlands	4	6.7
United Kingdom	2	3.3
Indonesia	2	3.3
New Zealand	2	3.3
South Africa	1	1.7
Pakistan	1	1.7
Trinidad/Tobago	1	1.7
India	1	1.7
Australia	1	1.7
Iran	1	1.7
Kenya	1	1.7
Ghana	1	1.7
Germany	1	1.7
Canada	1	1.7
Ukraine	1	1.7
Total	60	100
North America	28	46.7
Asia	14	23.3
Europe	8	13.3
Middle East	6	10.0
Africa	3	5.0
Caribbean	1	1.7
Total	60	100

Note: N = 60 given that three studies used joint US and foreign samples, total number of studies is 57.

Important Servant Leader Attributes in Judaism

Judaism emphasizes many key elements consistent with servant leadership. It begins with the promotion of a division of power to avoid excessive degrees of centralization of authority. This was reflected in the communal nature of leadership in the synagogue. Another key element is the emphasis on delegation and empowerment as seen in Exodus 18 when Moses assigned 50 worthy men to serve as judges to reduce his workload and lower waiting times as well as the importance of an organized leadership succession process as recorded in Deuteronomy 31. The metaphor of leading through service is clearly reinforced in the image of the shepherd who carefully tends and protects the flock placing himself in danger to guard the sheep. This beautiful imagery is most eloquently portrayed in Psalm 23 and David as king (1 Kings 2) (Bekker, 2010). An ongoing emphasis on the overall unity, wholeness, and well-being of the community consistent with the biblical "mission statement" that outlines the prime purpose of leaders is to love the Lord our God with all our heart, mind, soul, and strength, and our neighbor as ourselves (Deuteronomy 6:4) (Bekker, 2010). Finally, Judaism emphasizes that leaders should embrace a commitment to the humanity and dignity of all subjects, both Jews and foreigners, and embrace authenticity of action, cultivating a moral imagination, and promoting righteous conduct, thereby providing godly role models, and clear paths for moral growth (Bekker, 2010).

Important Servant Leader Attributes in Christianity

Christianity is the religion that explicitly endorses many key elements consistent with servant leadership. It begins with an overt Christological focus as leaders are called to authentic discipleship based on the example of Jesus Christ. Hence there is mimetic imitation of the Divine as leaders strive to reproduce the character, behavior, and conduct of Christ in accomplishing the organization's mission (Ayers, 2006; Bekker, 2006). Servant leaders strive to use power in a meek and humble fashion recognizing that their source of authority comes from God and their role as stewards in using power to honor God through mission accomplishment and the growth and well-being of followers (Engstrom, 1976). Hence, a follower-centered approach to power.

Servant leadership as demonstrated by the life and ministry of Jesus centers on the dynamic and sometimes paradoxical balance of achieving the mission as directed by Father God while serving others with love. This follower-directed approach merges the macro and micro focus of love by cultivating the growth and well-being of followers by gaining

their free-will commitment to achieve a transcendent mission through goal-directed individual and collective efforts subordinating personal interests for the greater good. In the Christian worldview, power is another manifestation of love and is the energy source for the church to accomplish the mission. Hence, power is freely delegated to each person through the Holy Spirit to accomplish their unique personal calling. This is reflected in the Trinitarian nature of God in which Father God delegates power and authority to Jesus and the Holy Spirit working in harmony empowering each to accomplish essential aspects of the mission. Jesus stated that the disciples would do greater things (John 14:12) through the power of the Holy Spirit, hence power and authority is not a fixed asset, but an eternally and infinitely expanding expression of God's love.

Another key Christian worldview element is the character virtue of *cursus pudorum*, which is the follower's voluntary surrender in love to the will of God (Bekker, 2010). This humble capitulation is unconditional obedience to God's will and purpose across all life circumstances, whether in a state of exaltation or abasement (Bekker, 2010). This is contracted with the concept of *cursus honorum*, or the formalized sequence of public offices during the Roman Empire, in which the needs of the state and ruler dominate both individuals and the promotion of the common good (Bekker, 2010). In essence, the purpose of followers is to serve the needs of leaders, while the Christological view is that leaders exist to serve God and their followers, an expression of the Great Commandment to first love God and then your neighbors (followers) as your selves (Bekker, 2010). (See Matthew 5:17–19, Matthew 20:28, Philippians 2:8, [1 Corinthians 11], Philippians 2:5, and Matthew 20:26 [Bekker, 2010].)

Important Servant Leader Attributes in Islam

Islam emphasizes the importance of integrity by leaders. For example, its teachings claim a harmony between the life of Mohammad (the founding prophet of Islam) and the teachings of the Koran on the foundational importance of virtuous character attributes and being an authentic adherent and example (Kriger & Seng, 2005; Bekker, 2010). Examples in the Koran include (Bekker, 2010):

a. "and you stand an exalted standard of character" al-Qalam (68:4),
b. "good deeds, regular prayer, practice regular charity, and constantly serve US" Surah 21. (Al-Anbiyaa, Ayah 73),
c. The love of Allah, motivates leaders to lead in moral and ethical ways (Peterson, 2001),

d. Effective leadership begins with service to Allah. Leaders learn to lead by honoring the spiritual disciplines that venerate Allah including prayer, fasting, reading of the Koran, and acts of service (Bekker, 2010). Service as leadership is central to early Islam (Kriger & Seng, 2005). A major goal of Islam, like servant leadership, is to eradicate all problems in our social life (Bekker, 2010).

Islam views leaders as "caretakers" entrusted by Allah to carefully steward the precious human, animal, material, and monetary resources given by God (Kriger & Seng, 2005). Islam emphasizes the symbiotic relationship among the character of the elite, their leadership integrity, and the health, well-being, and morality of society as a whole. Leaders are called to balance the civic square of collective social action and individual morality, as well as the spiritual and moral (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1994; Kriger & Seng, 2005).

The definition of wisdom in Islam is similar to the definition of servant leadership in Christianity. Wisdom according to Islamic scholar Abu Hamid al-Ghazzali is the integration of deeds, knowledge, and virtues, similar to the morality of motives, means and ends supported by the ethicality of knowledge, belief, and action (Kriger & Seng, 2005). He taught that the study of character is more important than the study of theology or belief (Kriger & Seng, 2005). In essence, in Islamic traditions a leader must be a "hearer and a doer." Islamic teachings emphasize that the leader derives the authority and power to rule from the consent of the governed, hence a very similar notion of our modern democracy and the conception of servant leader empowerment (Kriger & Seng, 2005).

Important Servant Leader Attributes in Buddhism

Buddhism enumerates many teachings consistent with servant leadership. Leaders in Buddhism are called to embrace altruism and our universal interdependency within a system. The foundation is the shared character traits (the four immeasurable states) of love, compassion, joy, and equanimity (calm temperament under stress) (Kriger & Seng, 2005: Bekker, 2010). The ultimate example of servant leadership in Buddhism is the Bodhisattva, a leader who sacrifices his or her personal opportunity to achieve enlightenment (the cessation of desire and achieving unity with the universe) to help others struggling with personal character growth (Bekker, 2010). A Bodhisattva sacrifices his or her life and soul to help others avoid degradation, thereby voluntarily descending into "hell" so others will have a chance to be saved (Kriger & Seng, 2005; Bekker, 2010).

Buddhism embraces a very similar understanding of servant leader character and wisdom as Christianity. Buddhism emphasizes appropriate motives, means, and ends through orthodoxy (correct knowledge and belief) and orthopraxis (correct decisions, actions, and behaviors). The Fourth Noble Truth of Buddhism emphasizes wisdom, mental development, and ethical conduct through the eightfold path (Bekker, 2010):

1. Right view
2. Right intentions
3. Right speech
4. Right action
5. Right livelihood
6. Right effort
7. Right mindfulness
8. Right concentration

Buddhism's focus on mindfulness is similar to servant leadership's emphasis on empathy, living in the moment through active listening, thereby resulting in more authentic relationships. Another key element in Buddhism that is fully compatible with servant leadership is to reject personal comparisons in which the observer uses societal or self-developed standards of success to classify relationships and people into "winners and losers," worthy or less worthy, thereby enhancing pride, fear, and complacency, and organizational hierarchy (Gray & Kriger, 2005; Kriger & Seng, 2005). In Buddhism, the focus is on the erosion of distinctions between leaders and followers thereby, promoting a higher degree of commonality of interest recognizing that success is the product of the team and the system (Kriger & Seng, 2005). It also incentivizes situational leadership in which all organizational members may become leaders as the circumstances dictate (Gronn, 2002; Kriger & Seng, 2005).

Human Resource System Functions

Traditionally, the HR function entails two global components, the first of which is the formal personnel system that supports various line and staff service delivery functions. For larger organizations, a central HR department with a full-time HR director performs these duties and services. For mid-size organizations, the organization typically assigns these functions to a sole HR director. For smaller organizations, an executive director in a nonprofit, a city manager in a local government, a supervisor in a business, or an assistant pastor in the church typically assumes the HR mantle. HR functions include employee and volunteer staffing,

compensation and benefits administration, health and safety programs, employee rights and discipline, and training and development programs, among others.

The second, and more important, aspect of HR relates to the direct day-to-day management of the service delivery system including individual, group, and organizational performance management and all of the associated functions to lead, manage, and motivate engaged and productive employees. The success of any organization is largely dependent on the conformance of the organization's culture and practice to SLHRM principles regarding the quality of employee selection and training, the provision of an adequate infrastructure (equipment, supplies), and ethical and effective supervision. A high level of employee motivation requires the creation of a workplace that meets the employee's physical and spiritual needs in conjunction with an appropriate mix of incentives. Workers who exert the required level of effort in the accomplishment of individual and organizational goals and work outside of their job description (organizational citizenship) when needed to help other employees and clients are indicators of a healthy HR management system.

This book focuses on both aspects and it will be of use to both HR professionals and line managers and leaders who must use and navigate the HR system to promote high performance. SLHRM entails developing performance management policies and practices that honor the "triune towers" of support, accountability, and integrity. Employee support entails the adoption of workplace policies and practices that sustain quality of work life and instill hope. Employee support also entails a "speaking truth in love" or "tough love" motivational, conduct, character, and performance-based accountability framework. SLHRM organizations imbed accountability within a value system that infuses the healthy pursuit of excellence with authentic forgiveness and grace policies. Support and accountability, in turn, leans on the pillar of integrity and the authentic implementation of the espoused values.

The worst incarnation of SLHRM espouses the values but with a failure to engage authentically and practice those principles. This gap between policy and practice engenders a "witch's brew" of dashed expectations generating a poisoned atmosphere of cynicism, destroying trust and "ship wrecking" the faith of subordinates, peers, and clients. As such, this book illustrates the SLHRM policies and practices that produce the positive fruits of a God honoring work environment including loving, engaged, and committed employees working with excellence to achieve the organization's mission.

SLHRM unswervingly commits to a covenantal relationship with each employee. The foundation of a workplace covenant is the commitment

to a long-term relationship founded upon mutual obligations, accountability, and trust. These include cultivating a high quality of work life including meaningful work, servant leader management, and leadership practices, dignified employee treatment, fair compensation, safe working conditions, and an assurance of long-term job security. From the employee perspective, this entails working skillfully, faithfully, honestly, and diligently in all circumstances, working outside of the job description when needed, assuming responsibility for solving workplace problems, honoring the authority and dignity of leaders, treating co-workers and clients with respect, and committing to an appropriate degree of innovation and creativity.

A great example of a leadership covenant is that of John Beckett (CEO of Beckett Corporation, which manufactures oil and gas burners) who models the importance of "word and deed" integrity and the commitment to the "ministry of interruptions" in which we deviate from our schedule to help others. Mr. Beckett takes time from his busy schedule to visit hospitalized employees. When the CEO personally touches employees, it provides validation of the stated policies and becomes the source of positive internal referrals. As satisfied customers can be your best sales advocates, the same principle operates for your employees who become organizational ambassadors with personal testimonies of good will acts of care and kindness.

SLHRM embraces a combination of deontological (principle-based ethics) and teleological (greatest good) attributes. When conflicts between servanthood principles and utilitarian stewardship objectives develop, the SLHRM organization makes the conscious choice to adhere to deontological principles (for example the commandment to observe the Sabbath) irrespective of the cost. An instructive example is Chick-fil-A founder Truett Cathy and his courageous decision to close stores on Sunday, which strongly conflicted with the prevailing retail and marketing wisdom. By choosing to honor the Sabbath, Mr. Cathy demonstrated both his faith in God and his care for the well-being of employees with a guaranteed day of rest. Chick-fil-A is now one of the most profitable fast-food franchises. When we obey God's commandments in spite of the obstacles, we are demonstrating our obedience and faith in a powerful God who moves mountains transforming lives and bringing order out of chaos. It is important to understand that following the correct path does not always lead to short-term or long-term success. Oftentimes, our obedience produces failure as the world defines it, but from the ashes rises God's perfect redemptive plan, resurrecting good from the trials and tears.

A SLHRM-guided organization rejects the compartmentalization of morality, integrity, and ethics at both the individual and organizational decision-making levels. We cannot promote a redemptive organizational culture unless our motives, means, and ends honor both the letter and spirit of integrity and obedience. As we die to the self, we become that new creation that views all life experiences from this common ethical/moral lens. Hence, this produces our sanctified spirits and we embrace the "mind of Christ," which is the foundation of spiritual wisdom and intelligence. The authentic incorporation of SLHRM generates a cultural environment of excellence, innovation, and creativity. When the organization views employees, clients, or customers as instrumental means to an end, it is very easy to move to a relativist ethical position leading to the withdrawal of God's favor.

Maintaining a SLHRM focus requires great faith, courage, and perseverance as Christians in management and leadership positions are under great pressure from many sources including:

1. The decline in religious belief and church membership.
2. The ascendency of post-modernism and moral relativism.
3. The erosion of civility and professionalism in the work place.
4. Loss of confidence in the ethics and integrity of organizations in all sectors given high visibility scandals.
5. The graying of the labor force and the challenges of succession planning.
6. The challenges of managing generational differences in the workplace.
7. Ongoing fiscal stress and a stagnant economy.
8. Global competition in the market economy.
9. Skill shortages in many highly skilled occupations.
10. The challenges of securing qualified, motivated, and long-term volunteers for nonprofits and churches.
11. The increasing levels of competition for the limited pool of charitable donations.
12. Declining government funding in conjunction with increasing service demands.
13. The need to demonstrate clear return-on-investment (ROI) with a declining resource base.
14. Maintaining and building management capacity given resource constraints.

There is a clear need for authentic and passionate leadership based upon Christian SLHRM love and integrity to address these challenges.

When the organization is experiencing stress and tribulation, the leader must rise above the confusion and model hope and confidence in the provision of the Lord. The HR function sets the tone and provides the supportive environment for employee engagement.

The temptation of Jesus in the wilderness (Matthew 4:1–11) provides great guidance for today's faith-based SLHRM-oriented managers. Satan tempted Jesus to act on expediency and satisfy short-term needs at the expense of long-term mission integrity. Crisis is a great test of character. The lesson for Christian SLHRM leaders is to maintain mission integrity in the presence of great fiscal and management pressures and to avoid compromising key values and principles. It is critical to reflect on Christ's statement "For what will it profit them to gain the whole world and forfeit their life?" (Mark 8:36, NRSV) with the many tempting paths of expediency to relieve short-term pressures. This book reinforces that the ability to maintain a consistent mission focus centers upon two elements. The first is the internal moral integrity of the leaders, managers, employees, and volunteers who have internalized the mission, vision, and values while the second is a SLHRM-led and SLHRM-directed HR system.

In all sectors, it is important to assure employees, volunteers, clients, and customers that their respective investments in the organization are wise and generate appropriate returns. SLHRM enhances management capacity, accountability, and transparency, and is an important means for overcoming the damage wrought by the various well-publicized organizational scandals in business, government, and the nonprofit world. However, instituting SLHRM policies and practices can provide a false sense of security if there is not a sustained long-term commitment to their genuine implementation. External accountability of performance and ROI is an essential element, and those who are committed to excellence of character and competency do not fear or resent the scrutiny of outside stakeholders.

I want to reassure the reader that the general principles of SLHRM are not mysterious and esoteric forms of wisdom discoverable and known only to a few after years of search and study. The great challenge is implementing SLHRM principles authentically, given our sin nature and the spiritual warfare of Satan's Kingdom. Hence, SLHRM knowledge is necessary, but not sufficient, to endure authentic integration. A sobering reality is that knowledge without application of SLHRM principles generates a higher level of accountability (in the words of scripture, we are "beaten" with more stripes, as in Luke 12:47). It is better to be ignorant of effective SLHRM practices, than to know about the practices and choose

not to implement what God entrusts sacredly into our care. If that is not sufficiently sobering, consider Matthew 7:22–23, NRSV:

> On that day many will say to me, "Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and cast out demons in your name, and do many deeds of power in your name?" Then I will declare to them, "I never knew you; go away from me, you evildoers."

Hence, given our love and reverential respect and fear of God, we need to strive to be a hearer and a doer of the Word. Another key element of SLHRM, humility, is recognizing that our knowledge level of good management practices frequently exceed our ability to implement and practice that which we know is right. The only appropriate response is an attitude of godly meekness and humility. We must consistently practice SLHRM in both letter and spirit to produce the fruit of the Holy Spirit, which provide the tangible evidence of godly motives and agape love. As Jesus states, "You will know them by their fruits" (Matthew 7:16, NRSV)! The insincere application of SLHRM destroys faith and credibility. God holds human resource servant leaders to a higher standard. When leaders fail the integrity test, it requires a much longer time of sustained excellence to restore confidence and heal the wounds of distrust.

A foundational element of SLHRM integrity requires God-honoring motives, means, and ends. Frequently, leaders and managers embrace a utilitarian view of their role and rationalize that the "ends justifies the means." Leaders habitually fail both to model and teach SLHRM, hence stifling employee growth. SLHRM emphasizes the significance of character encouraging employees to recognize the importance of authentically practicing altruism and the ability to delay gratification. A foundational element is establishing the basic SLHRM principles of trust based upon relationship credibility, and the belief that the leader doing the communicating is operating from a motive of love. Many non-Christians believe that power, judgment, and control motivate believers, hence discrediting the Christian worldview. Even more tragic is that many Christians are operating from this paradigm, and we must demonstrate in word and deed a different spirit that will break down the defenses. When Christian managers and leaders claim that their HR system centers on servant leader principles, but fail to honor the pledge through consistent, good-faith application, we in effect embrace a form of practical atheism, denying the dominion of Christ in that sphere and serving other Gods.

As Christians, we are ambassadors for Christ (2 Corinthians 5:20) and represent Him through our words of Golden Rule love and deeds. We evangelize by our good works and through loving our neighbor in the workplace by being a servant leader and follower. Our ability to share Christ in the workplace rests not upon the power of debate and logic, but on simply being an authentic disciple and loving others, thereby being a witness for what Christ has done in our lives.

Why is SLHRM such a critical process? Most organizations underinvest in HR, given that they are lulled into a false sense of security based upon their lack of need of it when the organization was smaller. HR problems begin to increase in size and scope as the organization grows. First, the HR system reflects and influences the organization's theology of work and human nature. Our HR leadership worldview exerts the most powerful influence on the quality of work life. For example, does the organization embrace a grace- and forgiveness-based and empowerment-oriented confidence in human nature, viewing mistakes and failures as critical components of the learning process, or does it hold that workers, because of their selfish and egocentric natures, require rigid discipline and close supervision to reduce errors and increase productivity? Do we trust employees to act ethically and morally, reducing the need for detailed surveillance and oversight, or do we possess a cynical view of human nature and a need to monitor carefully every keystroke? Hence, SLHRM is a foundational component of both organizational effectiveness and quality of work life. Unless we treat employees with dignity and respect, the organization labors in vain.

Christian Character Is the Foundation of SLHRM

The authentic practice of SLHRM begins with employee character. It is the most vital element. There are many foundational character attributes of godly wisdom necessary for success in SLHRM, but there are six essential qualities: love, humility, transparency, forgiveness, hope and perseverance, and empathy and compassion. Our times of trial and the hidden temptations of success are two of the most difficult times for the practice of SLHRM. In the midst of trial, the natural tendency is to remove one's eyes from God given the focus on the circumstances, while in times of success we remove our gaze from the Lord and focus on our own resources, power, and effort—a pride of self-sufficiency. Table 1.4 provides an overview of these six key character attributes, while chapter 2 presents a detailed summary of the biblical support for the various servant leader attributes

Table 1.4 Key SLHRM character elements essential for success

SLHRM Christian Character Attribute Scenarios

Love: The SLHRM–led manager embraces the practice of love that is the ability to integrate the goals of achieving the mission with moral integrity while promoting the development, growth, and well-being of employees. Love entails righteous and moral motivation and action regardless of emotional state and the manager's personal experiences and feelings toward employees. Love entails the dual elements of delaying gratification and altruism in the course of work duties placing the needs of others first. For example, a City Manager of a small local government must learn to overlook past betrayals by City Council members and department heads who attempt to make deals independently. He must actively mentor and prepare the Assistant City Manager to assume his duties, hence making himself dispensable. In addition, the City Manager must protect his subordinate from undue political interference at the risk of his job security.

Humility: Humility is a foundational character attribute. Humility is essential for servant leaders to avoid the twin poisons of pride and fear. True SLRHM humility is the recognition that success and higher performance is the product of the synergies of committed team members and an inherent understanding of the manager's strength and weaknesses. Hence, humble managers are secure in their identity and perceive no threat when others perform well. In our City Manager example, the humble City Manager actively appoints subordinates who complement his strengths and weaknesses and empower them to succeed.

Transparency: Transparency is a key character element that supports humility. Transparency is the consistent courage to share all types of information, positive and negative, regarding character and performance. When SLHRM managers practice transparency, it sends a clear signal that the manager welcomes open and honest feedback, thereby facilitating problem solving and driving fear from the workplace. For example, when our SLHRM city manager makes mistakes regarding the accuracy of budget forecasts, he accepts responsibility, apologizes for the negative consequences, and openly discusses how he and organizational practices can improve. He does not attempt to externalize the blame or create excuses.

Forgiveness: SLHRM managers understand that personal and organizational well-being requires the genuine embrace of forgiveness. Mistakes, failure, weakness, and betrayal are a ubiquitous element of the human condition. Hence, SLRHM managers make the conscious choice to forgive others for their errors, and themselves for their contributions. Forgiveness applied with wisdom drives fear out of the workplace. The wise SLHRM City Manager will publicly recognize employees with good faith attempts that result in failure, thereby helping to promote learning and eliminating the fear of failure.

Hope and Perseverance: The SLHRM manager understands that hope is the foundation of perseverance under stress. SLHRM managers communicate a genuine and contagious optimism and confidence that provides a rationale for employee sacrifices and a vision of a better future. Hence, the SLHRM manager is a "lighthouse" projecting a beacon of hope in the midst of organizational storms. Our city manager demonstrates his solidarity with employees in times of fiscal stress by first absorbing budget cuts through reductions in his and the other executive team's pay levels. He then charts a course of shared shouldering of the necessary budget cuts while empowering employees to restructure service delivery to enhanced efficiency and effectiveness to reduce job losses.

Table 1.4   Continued

Compassion and Empathy: SLHRM managers understand the importance of understanding the experiences, needs, motives, and problems of their employees. If they are to serve and lead effectively, they need to take into understand the "worldview" of those they serve. For example, our SLHRM city manager understands the workload levels and working conditions of employees, and strives to maintain fair and sustainable staffing and performance expectations that reduce employee stress. This enables employees to avoid the perils of "compassion fatigue" in which they lack either the energy or motivation to help other employees or customers.

Challenges in the Application of SLHRM Principles

In order for us to represent Christ as SLHRM ambassadors, we must demonstrate in word and deed that Christianity entails a transformational worldview that changes hearts and minds. The workplace is a wonderful setting to exhibit unconditional love. Our workplaces are not mono-lithic. There are many organizations in which managers and employees create a God-honoring "microclimate" work environment embedded within a hostile culture of moral relativism, hedonism or idol worship of achievement, power, and materialism. Our society has been undergoing a gradual erosion of moral, ethical, and spiritual integrity that is contrib-uting to the "love of many will run cold" (Matthew 24:12, NRSV). In reality, we are in a war for the souls and minds of humanity, with the workplace a central battlefield. The secularism of the west produces a hardness of heart and a spirit of ingratitude. For the materially well-off, our wealth and the social safety net generate an attitude of complacency that enables employees to take for granted the blessings and associated cost to sustain their standard of living. However, increasing income inequity and the erosion of the middle class creates great economic pres-sures on employees, given stagnant wage levels and reduced advancement opportunities. Third, given the high levels of unemployment, employers strive to increase productivity and limit hiring, increasing performance expectations on the remaining employees.

We cannot routinely apply these SLHRM values, principles, and prac-tices, as they are neither a mantra that one can chant nor a blueprint applicable in a mechanical fashion. In order for a transformation to occur there must be a genuine commitment. Enlightened managers embrace SLHRM and its associated character traits, values, and principles in all settings. It is a question of a passionate will and heart commitment to stay the course, and pay the inevitable short- and long-term costs associated with adopting a covenantal relationship. As servant leaders, the adoption of SLHRM does not guarantee organizational success; but in many cases,

SLHRM is antithetical to short- or long-term career success. Are we willing to pay the price for righteousness?

Hence, a major challenge to SLHRM is that the Christian "label" raises mixed feelings in our culture given the uneven performance and ethics of Christians in general. Some Christians operate with amazing integrity clearly promoting Kingdom objectives and making a huge difference on the spiritual and temporal levels while others struggle to maintain basic standards of morality and ethics. It is both "letter and spirit" adherence to the principles of servanthood and stewardship that determine our ultimate ability to influence others.

We must be cognizant of both the letter and the spirit of our management actions and decisions. Organizations adopt SLHRM "best practice" policies for a variety of reasons. Some organizations embrace these tools for their teleological (instrumental) benefits and others for their symbolic and political effects. Organizational researchers Bolman and Deal (2003) developed a framework for analyzing organizational behavior, and one of the lenses they used was viewing the organization as a "theater." Organizations adopt SLHRM practices for external and internal audiences to reassure them that they are progressive, informed, and competent. These practices frequently morph into what are termed "Potemkin villages" that look real from a distance but are merely structural facades with no foundation or root for implementation. It generates what Chris Argyris (1961) terms a discrepancy between espoused theory and the theory in use (Agyris & Schön, 1974). Just because an organization lists SLHRM as a foundational element of its mission, vision, and values statement, there is no automatic internalization of these values, hence the potential for an institutionalized hypocrisy to permeate the entire organization. Compartmentalization of SLHRM values inhibits growth and change.

One of the underlying reasons for the "policy and practice" gap is that humans are ego-centric and are inherently more interested in promoting personal goals and interests over that of clients, employees, other key stakeholders, and most importantly, the Lord's will. This battle reflects the never-ending inner struggle with sin in conjunction with the pressures of external stakeholders and the conflicting values of alternative worldviews. If one adopts SLHRM management practices in an organization founded on command and control (Theory X) principles, there is an inherent conflict resulting in double-minded practices with disappointing results. However, as it states in 1 Corinthians 15:58, NRSV "you know that in the Lord your labor is not in vain," and seeds are planted that can bear fruit in the future either in that specific organization or through employees moving to new employment situations carrying with them the foundation for Kingdom change and growth.

SLHRM: Summary of Foundational Principles

SLHRM practices are designed to meet our seven basic needs of (1) conferring dignity, (2) providing the necessary authority to complete tasks, (3) offering encouragement and provision that blesses employees, (4) job and relationship security, (5) clear and compelling purpose and meaning, (6) the appropriate balance between freedom/autonomy and accountable boundaries, and (7) intimate love and companionship (Hillman, 2000). It is important for SLHRM-oriented leaders and managers to discern the difference between God's permissive and his perfect will. All domains, secular or sacred, operate according to universal spiritual and physical laws. The concept of common grace entails the notion that God universally writes his laws of ethics and conduct in the human heart, and the Golden Rule principles that are the foundation of "best practice" human resource management generate blessings to all who practice them. However, these temporal fruits provide no everlasting value absent the redemptive work of Christ. Hence, there is an "eternal dimension" set of "cause and effect" SLHRM practices infilling and transcending secular HR practices. As Christians, we must seek to fulfill not only the Golden Rule common grace HR practices, but also the Christian higher agape love and redemptive SLHRM values that transform mind, body, and spirit. Hence, the worldly standards of success are necessary, but insufficient, for godly eternal success. One of the paradoxes of the Christian faith is that either legalistic adherence to ethical management principles or their embrace from a utilitarian perspective loses all life and meaning divorced from the life-giving vine of Christ's Holy Spirit love, grace, and purpose. In God's grace, we act not because of compulsion, or to pursue virtue, or to promote ethical reasoning and conduct, but as an organic expression of our gratitude for God's love, and for the joy He receives when we please Him. The foundation for salvation is a personal relationship with Jesus Christ, but sanctification requires the fellowship of believers in the ongoing relationship. God never intended that we work out our salvation alone.

   Below is a list of key SLHRM redemptive values, principles, and practices. This is not exhaustive but, in the author's view, it encompasses the most important. Both faith and reason are key elements in this journey. Christianity rests upon faith, but the physical, spiritual, and social laws of the universe demonstrate principles of cause and effect that validate the active presence and intervention of God reinforcing reason. In fact, one attribute of hell is "the absence of reason," as noted by movie director Oliver Stone. God created humanity in his image, and we discern and discover God's decision-making patterns both deductively and

inductively. God understands that we need empirical reassurance that our efforts are not in vain. Faith and belief must come first, but the evidence follows. The great scriptural example of this was John the Baptist sending his disciples to ask Jesus if he was the Messiah, "and said to him, 'Are you the one who is to come, or are we to wait for another?'" (Matthew 11:3, NRSV) Jesus replied by asking the disciples to examine the evidence of the sick being healed and the dead raised. He did not publicly chastise John's disciples, only responded to their question with the evidence to support intellectual, heart, and spirit belief.

In essence, these SLHRM principles are corporate expressions of the Christian walk of sanctification, which can be a lonely process, as we learn to persist in the face of temptation. The world encourages and rewards Christians to compartmentalize their faith, to invalidate their testimony and discredit the fundamental truth claims of Christianity. These standards are lofty, and it is important to recognize that God views us with a different lens and time perspective through the eyes of eternity in our redeemed and blood washed and forgiven state. These principles help us move forward in dying to the self. As televangelist Joyce Meyers states, we should thank God for where we are now, and give God glory and praise for where we are going. These SLHRM principles are important contributors to God's plan for the lives of all organizational members.

SLHRM Foundational Values, Principles, and Practices

1. *All HR practices should promote the Great Commandment to love the Lord thy God with all our heart, mind, soul, and strength and our neighbors as ourselves (Matthew 27:37–39). When leaders, managers, and employees model and practice the Great Commandment authentically, they produce the character of Christ and the fruit of the Spirit that enable the promotion of the Great Commission (Matthew 28:16–20).* Christian SLHRM leaders develop policies and practices that reinforce the organization's mission according to the will of God. This entails balancing stewardship (effectively and efficiently achieving the mission with honor and integrity) and servanthood (promoting the best interests and legitimate needs and interests of the key stakeholders). Both are necessary for a successful servant leader. To achieve each goal, leaders must seek the Lord for guidance through the Holy Spirit in separating the "best from the good." It is impossible to achieve stewardship and servanthood without the guidance, wisdom, and leading of the Holy Spirit given the complexity of life and the presence of spiritual warfare. The ministry of Jesus demonstrated the importance of laser-like devotion to the Father's direction in setting priorities.

2. *Balance many competing values, recognizing the importance of confronting and resolving conflict in a God-honoring fashion under the leading of the Holy Spirit.* The goal is to promote an organizational decision-making process that requires management to analyze fully the broad consequences of organizational decisions from multiple perspectives and values to promote the well-being of all organizational members and other key stakeholders. The foundational principle is that the spiritual good requires the practice of humility. This allows us to listen clearly to the position of others without rushing to judgment and imposing our view of reality on them. Once we more fully understand the motives and contextual circumstances, we will be in a better position for mutual exploration of the common interests and the identification of the conflicting interests and the short- and long-term consequences for failing to resolve, and the benefits to, a resolution. There must be a firm commitment to resolving conflict on biblical terms including direct discussion and negotiation. We must always contemplate the consequences of organizational policies from a broad framework. For example, if the work environment is overly demanding, employees often abuse sick time, given the need to take "mental health" days. The aggregate effect of individual decisions to be absent from work imposes costs on the collective workforce. Hence, the value of providing support for employees in times of illness begins to clash with the obligation to provide reasonable workloads. Clearly, the Golden Rule applies here. When an employee has a genuine need for time off (sickness, family crisis), the organization should accommodate. However, if organizational policies are producing excessive stress levels, leaders possess an obligation to address the root cause to avoid externalizing costs to other employees. I am not arguing for a purely utilitarian decision-making process, only that balancing values in conflict situations is important.

3. *Set high standards of performance to communicate, recognize, and cultivate organizational confidence in the inherent capacity of every employee to achieve exemplary levels of human growth and excellence.* This entails setting and maintaining high standards of performance with the appropriate degree of organizational support (resources, time, training, patience, empathy, etc.).

4. *Practice spiritual intelligence, which entails possessing a comprehensive knowledge of biblical leadership principles, a heart-based belief in their efficacy, authentically practicing them (being a hearer and doer, James 1:22), and making decisions with godly wisdom.* Wisdom-based decisions entail the promotion of God's will and purpose of agape love

through moral motives, means, and ends even in the presence of conflicting values and principles. In order to accomplish this lofty principle, we must be led by the Holy Spirit.

5. *All HR decisions must pass the 1 Corinthians 13 and Matthew 7:23 love test.* Regrettably, unrighteous motives birth many righteous actions. From a personal spiritual accountability standpoint, when we stand before the Lord, righteous actions driven by impure motives will count for nothing (1 Corinthians 13). Hence, SLHRM leaders manifest a relentless commitment to self-examination through the guidance of the Holy Spirit to discern what is in our hearts. This self-appraisal, though painful, results in the necessary character growth that produces the stewardship and servanthood commitment that places employee needs in the proper perspective, producing great fruit. When employees believe that leadership actively pursues their best interests, they are more patient and forgiving of management mistakes and errors of omission and commission.

6. *The intentional, systematic, and sustained cultivation of Christian character to promote a healthy and righteous work environment that fosters employee growth and well-being, thereby reducing dysfunctional stress, conflict, and suffering.* The ultimate goal is an organizational environment that manifests the fruit of the Spirit found in Galatians 5:22–23 (love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control). Christian SLHRM reinforces the importance of character growth and integrity, recognizing that character weaknesses will eventually erode employee gifts and abilities. A sobering lesson is that of Matthew 7:23 in which we can behave morally and make good decisions for the wrong motives. SLHRM practices must encourage and reward the basic character virtues of love, honesty, transparency, humility, forgiveness, and hope and immediately address character or ethical violations in the spirit of "love the sinner, hate the sin" as reflected in 2 Peter 3:9 as God is patient and firm and desires that none should perish, but all come to repentance. Competence without character is like a young child behind the wheel of a very expensive and fast car, someone is going to get hurt! Accountability partners are essential elements for Christian character growth and are a tangible demonstration of our humility and teachability. We can run from these painful episodes of character development, but we cannot hide. If we are not patient and do not learn from our mistakes, we simply add more time in the wilderness as we go around the mountain one more time. Self-interest and pride easily corrupts virtue if humility and vigilance are absent. We learn the most in trial and suffering, but are tempted

to the greatest degree in success. We must ruthlessly subject our motives to the review and discernment of the indwelling Holy Spirit. Power and success corrupts subtly and incrementally with the heart ungrounded in the truth. Servant leadership is a constant struggle!

7. *Recognize the importance of prayer and actively pray for God's guidance and wisdom.* The God-honoring formula of intense prayer followed by consulting the wisdom of godly counselors is a wise and essential practice. We must submit our questions to the Lord to separate the best from the good which can be destructive of God's plan (Proverbs 14:12). Ideally, individual employees and voluntary prayer groups are interceding for workplace harmony, unity, and the favor of God over all key stakeholders.

8. *Model a passionate commitment to integrity, promoting harmony between HR policy and practice.* Nothing erodes organizational member trust more quickly than perceived or actual hypocrisy. The foundational element is to promote obedience to the will of God. Upon the foundation of obedience, we then must be motivated by God-honoring motives, use righteous means, and pursue moral ends. Our thoughts, words, and deeds must honor God.

9. *Viewing the organizational relationship as a sacred covenant.* A covenant entails a mutual commitment to a God-honoring long-term relationship with reciprocal obligations and benefits. Management is the good shepherd providing a supportive, secure, loving, safe, and challenging work environment. In return, employees work with excellence, passion, and loyalty. However, today's labor market is very different from that of the past. The labor market structural and technological changes over the last 40 years have reduced the power and influence of unions and the bargaining power of individual workers. Management holds a higher degree of power and influence. However, SLHRM organizations do not exercise arbitrary and capricious power, given they recognize that they are stewards and not owners and that their true CEO is the Lord (Colossains 3: 23–24). Given management's enhanced power due to the nature of globalization, there is a great temptation to impose more demanding work performance standards with reduced levels of compensation. This will intensify the spiritual warfare in the workplace and requires SLHRM organizations to resist the temptation to take advantage of employees with their enhanced leverage.

10. *Provide each organizational member with purpose, meaning, significance, and dignity by clearly linking each position with the greater mission,*

vision, and values of the organization. Every organizational member must understand the importance and contribution of his or her job toward fulfilling the mission, thereby instilling significance and a clear sense of self-respect. The janitor is as important as the CEO! For example, janitors in a school need to understand that clean facilities promote better learning through less sickness, illness, and contributing to a psychological environment of order, respect, and excellence. Servant leadership is the foundation for successful, God-honoring management. It is the "path less traveled" and requires the Holy Spirit at the center as we die to the self. We must cease from our own labors (Hebrews 4:10), esteem others greater than ourselves (Phillipians 2:3), and learn to serve the mission first (John 5:19).

11. *Demonstrating trust in organizational members through transparency of management information.* This entails openness regarding the process and outcomes of HR and budgetary decisions. Transparency involves providing access to organizational policies, practices, studies, databases, as well as the ability to engage in ongoing two-way communication. The key is to provide sufficient information to inform, but with appropriate contextual explanation to avoid generating undue optimism, pessimism, or complacency. Nature fills a vacuum, and the informal network (the grapevine) and the rumor mill will fill the gap. By providing an appropriate amount of information on a need-to-know basis, this retards the development of rumor-mongering that sows fear, discord, and distrust. The biblical principle is to be "wise as serpents and innocent as doves" (Matthew 10:16, NRSV).

12. *Aspiring to the highest degree of organizational fair treatment through policies and practices that promote procedural, distributive, and interactional justice.* In essence, SLHRM organizations invest heavily in developing an organizational culture in which the HR and general performance management systems consist of policies and practices that on average produce a fair decision-making process and decision outcomes. This entails conscious and consistent commitment to "testing the spirit" governing the individual, group, and collective influence of organizational decision making. One of the key means of assessing the efficacy of the decision-making process in promoting justice is a systematic and ongoing action research process consisting of interactive information gathering methods, including surveys, focus groups, and interviews and justice audits, to examine sources of inequity and their remedies. SLHRM organizations generate and use this data to support the organizational

and learning empowerment process. Employees participate in gathering and analyzing data while organized into teams to develop solutions to problems and capitalize on opportunities.

13. *The consistent rejection of instrumental worldviews*. People are not resources, and organizations are not living beings. SLHRM never reduces organizational members and other stakeholders to abstract instruments or costs of production. When organizations view employees or other stakeholders in an instrumental fashion, it anesthetizes our conscience and permits decision makers to rationalize policies and practices that dehumanize workers and produce a pernicious fruit of human suffering. The pressure of competition enhances the presence and intensity of instrumental worldviews. Hence, it is critical for SLHRM organizations to embrace a God-honoring understanding and application of competition. However, there is much confusion about competition. What is a biblical view of competition? These elements include a godly love-based root motive for all actions, a set of decision rules that promote fair and ethical means to achieve goals, with the ultimate aim to improve the human condition in some aspect, either spiritual or material. As such, competition at any level rarely meets the pure standards of godliness. Godly competition stimulates innovation, creativity, and learning in the competing organizations, rejecting a war mentality of "taking no prisoners." God calls us to excellence, but we do not compete against others in a zero-sum fashion, only to perfect the faith, gifts, talents, and Christian character traits the God has given us as the competition process simultaneously enhances the well-being of our competitors. In essence, we are competing against ourselves as we all grow in Christ-likeness to generate an expanding pie or rising sea benefiting our consumers and clients and the larger quality of life in the community. Hence, competition is a loving and grace-filled exercise in which we realize that we learn as much or more from failure as we do from success. We confuse godly excellence and worldly excellence much too frequently. We must learn that godly "winning" entails humility. As the Apostle Paul states in 2 Corinthians 12:9, NRSV "My grace is sufficient for you, for power is made perfect in weakness."

14. *As Christ gave His life for the church, Christian leadership entails sacrificial acts of obedience and service*. We cannot learn to lead like Jesus until we learn to serve as He did. Before leaders ask for sacrifice from other stakeholders, leadership must voluntarily "die to the self," and adopt and apply the policy to their own job situations first.

Therefore, when fiscal stress requires service or HR reductions, upper management is the first level to undergo meaningful and painful cutbacks. "Good shepherds" sacrifice for the good of the flock. There is a moral obligation for collective responsibility and sharing of the pain. Without concrete measures of shared sacrifice by management, employees become cynical on any form of management accountability.

15. *Embrace a kingdom definition of success of leaving the ninety-nine for the one (Luke 15).* The comforting news is that honoring SLHRM principles does not require us to change the world as individuals operating under our own power. One of the paradoxes of the Christian faith is that God simultaneously embraces the micro and macro, the individual person and the entire universe. We may not be able to alter the culture of our organization single-handedly, but we do exercise a potent influence as a manager or colleague as we practice SLHRM within our zone of responsibility and influence. We honor both the letter and spirit of our organization's mission by ministering to our employee flock and providing Good Samarian assistance to the wounded on our path. Research and personal experience demonstrate that individual managers and groups of employees can create a SLHRM micro-climate embedded within the global instrumental organizational culture. Our actions do revolutionize the world of our subordinate employees and peers, with the prime exemplar the ministry of Jesus who spoke life into His disciples, one person and small group at a time. Jesus stated that the Father leaves the ninety-one for the one, and so should we (Matthew 18:12). So do not grow weary in doing good (Galatians 6:9), because God will transform the world of one employee or client through your obedience, as you cumulatively promote the Kingdom and enhance the mission of the organization.

16. *Passionately pursue and practice the good irrespective of the outcome.* To be a true "hearer and doer" (James 1:22) of SLHRM principles, we must humble ourselves and trust God for the outcome. True agape love trusts not in a result, but in a relationship. If we love God, we will choose to pursue righteous actions irrespective of the final conclusion. Win, lose, or draw, we, like Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego in Daniel 3, will not bow down and serve the riches, vices, temptations, problems, circumstances, fears, idols, and gods of this world. We will enter the furnace and trust God for the protection, loving and trusting Him with each step. This requires great courage and only by the power of the Holy Spirit.

17. *Promote a holistic understanding of leadership accountability grounded first on high standards of personal accountability.* To whom much is given, much is required (Luke 12:48). This entails accepting responsibility for organizational problems and mistakes before focusing on others (removing the log in our eye, Matthew 7:5). Change begins with the leader. Christian leaders reject the knee-jerk response to assign responsibility and blame to employees for poor performance and resistance to change, which is frequently the result of ineffective management, the manager's own resistance to change, and other contextual factors beyond employee control. SLHRM managers actively seek out the external factors that inhibit success first before assigning responsibility to employees.

18. *The use of organizational capital punishment (layoffs or termination) is an option of last resort.* The decision to terminate or lay off organizational members entails profound ethical and value-based examination of consequences on multiple levels, from the inherent morality of separating organizational members in a time of economic recession, to the impact on families and the community, to the procedural justice implications (the fairness of the process and its associated criteria), and the distributive justice consequences (who is deserving of a layoff).

19. *A key SLHRM principle is honoring our biblical obligations to the poor. This entails a commitment toward generating wealth for community investment and providing jobs.* This responsibility demonstrates internalization of the Golden Rule to address our loving duty to the needy and the downtrodden. SLHRM organizations do not "glean their fields" (Ruth 2) and extract every penny of value from their employees. They invest generously in training and employment opportunities to enhance the human capital of their low-wage workers. In the private sector, many investors support the social entrepreneurship model promoting a broader set of values other than short-term profit. This type of investing supports long-term wealth creation and a more responsible business community. Jesus invested in his disciples for the long term, not for a quick and superficial "return." Scripture provides clear guidance regarding our responsibility to help the poor and is a key component of our biblical job description. In the New and Old Testaments, there are over three hundred references to how we should treat the disadvantaged. One example is Isaiah 58:6–7, NRSV: "Is not this the fast that I choose: to loose the bonds of injustice, to undo the thongs of the yoke, to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke? Is it not to share your bread with

the hungry, and bring the homeless poor into your house; when you see the naked, to cover them, and not to hide yourself from your own kin?" It is clear that in this fallen world, humanity cannot eradicate poverty, as Jesus states: "For you always have the poor with you." (Matthew 26:11, NRSV) This reality does not invalidate our attempts to practice the Great Commandment (Matthew 22:37). The roots of poverty are an amalgam of social, political, economic, cultural, and most importantly, spiritual antecedent roots and causes. Hence, poverty is a classic systems issue at the individual, family, community, regional, national, and, world levels, reflecting the cumulative effects of flawed and sinful individual and collective decisions. From a biblical standpoint, the strategies for meeting the needs of the poor begin with philanthropy and our giving to the church and faith-based charitable organizations. However, in this regard, there exists "spiritual capital failure" as less than 5 percent of Christians provide the biblically recommend tithing level of 10 percent on earned income (Barna, 2013). When the measure is that of total wealth, the giving levels are even lower at 4.7 percent with the rich giving a lower percentage (4.2%) than the middle class (7.6%) (Gipple & Goss, 2013). Another key element in the Bible is the early church's communal focus, as seen in Acts 4:33–36, in which those blessed with abundance provided for those who lack. In the Old Testament, a powerful poverty reduction policy was the use of the sabbatical directed at reducing the deleterious influence of debt that resulted in slavery for the impoverished. The Bible directs Hebrew slaves to be released from bondage every seventh year (Exodus 21:2–6), and all debts canceled to break the cycle of poverty (Deuteronomy 15:1–6). Thus, the biblical ethos is one of grace, recognizing that long-term debt is an intolerable burden. Another key element is the sabbatical year in which every seventh year the fields were to lie fallow so the poor could harvest the residual crops (Exodus 23:10–11). In addition to the sabbatical years, every fiftieth year was the time of Jubilee (7 sabbatical cycles) in which slaves were freed and land returned to its original owners (Leviticus 25). From a biblical standpoint, what are the obligations of present-day employers? One implication is undertaking a concerted effort to provide income-generating opportunities for the poor. The key is to offer meaningful work to reinforce the dignity, confidence, and self-sufficiency of the poor. Hence, it is important to link poverty and charitable programs to some form of work effort for the able-bodied.

Performance Management Elements

1. *Cultivate and reward the demonstration of SLHRM courage and reasonable risk-taking.* Let us first define SLHRM courage by what it is not. It rejects self-aggrandizing behavior and decisions that promotes personal gain or advancement, notoriety, or adrenaline-pumping "organizational mountain climbing." SLRHM courage and risk-taking is another powerful manifestation of love that places the manager's position at risk to promote the altruistic completion of the mission, facilitate the growth and well-being of others, and/or protect them from harm (Meade, 2014). This type of courage and risk-taking is a rationale process based upon careful advance planning, a reasonable level of risk, and consultation with others.

2. *SLHRM organizations embrace a biblical model of leadership in which organizational members are consistently empowered and developed.* This entails adopting a systematic succession planning process, power sharing and delegation, mentoring and coaching programs, individual development plans, and adequate resource support and release time for training and education activities. Below are key elements of empowerment from a biblical standpoint.

   a. Commit to succession planning and leadership dispensability by mentoring successors as did Jesus with the disciples.

   b. Humility: Commit to endowing others with "a double share of your spirit" (2 Kings 2:9) as Elijah mentored Elisha and preparing others to accomplish even greater things (John 14:12).

   c. Esteem others greater than themselves (Philippians 2:3); bearing the burdens of others in love (Galatians 6:2), and looking out for the interests of others (Philippians 2:4).

   d. Reject inappropriate performance comparisons (2 Corinthians 10:12, Galatians 6:4–5) and dysfunctional competition (Galatians 5:26) that feeds the ego and promotes the sin of superiority and vain glory.

   e. Help others unbury talents (Matthew 25:24–25) and use them appropriately.

   f. Take joy when others succeed and sorrow when they fail, even those who oppose us (Proverbs 24:17).

   g. Serve supporters, detractors, and betrayers with love and excellence (Matthew 5: 46–48).

3. *Promoting servant followership in which organizational members accept responsibility for solving problems, exercising initiative, helping coworkers and clients even when inconvenient or contrary to personal interests.* Servant followership entails committing to godly excellence irrespective of

the obstacles and situation (working for God, not man, Colossians 3:23). Servant followers understand their strengths and weaknesses and select jobs or positions based upon their gifting and passions, thereby reducing stress on themselves and others. The true test of servant followership occurs when management or others fail to honor their commitments. Do we honor our Lord's command to love others unconditionally and serve "just and unjust managers" as Jacob served Laban (Genesis 37–31) and David with Saul (1 Samuel), or do we give ourselves over to worldly sorrows or temptations and embrace bitterness or vengeance? Servant followers "take the road less traveled" and embrace a commitment to mission achievement irrespective of the obstacles and the personal cost. Let us ask the Lord for the strength to not make excuses and rationalize away our responsibilities and take the high road. We need to model the example of God sending his rain on the just and unjust, as the sun rises for the evil and the good (Matthew 5:45).

4. *Cultivating godly excellence over worldly excellence.* Godly excellence entails four factors: obedience to God's will and word, the presence of holy motives (the desire of the heart), giving our best efforts regardless of the circumstances, and learning from our mistakes and correction from others. One of the greatest snares for Christian leadership is adopting secular standards of success (i.e., goal achievement, power, influence, reputation, money, resources) to replace Kingdom standards. When we adopt worldly measures, we can easily slide into idol worship. Kingdom metrics begin with promoting genuine love and unswerving obedience to God and seeking His will in all areas of our lives. Kingdom metrics entail a developmental process focus in which we cultivate Christ-like character in others. It is important that SLHRM organizations reject embracing the criteria of the secular marketplace to measure their success. I urge SLHRM organizations to embrace the higher standards represented by the Kingdom Business movement that provides a relevant example of viewing profits as means, and not as ends (see the Regent Center for Entrepreneurship, 2014 at http://www.regententrepreneur.org). The Kingdom Business ethos provides an alternative worldview on the role of commerce and the associated standards of excellence. Godly excellence encompasses most of the main elements of secular business success (profit, growth), but we must communicate that profit and sales growth is not a terminal objective or value, but an intermediate performance metric and resource in meeting the important needs of the client or customer, providing jobs, improving communities, and developing

employees. These are the broadly defined spiritual elements associated with the Great Commandment. A foundational principle is that profit for private business and net revenue for nonprofits and government is not an end, but a means to God-honoring mission accomplishment. The goal is to promote God's will and improve the physical and spiritual human condition. Hence, SLHRM organizations reject sophisticated marketing campaigns to generate or stimulate fleshly desires or to distort and manipulate ethical and moral spiritual motivation. For example, private companies often use marketing by stimulating the passions in three global areas, (1) fear and anxiety over losing quality-of-life elements such as health, (2) pride, competition, comparison, and a spirit of envy (keeping up with or exceeding your neighbor or peer group), and (3) cultivating a hedonistic and materialistic lifestyle. These marketing passions transform luxuries into necessities, which are really "desires" based upon lusts. For faith-based organizations and nonprofits, the manipulation takes on more subtle forms including: (1) exaggerating the degree of relationship and relevancy between the organization's mission and the donor's interests, passion and motivation for giving, (2) exaggerating the ROI from donations, and (3) manipulating donor emotions through exaggerated appeals and the use of graphic images of suffering.

5. *Promote sustainable and balanced workload and effort levels that challenge but do not overwhelm employees thereby reinforcing a God-honoring set of life priorities: God first followed by family, then work.* Christian leaders reinforce and cultivate godly-life priorities (life balance) rejecting "idol worship" work habits. The organization's mission, vision, and values reinforce a well-ordered set of life and work priorities ensuring that employees possess adequate time and energy for family responsibilities, personal refreshment, and church and community service. Christian leaders do not set unhealthy examples of organizational effort, encouraging idol worshiping workaholic behavior. Even though leaders may be able to sustain the 60-hour-week pace, many organizational members will fall by the wayside. Follow the example of Jacob who, when traveling, never went at a speed faster than the animals and children could safely traverse the terrain (Genesis 33:14). A contemporary example is vigorously promoting balanced attendance policies that encourage employees to reduce or eliminate presenteeism (working while ill) and remain at home until well.

6. *Promote work/life balance by providing employees with flexible work schedules (compressed work week, flex time), virtual workplace, nontraditional*

career paths (job sharing, part-time), regular sabbaticals, and generous family friendly benefits (child and elder care assistance). These policies reduce work and life stress for employees and their families. SLHRM employers authentically promote access to these programs and do not penalize employees for participating. Many organizations offer these benefits, but either discourage their use or view employees that utilize them as less committed and loyal. Other elements include providing Employee Assistance Plans (EAP) and wellness programs to promote preventive health care, physical fitness, and weight-loss and disease-management programs for existing illnesses.

7. *Driving fear and perfectionism out of the organization through promoting the godly pursuit of excellence and a culture of forgiveness.* This requires the redefinition of excellence as a long-term character and competency growth-building process that by definition requires mistakes, errors, and setbacks. Organizations should encourage, recognize, and reward members for good-faith failures through forgiveness policies and formally recognize and thank members for their efforts and sacrifice. A workplace based upon fear produces the spirit reflected in the parable of the talents (Matthew 25:14–30). We bury the gifts God give us because we are afraid of the punishment that comes with mistakes. Management by fear inhibits our God-given creativity attributes and produces a climate of compassion fatigue in which we are too tired or fearful to step outside of our protected zone and help others. We then become like the priest in the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10: 25–37) that passes on by the wounded in our path. The reference to the term "worldly sorrow" (2 Corinthians 7:10) refers to our free will decision to act on our fleshly impulses of anger, bitterness, and lack of forgiveness when we are hurt or threatened. When the instrument of our pain is those in leadership positions, the pain is even more intense. We must cast our worldly sorrow on the Lord and through the power of the Holy Spirit embrace an attitude of forgiveness. It is important to recognize that courage is not the absence of fear, but persisting in its presence. The Devil will use the lie that we must extinguish all fear to be worthy. That is another lie from the pit of hell as only God's perfect love casts out all fear (1 John 4:18), not our self-efforts. God only expects us to trust Him irrespective of the circumstances or our feelings. When fear controls our minds and actions, it is a product of placing more power and influence on the circumstances or the problem versus the promises of God for protection and deliverance.

When we fail to place God at the center of our lives, all efforts to medicate and control the pain and the associated fear result in failure leaving a void of insecurity at our core.

8. *Develop challenging but reasonable SMART goals (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, timely) and standards with employee input and participation.* Christian leaders do not impose unreasonable performance expectations regarding the quantity and quality of work, nor do they create role conflict situations (quantity versus quality) in which mutually contradictory expectations frustrate and discourage organizational members. Goal setting is the most effective motivational approach as it incorporates elements of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Locke & Latham, 1990). When we set challenging SMART goals, it focuses limited time and energy and helps employees avoid distractions. When those goals are accomplished, it produces a sense of intrinsic accomplishment and satisfaction. It also provides the foundation for the explicit linkage of goal attainment to organizational monetary and nonmonetary goals.

9. *Promoting accurate weights and measures, which is a reference to using precise metrics in all forms of interactions and transactions, including our interpersonal relationships* (Proverbs 16:11). In the performance appraisal process, this entails measuring performance accurately and fairly with minimal amounts of criterion contamination (e.g., includes non–job–related factors such as race) and deficiency (fails to include important elements of performance such as quality). Praise and encouragement is not withheld (a form of theft) thereby discouraging employees and tempting them to anger, given the absence of accurate character and performance corrective feedback that demonstrates a genuine love and concern.

Employee Development Principles

10. *SLHRM organizations treat contingent (temporary, contract, and part-time) workers with equal levels of respect, dignity, and support as full-time employees.* This entails rejecting any manifestation of "second class citizenship." The organization's treatment of contingent and part-time workers is another "window on the soul." Fair treatment equates with internal and external compensation equity, safe working conditions, an effective human capital investment infrastructure (orientation, training, and development), a valid and reliable performance management system, and ongoing encouragement and gratitude for their contributions and performance.

11. *SLHRM organizations treat volunteers with equal levels of respect, dignity, and support as full-time employees.* This entails providing such elements as clear job descriptions, regular performance feedback and performance appraisals, and ongoing encouragement and recognition, comprehensive orientation, and training sessions. "Word of mouth" marketing is an organization's best friend or worst nightmare. The treatment of volunteers is another "window on the soul" and a formal volunteer management plan will produce a more effective volunteer program with higher return-on-investment.

12. *Promote a long-term, grace-based view, of employee development.* Jesus patiently coached, mentored, and developed His disciples for the long term. He empowered and encouraged them to learn from mistakes and failures, thereby using these painful situations as the catalyst for spiritual character growth. Many organizations begin with good intentions, but are not able to escape the implicit value and belief system that focuses on short-term performance at the expense of long-term development. Just as people pleasing and affirmation anxiety can bind individuals, organizations can be bound to the fear of violating the expectation of clients, customers, donors or other key stakeholders for short-term gain. It requires strength of collective will and character to promote a long-term perspective. Patience is a foundational element of humility and empathy. Without patience, we are unable to reach out to others and take the time to understand their hidden pain and problems. It takes time to develop character, and its absence sabotages all of our gifts, abilities, and accomplishments. It is like a cancer that is starving us from the inside. Without Christian character, our work efforts are unauthorized and based upon fleshly motives that will not stand the test of fire (1 Corinthians 3:12). A major spiritual intelligence discipline is teachability, and one means for demonstrating our humility is voluntarily being placed under the authority of an accountability partner. We work out our salvation in relationships, and we must be willing to learn from others and receive discipline and corrective feedback. God is the master efficiency expert, and even when we sin and the attacks of the enemy sidetracks us, it is not really a diversion because God will take what was meant for evil and turn it into good (Genesis 50:20). God never wastes our pain, suffering, and sin, as reflected in Romans 8:28 NRSV: "We know that all things work together for good for those who love God, who are called according to his purpose." Hence, when we cast our problems, failures and sins at the foot of the cross, nothing done for the Lord is in vain

(1 Corinthians 15:58)! When we are transparent and confess, repent, and renounce, we will be in a position to help provide comfort and guidance for others. God is the master global positioning system. He sees the present, past, and future as one. He is omniscient, and knows the orientation of our heart and the choices we will make. As such, He uses even our mistakes and sins to prepare us for the realization of our calling and purpose. Forgiveness policies are consistent with the notion of a covenant relationship with mutual obligations and support. When an employer forgives an employee for a major mistake, it increases leadership and management trust and is consistent with the Christian message that God transforms our weaknesses into strengths. Discipleship growth must be promoted in the church, and we must challenge the notion that discipleship growth in the workplace should not be taught. Sherman and Hendricks (1987) reinforce that true change comes from the inside out, and effective Christian servant leadership requires that we both communicate (teach) and model these principles. Servant leaders are teachers reinforcing the essential elements of character growth and development in principle, word, and deed.

13. *Invest in all employees, not only the elite superstars*. SLHRM organizations recognize that every employee is worthy of appropriate growth and development opportunities according to their talents, performance, career and life goals, purpose, and needs. The objective is not a radical egalitarianism, but a celebration of the inherent gifts that each employee brings to the workplace. Long-term success requires the careful cultivation of individual and group work skills, both hard and soft. Success is always a collective, not an individual product.

14. *Place employees in areas of natural gifting, abilities, and passions*. Performance excellence is a natural by-product when SLHRM organizations select and place employees consistent with God's will and the employee's natural talents and spiritual gifts. Organizational selection decisions based on matching employee gifts, passion, and ability levels with job requirements produce significantly greater harmony levels. In addition, it is much easier to raise performance in areas of strength and giftedness than to remediate areas of weakness. It is joyful to operate in the "zone" that God designs for us. There are gifts and talents that we "bury" given the hurts, traumas, fears, and strongholds in our lives. I know from my personal experience that Satan engages in preemptive spiritual warfare to deceive us through regarding the presence of a gift, its appropriate use, or our level of gifting. When I was a freshman in college, I took the

Strong Interest Inventory test and discovered much to my chagrin that the two highest professions were teaching and the ministry, a strange combination for an atheist! I realize now that Satan used the anxiety and panic disorder and other mental illness elements to saddle me with fears and insecurities to keep me from using the talents and gifts God gave me. I thank the Lord that I somehow was able to move forward in spite of my fears in such areas as public speaking until the Lord began to deliver and illuminate. The point is that we have many gifts that remain dormant until the appropriate time, and this occurs at all ages. To God be the glory! As Bolles (2013) in his classic book *What Color is your Parachute?* noted, when we operate consistent with our abilities, gifts and passion, we are able to meet the critical needs in others that only we can supply. This blessed cycle is another manifestation of God's love as he gave each one of us the means to bring hope and joy to others.

15. *Adopt the body of Christ-centered perspective, facilitating healthy individual employee and team development.* This entails providing team building training and developing performance management and compensation systems that provide an appropriate balance between individual, team, and overall organization performance. Employees often receive excessive degrees of credit or blame for system and group performance issues. It is a challenging process to separate the individual from the group influences, but a concerted effort will produce a more valid and reliable performance measurement process.

16. *Engage in systematic workforce planning efforts that entail providing employees with adequate training programs, including individual development plans and individual learning accounts.* SLHRM organizations recognize that employees are the foundation of the organization, hence the need to demonstrate through significant resource investment that the organization is systematically committed to cultivating employee growth. Employees are reassured of their employer's commitment by training and development investment. This is even more important with the erosion of the traditional "psychological contract" of long-term job security in return for loyal and satisfactory performance.

17. *A genuine commitment to an expanded definition of diversity that transcends race and gender and includes a full range of human attributes.* This includes religion and spirituality in addition to the traditional elements of race, gender, age, and disability status. The focus is on enhancing awareness and understanding how subtle cultural conventions and practices disadvantage traditional minorities. The goal is to promote a culture of excellence in which only character and competency are the major factors that promote career development.

This master list of attributes reflects key Christian SLHRM princi-
ples and provides an architectural blueprint for the motives, means, and
ends that honor the Lord. The goal is not a legalistic adherence, but a
"heart of flesh" that embraces both the "letter and the spirit" of treat-
ing employees and other key stakeholders with godly love and respect.
It is a very demanding standard, the path less traveled, but it is clearly
the road that produces the most eternal value. The other key element is
to recognize that adherence to these principles does not guarantee suc-
cess, as the heroes of the faith in Hebrews 11 that did not see the prom-
ise in their lifetime demonstrates. In many cases, adherence to SLHRM
principles results in resistance, ridicule, persecution, and failure. The
world's and God's definition of success are very different. If you obey
the Lord irrespective of the outcome, you walk by faith and not by sight
(2 Corinthians 5:7) and earn the praise of the Lord, generating not hay,
wood, and stubble, but the eternal precious jewels of stone that stand the
test of fire (1 Corinthians 3:12). God's definition of success entails gener-
ating love-based relationships. Are you willing to get into the boat first
and then walk on the water when the Lord calls (Matthew 14: 22–33)?
I pray for the Lord's grace and favor in this regard to work out your salvation
with fear and trembling. To God be the glory!

CHAPTER 2

BIBLICAL FOUNDATION FOR SERVANT
LEADER PRINCIPLES

It is vitally important to establish the biblical foundation for the various servant leader principles that comprise SLHRM. This chapter provides a systematic list of key biblical attributes organized by five global servant leader attributes: servanthood, stewardship, servant leader behavior, servant leader character, and servant leader foresight. Each attribute includes biblical examples followed by contemporary servant leader application insight.

Biblical Foundation: Servanthood Attributes

Place Needs of Followers First: Abram provided Lot with first choice in dividing the land (Genesis 13). By deferring to a subordinate, this humble act reduces conflict plus demonstrates confidence in the subordinate's judgment while demonstrating a steadfast faith in the future.

Obedience and Willingness to Engage in Altruistic Sacrifice: Prime examples include Abraham agreeing to sacrifice his son, and Apostle Paul's ongoing willingness to sacrifice all (his life, health, wealth, comfort, fame) for the preaching of the Gospel (Genesis 22:1–19, 2 Corinthians 11:23–29). When we are willing to sacrifice an important part of our personal mission and identity for a greater good, this demonstrates a powerful personal faith, which is inspiring to others.

Balance of Servanthood and Stewardship

1. All four Gospels demonstrate the delicate balance between servanthood and stewardship. Unless Jesus accomplished the mission of obeying Father God by proclaiming the Kingdom of God,

manifesting miracles, and dying on the cross for the sins of mankind, His life and ministry would not possess its intended scope and impact. Hence, it is the balance of achieving the mission while loving and encouraging others as reflected in John 21. Servant leaders understand that like the biblical admonition of the balance of faith and works, we must balance stewardship mission achievement and servanthood.

2. Jesus set clear priorities. In sending out His disciples, Jesus instructed them to only minister to the nation of Israel and not the gentiles (Matthew 10:5–7). Servant leaders must set priorities with limited resources and time.

3. Jesus practiced altruism by giving His life for the forgiveness of sins (Matthew 20:28, Mark 10:45). Servant leaders esteem others greater than themselves and sacrifice their personal interests for the collective good.

Promote Best Interests of Others Irrespective of their Level of Support and Understanding: Jesus demonstrated an unswerving passion and commitment to implementing the plan provided by God the Father. He resisted the pressure of both supporters and opponents to bend to their agendas. Jesus resisted the desire of the disciples and His other followers to assume the mantle of warrior King and free the nation of Israel militarily. He resisted the demands of the Pharisees to cease key aspects of His ministry given their jealously and the fear of alienating the Romans, His breaking of legalistic interpretations of the law such as no healing on Sunday, and the pressure to become a "genie-like" provider of miracles (Luke 24:21, Acts 1:6–7, Matthew 23, Mark 10:2, Mark 12:13, Luke 13:31, Luke 16:13–15, John 8:3, Luke 23:8). Servant leaders understand that the loving exercise of power is not a pure democracy, and like our republican form of government, servant leaders must uphold key principles of integrity and promote the long-term best interest of the subordinates even when it is not recognized or desired.

Unity: The Apostle Paul understood the importance of mission unity and focusing not on individual, but on collective achievements, emphasizing that we should not glory in the self, but in being used by God to complete the mission (1 Corinthians 1:10–13, 1 Corinthians 2:2, 1 Corinthians 3:10–15). Servant leaders cultivate an ethos in which all employees possess a clear understanding that what unites all employees is the importance of mission achievement, hence the emphasis on collective goals.

Servant Followers: Paul admonishes all Christians to reflect that accountability is first and foremost birthed from God's authority. Hence, we should recognize that our true "supervisor" is always the Lord and

work with excellence in all settings (Colossians 3:22–23). Servant leaders promote servant followership, or working with excellence irrespective of the supervision level or quality. We need to serve just and unjust, skilled and unskilled managers, with excellence.

Commitment to Work/Life Balance: Jesus understood and modeled the practice of rest and harmony with our various life seasons. Jesus spent time alone in prayer to remain spiritually connected to God the Father and rested on a regular basis. He understood that humans must be connected to both the life-giving elements of spiritual and physical renewal (Matthew 14:23, Luke 9:18, Mark 6: 30–32, John 15:1–7). Servant leaders model a commitment to work/life balance by limiting work hours, setting boundaries on accessibility, utilize paid time off (vacations, holidays, etc.), and refresh themselves during the workday by taking breaks and lunch hours.

Sustainable Work Pace: Jacob traveled at the pace of the children and animals (Genesis 33:12–14). Servant leaders understand the importance of a reasonable work pace to avoid exhausting employees.

Reduce Status Difference and Demonstrate Commitment to Teamwork

1. Nehemiah worked on the efforts to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem himself, demonstrating his personal commitment to the cause (Nehemiah 5). Servant leaders authentically and enthusiastically perform the work of subordinates when necessary to reduce burdens and demonstrate empathy.

2. The Apostle Paul referred to the church as the "Body of Christ" and used the analogy of the body to demonstrate the system interconnectedness and mutual dependency of the various components of an organization. Hence, each bodily component's (team member) unique role and function must be respected and acknowledged. Another example is that of agriculture where some plant, some sow, but God gives the increase reinforcing that success is ultimately God's and all team members are important contributors (Romans 12:4–8, 1 Corinthians 3:10–15). Servant leaders cultivate teamwork and understand that all employees, from the most skilled to unskilled, to the most visible to invisible, are important to the success of the organization and mission.

3. Elijah's great victory in defeating the prophets of Baal on Mt. Carmel was conducted under the assumption that he was the only prophet or line of defense (1 Kings 18). Servant leaders can still be used by God with mistaken assumption and motives.

4. Elijah became overwhelmed after his confrontation with the prophets of Baal on Mt. Carmel for several reasons, including isolating himself from other prophets and an absence of teamwork given his pride. He became depressed, fled into the desert, and asked God to kill him because he believed he was alone. God corrected him by stating that there were 7,000 other prophets who had not bowed down to Baal (1 Kings 19:18). Servant leaders recognize the need to set boundaries and to work as a team. Prolonged work completed in isolation leads to depression and negative emotions.

Social Justice

1. Nehemiah ended the practices of usury, land foreclosures for indebtedness, and committing debtors to slavery. He donated his food allowance to a worker food program feeding 150 officials (Nehemiah 5). Servant leaders possess a passion for relieving suffering, promoting a higher quality of life, and reducing excessive levels of inequality.

2. Scripture reinforces the personal and corporate obligation to consider and meet the needs of the poor (Proverbs 21:13, 22:8–9, 22). Servant leaders understand that employees are more engaged and committed when the mission of the organization's and their specific job duties and goals promote altruistic causes.

3. In the Book of Acts, the early believers developed a communitarian culture in which financial resources were shared. Paul reinforced the importance of promoting equality within the church by having those with resources help those without (Acts 2:42–47, Acts 4:32–35, 2 Corinthians 8:13–15). Servant leaders understand the importance of promoting confidence in the inherent fairness of the HR system, equality of opportunity, and providing support for employees when they are experiencing financial, health, or performance challenges. For example, when organizations face budget challenges, hours are reduced collectively to avoid layoffs, and employees are encouraged to donate sick or personal leave to ill employees who have exhausted paid leave.

Biblical Foundation: Stewardship Attributes

God–Honoring Accountability

1. David committed many major sins and mistakes including: (1) focusing on the strength of his army and not God's power by taking a census of his troops over the objection of his general Joab,

(2) by his ignorance of priestly protocol in moving the Arc, resulting in the death of Uzzah who steadied the cart with his hands (1 Chronicles 13:8–10), and (3) committing adultery with Bathsheba and then having her husband killed (2 Samuel 11, 2 Samuel 24:1–3, 1 Chronicles 13:8–10). Servant leaders can make many serious mistakes and sins, but if their heart is soft toward God and they willingly repent, thereby learning from their trials and mistakes, enhancing their credibility and trust in the view of subordinates and other key stakeholders.

2. Nehemiah, when learning of the condition of the temple and the City of Jerusalem, accepted responsibility for the sins of his ancestors in not restoring the temple by offering passionate, genuine, and heartfelt prayers of repentance. Daniel also provided a similar prayer of responsibility for the collective historical sins of Israel (Nehemiah 1 and Daniel 9). Servant leaders assume responsibility for the organization's overall performance and the events outside of their control contributing to the problems.

3. Jesus understood that in order for us to be credible in providing feedback to others, we first must look inward and relentlessly self-examine our own heart, attitudes, and actions before we counsel or correct others. We must remove the "log" from our own eye by first acknowledging our weaknesses, sins, and contributions to a problem. This enables us to more accurately see the dysfunctional and sinful issues in ourselves and others and begin the repentance process (Matthew 7:5). Servant leaders understand their own fallibility and the presence and effect of their own weaknesses and sins. They understand that in order for a just and fair outcome to be produced, they must establish their personal credibility and avoid even the appearance of hypocrisy. Second, they understand that they cannot properly diagnose the potential cause and solutions if their internal lenses are flawed. When we fail to acknowledge a weakness or sin in our own life, we frequently react with a higher degree of emotional intensity when that same problem or issue occurs in others.

The Absence of God-Honoring Accountability: Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden were tempted by the serpent to become like God (Genesis 3:1–13) and ate the fruit from the Tree of Knowledge. When God confronted them, Eve blamed the serpent and Adam blamed Eve. They rationalized away and externalized responsibility, thereby hiding from God and justifying their disobedience. Servant leaders recognize an absence of accountability in themselves and others. They lead by example and admit their mistakes and sins.

Vision

1. Abraham unconditionally obeyed God to leave his home with no clear directions (Hebrews 11:8–12) and Noah followed God precisely in building the arc even with no prior experience in boat building, living hundreds of miles from the ocean, and residing in a very dry climate with no rain (Genesis 6–9). It is important to possess the faith and courage to begin leadership journeys with only a general sense of direction.
2. Nehemiah provided the people with a clear vision of a finished temple, providing hope (Nehemiah 4). Servant leaders provide a clear and compelling vision that justifies the costs and sacrifices in mission achievement. Without hope, motivation vanishes.

Discipline

1. Giving and receiving discipline is another form of love in the Bible. Those whom we love, we will not allow to destroy themselves with sinful practices. There are many scripture passages that reinforce that the person of wisdom seeks and accepts discipline and correction. Discipline and correction are not pleasant at the time, but they produce a pleasant and powerful fruit of humility, growth, health, and long life (Proverbs 3:11–12, Proverbs 9:11, 10:8, 10:17, 12:1, 13:1, 13:10, 13:13, 13:24, 15:5, 15:10, 15:32, 19:18, 19:20, 23:13–14). Servant leaders understand the critical importance of correcting and disciplining in love, both as a recipient and as a transmitter. The ability to receive and respond in the appropriate spirit is a foundational element of humility and an essential element of spiritual and emotional intelligence. The key is to receive feedback from all sources with an open mind, recognizing that helpful information comes from friends and foes alike.
2. One of the key indicators of a rebellious and foolish spirit is resisting correction in which the receiver lashes out and attacks the provider of the discipline (Proverbs 9:7, 13:13, 13:18). When leaders resist correction, it reflects a combination of pride and the fear and the erroneous assumption that the truth equates with losing respect, power, and control. This characteristic encourages other employees to resist transparency, corrections, and ultimately authority.

Wisdom in Decision Making: Wise decision makers in the Bible seek out counsel from trusted advisors (Proverbs 10:14, 15:22). Servant leaders understand the importance of diverse perspectives in the decision-making process,

recognizing their personal limits and the presence of cognitive biases in themselves and others. Hence, they seek advice from a diverse group of knowledgeable and trustworthy sources to expand the scope of information, incorporate alternative views, and test their own assumptions.

Respect for Authority: The Apostle Paul clearly indicates that civil and governmental authority is derived from God's power and must be respected and honored with our heartfelt obedience. Hence, by extension it is our duty to obey those in authority throughout our various life domains (government, employer, family, elders) conferring respect, honor, financial support, and reverence. We are all called to pray for the wisdom, favor, and well-being of those who exercise authority over us to promote peace and harmony (Romans 13:1–8, 1 Timothy 2:1–4, 1 Timothy 5:1–2, Titus, 2: 9–10, 3:1–2). Servant leaders should demonstrate reverence and respect for the authority figures in their professional and personal domains. In addition, they should confer and demonstrate respect toward their subordinates and their contributions.

Biblical Foundation: Servant Leader Behavior Attributes

Empower Others and Make Self Dispensable: Jesus understood that to empower others effectively we should first be under authority. Jesus stated that all of His actions were completed under the authority of the Father. Second, He understood that growth requires detailed mentoring and coaching. Jesus taught the masses, but He discipled the few. Jesus provided clear instructions and ample feedback, understanding that learning requires trial and error. Most importantly, Jesus took genuine joy and pride in seeing His disciples grow and succeed, and more so, exceed the accomplishments of the teacher (John 5:19, Matthew 13:34–35, Mark 4:10–12, Luke 8:9–11, Luke 22:31–32, John 14:12). Genuine empowerment is a great challenge for servant leaders. It requires a significant investment of time, energy, patience, and commitment to the well-being of others. Servant leaders define success in the degree of growth and success those under them experience, with the goal of increasing the sum total of capacity and performance from both a character and competency level for each succeeding generation.

Succession Planning and Discipleship

1. Elisha demonstrated his commitment and motivation to learning under Elijah by killing his oxen and burning his equipment (1 Kings 19:19–21). Servant leaders understand the importance of

setting priorities and limiting their options by making decisions at the appropriate time and fashion that demonstrate unswerving commitment to the mission.

2. Elisha demonstrated his passion to serve by boldly asking for a double portion of Elijah's spirit (2 Kings 2:9). Servant leaders select mentors and sponsors who possess godly and anointed characteristics and attributes at higher ability and gifting levels than themselves, while the servant leader as mentor possesses the humility and self-confidence to mentor a replacement who will exceed his or her power, influence, and accomplishments.

Shared Leadership Model: In the Book of Acts and as described in Galatians, the disciples developed a shared, team-based leadership approach. A clear example is Peter's explanation in Acts 15 of his rationale for extending the Gospel to the gentiles (Acts 2, Acts 15, Galatians 2). Servant leaders share power and embrace a team perspective.

Exercise Upward Influence: Moses consistently exercised upward influence, interceding before God to ask for mercy and forgiveness for the sins and mistakes of followers (Numbers 14:13–20, Numbers 21:6–8). Servant leaders are good shepherds and aggressively petition higher authority to protect the well-being of subordinates. They perform with excellence, and so they possess the credibility and influence with their superior to secure key resources to protect and prosper their subordinates.

Honest and Balanced Performance Feedback: Scripture emphasizes the importance of using "honest weights and measures," which represents employing honest and transparent standards in all forms of human interaction, from business relationships to our family relationships. In essence, when we fail to tell the truth in love, we are "stealing" in one form or another (Proverbs 11:11, 20:10, 20:23). Servant leaders understand the importance of accuracy and fairness in their interactions with employees, customers, clients, and other key stakeholders. For example, in providing performance feedback we steal from our employees when we fail to provide adequate monetary and other forms of recognition/rewards for good performance, or when we fail to provide corrective feedback to facilitate accountability, growth, and learning.

Providing Public Recognition: The Apostle Paul provided clear, specific, and ample positive recognition and feedback to many workers in the church, from Timothy, his hand-picked successor, to lesser known but important church workers (Romans 16:1–16, Philippians 2:25, Colossians 4:7). Servant leaders praise in public, understanding the importance of communal recognition for a job well done. Public recognition is a powerful motivator and source of encouragement in challenging times.

Conflict Resolution: The Apostle Paul demonstrated a godly response to conflict when Peter refused to eat with gentiles, given pressure by Jewish Christians to uphold traditional Judaic law. Paul confronted Peter directly before the church leadership and provided a clear and specific theological rationale for placing only a few Jewish law restrictions on gentiles in the appropriate setting (Galatians 2:11–15). Servant leaders confront others in love, not with the goal of humiliating or dominating, but challenging in love based upon moral and spiritual principles that promote the well-being of others and uphold moral and spiritual principles.

Biblical Foundation: Servant Leader Character Attributes

Humility and Teachability, Empowerment

1. Moses accepted the advice of his father-in-law Jethro to delegate responsibility for judging disputes to 50 carefully selected elders, thereby reducing decision-making burdens (Exodus 18:13–27). Leaders must embrace humility to receive corrective feedback and grant power to subordinates.
2. Moses engaged in systematic succession planning by empowering, anointing, and training Joshua (Numbers 27:17–19, Deuteronomy 31:1–7). Servant leaders make themselves dispensable and publicly declare a successor with enthusiasm.
3. Paul engaged in long-term succession planning carefully grooming Timothy by providing a full range of developmental experiences (1 Timothy 4:12, 1 Timothy 6:11–21, 2 Timothy 3:10–17, Philippians 2:19, patience, 1 Timothy 5:22). Servant leaders invest significant amounts of time and energy in personally mentoring and coaching successors.
4. The disciples recognized the need for delegation and empowerment in Acts 6. The disciples were becoming overwhelmed with the demands of administering a food program, reducing time for other key tasks. To address this issue, they delegated the administrative duties to carefully selected leaders in the church (Acts 6:2–4). Servant leaders recognize when work demands become counterproductive with high opportunity costs, they actively delegate and empower to reduce the burdens and enhance organizational effectiveness.

Humility

1. Moses was instructed by God to demonstrate a higher level of God's power by speaking to the rock to bring forth water but because of his anger with the complaining of the Israelites he struck the rock

instead (Numbers 20:1–13). This was a serious act of disobedience and reflected that pride was influencing Moses's decision making making him a less reliable instrument of God's power. There is a higher degree of accountability for those in leadership positions, requiring a humble heart to receive and accept discipline.

2. John the Baptist refused to compete with Jesus for followers, understanding that it was his time to reduce his ministry as that of Jesus increased (Matthew 3:11, John 3:30). Servant leaders actively embrace and promote the growth and success of others and voluntarily relinquish power to promote the common good.

3. Jesus demonstrated His humility by being baptized by John the Baptist, pleasing the Father greatly (Matthew 3:15). Servant leaders recognize the collective nature of authority embedded within the organization and team.

4. The Apostle Paul was not threatened by evangelists who preached the Gospel with self-serving motives or by opponents who attacked him, as long as they were preaching the Gospel and people were being brought to Christ (2 Corinthians 12:7–10). Servant leaders do not exert ego ownership over the mission and rejoice when progress is made, irrespective of the source and the cost to their personal reputation.

Pride: Pride is the root sin motive that produced the envious spirit in both the angelic and human realms. Satan desired to usurp the power of God and become God, and Adam and Eve wanted to be like God. The end result was chaos and death in the spiritual and natural realms. As it states in Proverbs 16:18, pride goes before a fall. Another great example is that of the Tower of Babel in which the inhabitants of the city were unified in their desire to exalt their names into heaven. With unity of purpose comes great power regardless of the morality of the motives, means, and ends (Genesis 3, Genesis 11, Ezekiel 28, Isaiah 14, Revelation 12:9, Proverbs:11:11, 13:10, 14:30, 16:18, 16:25, 18:12, 19:21, 21:2, 21:4). Servant leaders relentlessly examine themselves for the presence of pride. Pride appears in its most pernicious form in times of success in which it is tempting to take credit for the successes born of God's power and that of the team talents and contributions that support the leader. Another key element is a recognition of our moral limits in using power and influence. As with the Tower of Babel, our intellectual and creative capacities will exceed our moral capacity to manage the power gained with self-serving motives.

Integrity: Daniel possessed great favor and credibility with the king given his excellence of character, competency, and performance, which

created great jealousy and anger among the other advisors. Given his unquestioned integrity, his opponents could not find any credible charges of misconduct. They had one weapon that they could use against Daniel: the king's own vanity in being viewed as a god. They convinced the king to pass a law stating that for a 30-day period only the king could be the object of prayers, upon the penalty of death. Daniel was thrown into the lion's den only to be miraculously protected, vindicating him and leading to the execution of those who had brought the false accusations. In Scripture, those who used deceitful means to attack others reaped a bitter harvest (Daniel 6, Proverbs 10:9, Proverbs 11:3). Servant leaders should expect attacks against their integrity because of their excellence and good example. Servant leaders do not recant the truth for expediency's sake and trust God for protection. Those who engage in immoral acts of deception will reap a bitter harvest.

Testing of our Motives: The Apostle Paul continually emphasized the importance of ongoing internal examination of our motives. We can be pursuing good and honorable objectives with ethical means but with the wrong motives. Love in its various forms is the foundational motive of the Kingdom (1 Corinthians 13, 1 Corinthians 3:11–15, 1 Thessalonians 2:5). The examination of our motives is an essential element of leadership and personal growth. Without the deep introspection of our motives, we gradually lose our ability to discern the ethical, moral, and spiritual nuances of our actions that contribute to rationalizing and justifying self-serving and sinful behavior. A great challenge is our ability to select the appropriate form of love given the needs of a specific situation.

Respect for 360-Degree Authority

1. David patiently and skillfully endured the attacks of King Saul and remained a loyal and highly effective servant and military commander, recognizing that God would vindicate him, even when presented with golden opportunities to kill Saul, his enemy (1 Samuel 18:10–11, 1 Samuel 19:9, 1 Samuel 24:3–4, 1 Samuel 26:7). Servant leaders serve just and unjust masters with excellence, resisting the impulse to take revenge or to vindicate themselves.

2. David not only respected higher authority but also understood the importance of honoring the authority and expertise of his men and the dignity of subjects. David's men heard his desire for a drink of water from a well that was in enemy hands and sent a team to secure the water. However, David did not want to take advantage of his troop's commitment and poured out the water (2 Samuel 23:15–17). Servant leaders recognize that their success is the product of a team

effort and therefore do not take advantage of subordinate desire to please those in authority.

3. When David was cursed in public by a subject, he did not retaliate, trusting God for vindication (2 Samuel 16:5–14, Proverbs 16:7, Proverbs 20:22). Servant leaders do not respond to public insults or slander, trusting God to protect and vindicate.

Emotional Regulation and Regulation of Speech

1. Scripture is replete with guidance and encouragement to monitor and regulate (Proverbs 13:3, 15:1, 15:13, 15:23) our internal dialogue promoting self-awareness (Proverbs 16:2, 21:2). This comes in the forms of identifying and replacing anxious and fearful thoughts with those of God's promises of protection, faith, and hope (Proverbs 10:24–25, 12:25, 13:3, 15:1, 15:13, 15:23, 16:2, 17:22, 18:14, 21:2). A central element of success for the servant leader is to replace and not repress dysfunctional and stress-inducing thoughts with God-honoring thoughts that reduce dysfunctional thinking and the associated negative emotions that adversely influence decision making and physical health. When leaders are self-aware regarding their sources of stress, they can reduce their cognitive distortions and thereby become more effective leaders, reducing the stress on their subordinates. A key element of leadership is to reduce the stress levels of employees, and this begins with self-examination and understanding of our personal risk factors, trigger points, and appropriate solutions. Second, it is important to understand the stress risk factors for your employees and reduce their presence and influence. In order to understand the stress-inducing triggers of others, we must be emotionally connected and engaged through vital and vibrant communication and relationships.

2. Our words possess the power of "life and death." From a biblical standpoint, the motive behind our speech is to "speak truth in love" to glorify God and promote God's will and best interest for others. In addition, we must speak gently, monitoring our body language and tone of voice (Proverbs 15:1, Ephesians 4:15). Servant leaders carefully reflect before speaking, recognizing the power and influence of words on subordinates and other stakeholders. They understand the importance of not only the content of their speech, but the motive, tone, and body language that combine to produce the received meaning. Research indicates that in order to maintain a healthy relationship, there should be at approximately a 5.6 to 1 ratio of positive and negative comments (Zenger & Folkman, 2013).

Workplace forgiveness: Joseph did not retaliate against his brothers who sold him into slavery, Potiphar who imprisoned him after a false accusation of attempted rape, or the cupbearer who reneged on his promise to petition Pharaoh to release him from prison after interpreting his dream (Genesis 39, 40, 50:20). The greatest example of forgiveness relates to Jesus and His disciples with the events surrounding the crucifixion. Jesus appeared to His disciples after the resurrection on the shores of the Sea of Galilee. Jesus demonstrated His love for Peter, John, and the other disciples by His public forgiveness of their abandonment, denial, flight, and doubt. He empowered the disciples through assigning the Great Commission and Commandment, conferring the Holy Spirit in John 21 and at Pentecost (Acts 2). All four gospels reinforce this great example of grace (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, John 21, Acts 2, Mark 10:45). Servant leaders understand the power of forgiveness in healing wounds and promoting relationship restoration. When leaders who are in a position of power avoid retaliating, this sends a powerful message of forgiveness, enabling others to accept forgiveness and forgive themselves.

Faith and trust: Joshua and Caleb were sent along with ten other Israelite spies to survey the Promised Land (Israel). They were the only two to urge Israel to attack, trusting God for provision and protection. The report of the other ten spies that the enemy was too strong generated fear and doubt, leading to a decision to disobey God's command to attack Canaan (Number 13:16 to Numbers 14:25). Servant leaders trust God and not the power of the circumstances. As such, they assume calculated risks that promote mission achievement.

Courage

1. Gideon was selected by God but still manifested fears and doubts. He asked four times for evidence of God's provision and protection in the form of a supernatural burning of the offering, a fleece being dried and then wet spontaneously, and to overhear the conversation in the enemy camps regarding a dream heralding their defeat (Judges 6:17–24, Judges 6:33–39, Judges 7:9–14). Servant leaders understand that courage is not the absence of fear, but persisting in its presence. As such, they are not excessively prideful nor refuse to ask for help or reassurance. In effect, they fear the Lord and obey His commands over their natural fears.

2. A shepherd boy David, agreed to fight the Philistine champion Goliath when all trained soldiers hid in fear. David did not use the traditional armor of his day, using only the tools of his trade (slingshot) that reflected his natural and spiritual gifts developed in his

shepherding responsibilities (1 Samuel 17). Servant leaders use their natural gifts and abilities to defeat the Goliaths of fear that appear in organizational life. They reject trying to use tools and strategies that are not within their skills and ability level.

3. Nehemiah demonstrated great courage in resisting the repeated intimidating threats of Sanballat the Horonite, Tobiah the Ammonite official, and Geshem. These threats included filing complaints that Nehemiah desired to make himself king and was rearming the nation of Israel (Nehemiah 2:19–20). Servant leaders trust God for protection in the face of threats and obstacles, recognizing that God is responsible for the outcome. They also take concrete actions to reduce the threat to their subordinates.

4. Nehemiah ignored the threats of Sanballat and his supporters and took concrete steps to reassure his followers by providing them with weapons and organized the deployment of guards to protect the workers (Nehemiah 4). Servant leaders understand the importance of symbolic and concrete actions to reduce anxiety and fear among subordinates.

5. When threatened with death for disobeying laws to worship the Persian Kings Nebuchadnezzar and King Darius, Shadrach, Mescah, Abednego, and Daniel all made the decision to fear and obey God more than the power of the king. They refused to worship the pagan idols and incurred the wrath of the king with trips to a fiery furnace and a lion's den. In both cases, they trusted that God would ultimately protect and vindicate, whether in life or in death (Daniel 3, 6). Servant leaders honor the deontological principles of honoring God's commandments irrespective of the cost. They would rather fail and suffer the consequences than gain a short-term success at the expense of integrity and sinning against God.

Fear

1. Saul demonstrated a greater concern with the reactions of his subjects and soldiers than obeying God. For example, when he was instructed by the prophet Samuel to wait for seven days before the sacrifice, Saul grew fearful when the seventh day arrived and Samuel was absent and his men began to scatter. Out of desperation and fear he inappropriately assumed the role of a priest and conducted the sacrifice himself in violation of God's general and specific command (1 Samuel 13:1–15). Servant leaders resist the temptation to adopt unethical or immoral means when circumstances appear dire. They are patient and place the "fear of man" in perspective.

2. Saul demonstrated his fear of confrontation and displeasing others by not obeying God's instructions to completely destroy the Amalekites and their possessions. He was more afraid of the reaction of his men than of obeying God and allowed his soldiers to keep sheep and goats as plunder and for sacrifices to the Lord (1 Samuel 15:24). Servant leaders "fear God first," thereby resisting the temptation to compromise to placate subordinates.

3. Saul became angry, jealous, and envious when David was acclaimed for killing tens of thousands to Saul's thousands (1 Samuel 18:17). The process of comparison is fraught with danger for servant leaders. It leads to pride, fear, and complacency, undermining the ability to empower others and solve organizational problems.

Persistence

1. Daniel demonstrated great persistence in prayer when his prayers were blocked for 21 days by the "Prince of Persia," a demonic spirit (Daniel 10). Servant leaders persevere and grow through obstacles and resistance. Irrespective of the length of time, servant leaders remain committed to achieving the mission.

2. When Moses was sent before Pharaoh, God did not provide immediate success. In fact, the demands of Moses resulted in harsher treatment of the Israelites by Pharaoh (gathering their own straw in making bricks, Exodus 5:7–11) and more disappointment. However, these trials strengthened the resolve of Moses and Israel and set the foundation for the greatest miracle, the parting of the Red Sea and freedom for the Israelites (Exodus 14). Servant leaders understand that perusing a righteous course of action may increase resistance and produce short-term failure. However, they trust God for protection and the ultimate outcome.

Hope: Without hope, we become susceptible to many forms of negative emotions that lead to mental and physical illness (Proverbs 13:12). A major element of servant leadership is to give employees hope in trying circumstances. Without hope, employee stress level increases and performance decreases.

Response to Failure: Jesus demonstrated the delicate balance of grace and accountability as He led the disciples through the various seasons of His ministry. These successive seasons increased the demands on the disciples, requiring growth and learning, which occurred through trial and error. Jesus provided ongoing loving correction founded upon unconditional forgiveness for key character and competency-related failures

including lack of faith when under pressure (John the Baptist and his imprisonment, Matthew 11:3), failure to ground their works on God's power as demonstrated in their inability to cast out the demon in Mark 9, demonstrating pride in desiring a place of leadership without earning the position (Luke 9:46), being more concerned with the role and success of others (John 21:21–22), the inability to stay awake and pray in the Garden of Gethsemane (Matthew 26:41), fleeing at the arrest of Jesus (Mark 14:50), Peter's denial of knowing Jesus (John 18:15–27), and doubting whether Jesus was raised from the dead (Matthew 28:17). Jesus understood that growth takes time, experience, and enduring trials, tribulations, and failure of self and others (Mark 14:16–72, Matthew 26:56, John 20:19–23, Luke 7:18–28, Luke 22:31–34, Luke 24:25–37, Matthew 28:16–20, and John 20:24–29). Servant leaders understand that failure and character flaws are ubiquitous elements of human nature and they take a long-term, developmental approach. Learning and growth entail responding to life's full range of experiences, positive to negative, failure to success.

Trials and Testing

1. Trials and tribulations are tools that God uses to refine our character. Hence, we should welcome the presence of problems as opportunities to grow in godly faith and character. As it states in Romans 8:28, all things produce good for those who love God and are called according to His purposes (see also Proverbs 17:3). Servant leaders understand that growth and learning occur within the crucible of enduring trials, tribulation, and failures with hope and faith producing both character and competency, growth and improvement. Hence, HR practices must reinforce that failure and trials are normal and necessary elements of learning.

2. All the great biblical figures in the Old and New Testament endured a time of severe testing to promote godly character before they were promoted to positions of authority. This assumed 40 years in the wilderness for Moses and 13 years in prison for Joseph in the Old Testament to Jesus fasting for 40 days in the wilderness to weaken His human strength before His confrontation with Satan. The temptation of Jesus in the wilderness illustrated three great temptations. The first was to use authority and abilities to satisfy short-term needs or desires as well as reducing pain and suffering at our convenience ("turn these stones into bread," Luke 4:1–4), thereby ignoring the higher order mission imperatives of trusting God and living from his provision. The second was to obtain

power and influence without pain or suffering (Satan promised to give Jesus the ability to rule all the world's kingdoms, Luke 4:5–8), thereby promoting self-interests versus the altruistic use of power and authority that requires great personal cost, in other words being a gambler searching for the "jackpot" versus an investor patiently building for the future. The final temptation was to use sensational means of self-promotion ("throw yourself off the temple," Luke 4:9–12) without having to invest the time, energy, and pain required for character growth (Luke 4). Servant leaders understand that great responsibility requires godly character. Hence, employees should not be promoted until they possess the character attributes to manage the authority and power appropriately.

Patience

1. Sarah and Abraham became impatient in waiting for the birth of their promised son and took action to accelerate the process by permitting Abraham to impregnate Hagar, Sarah's servant, thereby creating jealousy, division, and discord within the family (Genesis 16). When leaders lose patience and adopt expedient but unethical strategies, it produces significant negative unintended consequences.
2. Esau gave up his birthright to satisfy his intense hunger after returning from a hunting trip (Genesis 25:19–34). Leaders who respond to short-term pressures in expedient and/or inappropriate ways produce high long-term cost, loss, and dysfunction.
3. Moses led the people of Israel for 40 years in the wilderness despite ongoing challenges to his authority, disobedience, rebukes from God, and the daily heavy leadership burdens (Numbers 14:26–38). Leaders must be willing to endure long periods of isolation and little perceived progress while continuing to inspire confidence and hope in the ultimate success of the mission.
4. Joshua demonstrated exceptional patience and faith in serving 40 years before being promoted to leader of the tribes of Israel, replacing his mentor Moses (Joshua 1:1–18). Servant leaders are patient in their career progress and development. They are pleased to assist senior leaders and allow others to receive the credit.

Contentment: Contentment is a foundational biblical virtue. Contentment is not resignation, but a trust that God is working for our good in our present circumstances with hope for the future (Proverbs 15:16–17).

Servant leaders communicate that they are pleased with employees, but not satisfied, recognizing the value of present contributions while exhibiting confidence in the employee's capacity for future growth and development.

Ministry of Interruptions: Jesus understood the balance among planning, priorities, and unscheduled opportunities. Jesus continually modeled His willingness to interrupt His current task or activity to address the needs of those who reached out to Him. He healed the woman with the issue of blood, two blind men, and blind Bartimaeus, among others. A powerful example of flexibility on priorities is the Canaanite woman with the demon-possessed daughter who interrupted Jesus at a banquet. Jesus initially proclaimed that the focus of His ministry was for the Jews only, but her faith and persistence led Jesus to grant her request and heal her daughter (Mark 5: 25–34, Matthew 9:26–28, Mark 10:46–52, Matthew 15:21–28). Servant leaders understand the importance of relationship cultivation in unplanned encounters. In essence, there are not accidents from a Christian worldview belief system as all interactions possess a greater purpose. When leaders seek out unplanned interactions, it cultivates relationship trust, understanding, and commitment.

Response to Persecution: Jesus unequivocally trusted God the Father for His protection and vindication. When Pontius Pilate marveled at the silence of Jesus to the accusations against Him, Jesus stated that no power was given accept that which was granted by God to promote his will and the mission (Matthew 15:4–6, Mark 15:3–5). Hence, all situations work to the good of those who love God and are called according to His purpose (Romans 8:28). Servant leaders are confident and faithful, trusting God for ultimate vindication irrespective of the degree of persecution and the nature of the circumstances.

Overlooking Offenses: Scripture reinforces the importance of not reacting with negative emotions such as anger, bitterness, rejection, and fear to the intentional or unintentional offenses of others. When we overlook the offense, it demonstrates that we are "dying" to our selfish pride, rejecting the human tendency to engage in an "eye for an eye" retaliation toward the offending party. Our human nature is to desire justice for others, but grace, patience, and forgiveness for ourselves (1 Peter 3:9, Proverbs 19:11). Servant leaders understand that overlooking offenses reduces the intensity of conflict and promotes harmony. When we overlook offenses, it removes a powerful weapon of manipulation and control that others have over us. The capacity to overlook offenses increases our effectiveness in cultivating trust with others and effectively interacting with difficult people.

Servant Leader Lessons from the Ministry of Jesus: Sermon on the Mount

1. We are called to be "poor in spirit," which means to recognize our dependency on God to accomplish our mission (Matthew 5:3). Servant leaders recognize that in order to accomplish the mission given life's complexity and obstacles, a team and a higher power is needed.

2. We are called to "mourn" and recognize our weakness and sin in order to receive comfort from God (Matthew 5:4). Servant leaders recognize and accept responsibility for their weaknesses, personal mistakes and sins as well as that of the collective.

3. We are called to be "meek," which is power under the authority and control of God (Matthew 5:4). Servant leaders use power humbly and for the promotion of the mission, not for personal gain and glory.

4. We are called to perform our good deeds without publicity or recognition, simply for the motive of serving God and loving others (Matthew 6:1–4). Servant leaders serve altruistically and "do the right thing" quietly and behind the scenes.

5. We are called to passionately seek and promote righteous motives, means, and ends (Matthew 5:6, Matthew 7:21–22). Servant leaders embrace excellence of character in all management domains and integrate fully the Golden Rule in all interactions.

6. If we are to obtain mercy and forgiveness for our own sins and mistakes, we need to reciprocate mercy and forgiveness for others. When we recognize that another person has a grievance against us, we should actively work toward reconciliation (Matthew 5:7, 5:23). Servant leaders are very aware of their own frailties and need for mercy and forgiveness, and they instill this by practicing mercy and forgiveness in management decision making. They actively seek to resolve grievances that contribute to broken relationships and seek reconciliation.

7. We are called to be pure in heart, which entails examining our motives and replacing sinful and selfish intentions with a God–honoring rationale (Matthew 5:8, Matthew 5:21). Servant leaders understand that it requires a higher power to discern the motives of our heart in order to love and trust others authentically.

8. When we seek peace by resolving conflict, we honor and obey God (Matthew 5:9). Servant leaders strive to reduce or eliminate dysfunctional conflict and office warfare.

9. When we obey God and pursue righteousness, we will inevitably experience persecution in various forms, and we are called to be comforted by the knowledge that the presence of opposition indicates we are obeying God and are on the correct path (Matthew 5:10–12). Servant leaders understand that we must pay a price in terms of envy, jealousy, and personal attacks for righteous, motives, means, and ends.

10. We are called to honor our obligations and oaths (Matthew 5:33). Servant leaders make every effort to honor commitments, contracts, and promises and make restitution if they are unable to fulfill their commitments.

11. We are called to pursue godly ends and thereby produce a godly treasure of eternal value (Matthew 6:19–21). Servant leaders define success in God's terms of promoting love consistent with the organization's mission, and not the traditional metrics of power, profitability, or influence isolated from larger moral considerations.

12. Jesus reinforced that worry is completely counterproductive, as anxiety cannot add a single second on your life span, and we need to trust God, the creator of the universe, for provision and protection ("clothing the lilies of the field") while relying on God to meet the challenges of the day and not worry about the future. (Matthew 6:25–34). Servant leaders understand the importance of a balance of reasonable planning for the future while living fully in the moment, addressing the problems of today, trusting in God for protection and provision.

13. God calls us to be persistent in seeking His provision and protection through prayer (Matthew 7:7–10). Servant leaders reinforce the importance of persistence in achieving objectives and exercising faith.

14. God calls us to test appearances of leaders to discern whether they are "wolves in sheep clothing" by examining fruit produced by their actions (Matthew 7:15–20). Servant leaders exercise emotional intelligence by being alert for the presence of hypocrisy and addressing it proactively.

Character Attributes for Leadership in the Church: The Bible is very clear on its emphasis on godly character attributes as the foundation for leadership. They include:

1. Altruism in caring for the needs of others over self (Philippians 2:19–24)
2. Respectful toward authority (Titus 1:6)

3. Humble (Titus 1:7)
4. Encourage others (Titus 1:9)
5. Correct with love (Titus 1:9)
6. Teach with excellence (1 Timothy 3:2)
7. Pursue moral excellence (2 Peter 1:5)
8. Self-control and endurance (2 Peter 1:5)
9. SLHRM organizations select for character and cultivate and reinforce character growth in the leadership process.

Excellence of Character and Competency

1. Nehemiah's commitment to excellence and integrity produced favor from the king when he requested permission to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem (Nehemiah 2). Servant leaders build reservoirs of credibility that translate into favor and higher levels of influence at all levels.
2. Daniel's ongoing commitment to excellence caused even his enemies to make peace with him (Daniel 1). Servant leader credibility increases trust and favor. Servant leaders understand that God is the source of their promotion, and that demonstrated excellence increases visibility and promotion opportunities.
3. When our work is excellent, we will serve important causes and receive the favor of the king (Proverbs 22:29). Servant leader excellence often leads to promotion and terms of visibility and influence.

Fair Treatment: The Apostle Paul understood the importance of fair and equal treatment. He strongly condemned partiality and favoritism given the discord produced (1 Timothy 5:21). Servant leaders understand the pernicious effects of the formation of "in-groups" and "out-groups," including the pride and complacency produced in the favored and the envy, anger, and pain experienced by those with lower status. It also reduces engagement and overall levels of productivity for the workforce as a whole.

Fair Compensation: Scripture is crystal clear in its entreaty to pay workers a fair wage and never to defraud employees of their wages. The prayers and cries of the cheated rise directly to the Lord (1 Timothy 5:17–18). Servant leaders commit to a fair wage system on all levels. This entails internal, external, and merit-based equity.

Biblical Foundation: Reasoning Attributes

Foresight: Noah accepted the improbable job assignment of building the arc with faith and obedience (Hebrews 11:7). Servant leaders manifest

an ability to trust higher authority when logic and a clear rationale are not provided.

Godly Reasoning

1. The Bible provides clear guidance on our reasoning process. The first principle is that we are called to "test the spirits" given the presence of many "false prophets" that misrepresent the truth in their speech and actions. We are also called to "test ourselves" and to examine our motives, means, and ends given the powerful influence of rationalization and self-deception (1 John 4:1, 2 Corinthians 13:5, 1 Thessalonians 5:21).

2. The Bible reinforces the importance of "testing the spirits" through determining whether there are alternative explanations for a specific event, or a "rival hypothesis." For example, in the Book of Acts, the conferral of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost was viewed quite differently depending on the perspective of the observer. For the disciples, it was the promised realization of the tangible anointing of God's presence as prophesized by Jesus and other Old Testament writers. To others, it was a sign of drunkenness. Peter rebutted the intoxication explanation by stating it was too early for drunkenness (Matthew 12:24–26, Acts 2:1–13, John 12:29). Servant leaders understand that appearances are deceiving and conventional wisdom requires validation and testing. Hence, servant leaders are open to new explanations.

3. In scripture, the principle of multiple methods of providing information is well established. We have the four gospels that provide complementary and reinforcing information on the ministry of Jesus (Matthew, Mark, Luke, John). Servant leaders understand the importance of reducing measurement criterion deficiency (incomplete) and contamination (inaccurate) in management decision making through utilizing multiple sources of evidence. This is necessary given that a single measure and method rarely measures a construct accurately and comprehensively.

4. Scripture emphasizes the importance of reliability of witnesses by requiring corroboration and agreement. The Bible requires consistent testimony from at least two or three sources (Matthew 18:16, 2 Corinthians 13:1). There is a need for multiple accounts to present a fuller and more complete assessment of the measured objects. Servant leaders understand that consistency of eyewitness accounts does not guarantee accuracy and truth, but consistency is an essential precondition for reliability.

Conclusion

The biblical roots of servant leadership are firm and comprehensive. This chapter illustrates the range of applications in the Old and New Testaments. As such, there is a rich range of examples that provide ongoing guidance from both a principle and practical application level. The challenge is to apply these principles consistently.

CHAPTER 3

SLHRM ORGANIZATIONAL INTEGRITY

Elements That Erode Organizational Integrity

One of the great spiritual warfare battlegrounds relates to the integrity issue. The practice of SLHRM is challenging in all arenas, sacred or secular. We face great spiritual warfare temptations to renounce our godly inheritance of righteous conduct and adopt self-serving standards of success. Hence, like the nation of Israel, we "return to Egypt" and accept the toils of slavery in return for security in meeting our short-term needs. It requires great character strength to resist the powerful incentives to compromise our values. We need to seek the Holy Spirit's help to be "wise as serpents and innocent as doves" (Matthew 10:16, NRSV). Our task is complicated by the deceptive nature of the human heart, as we fall prey to the traps, snares, and value compromises that on the surface appear moral and ethical. It is important for SLHRM organizations to work collaboratively to create a culture of righteous motives, means, and ends in all aspects of HR practice. SLHRM organizations demonstrate the love and power of Christ and an alternative to "business as usual." Regrettably, many Christians and Christian organizations are less faithful and passionate in practicing SLHRM principles and the Golden Rule than secular organizations.

Given this reality, we all experience flawed human nature at work in our organizations both within our selves and in others. When there is a higher degree of ethical conduct from non-Christians, it erodes the credibility of the Christian message and our specific witness. What factors seem to contribute to this paradox? One element relates to the hardness of our hearts impeding our sanctification growth. We can be a saved Christian, but still subject to the same spiritual and emotional strongholds as others. Another is that given the spiritual stakes are higher, there is a

greater degree of spiritual warfare directed at the weaknesses of Christian managers and employees.

The great temptation for Christian SLHRM adherents in the presence of hypocrisy is to embrace a worldly sorrow born of a sense of disappointment and even betrayal. Hypocrisy is the sin that Jesus most vehemently attacked given its power to shipwreck the faith of followers and increase the credibility of detractors. Hypocrisy is one of the most serious moral and ethical violations from almost any perspective and produces a powerful set of negative emotions, attitudes, and behaviors (Cha & Edmondson, 2006). A major contributing factor for this issue is the absence of emphasis by the church on "24/7" discipleship and the importance of integrity in all life domains. When we compartmentalize and rationalize our faith (church on Sunday, embrace the world all other times), we embrace the ruling postmodern worldview, situational ethics based upon self-interest. We all encounter compromising situations and it takes great character strength as we trust in the Lord for provision and protection when logic and circumstances shout loudly to embrace the more expedient path.

Organizational Justice Elements

What are the key elements that contribute to organizational hypocrisy? The Lord calls us to a higher standard of accountability. Clearly, the foundation is a gap between policy and practice, being a "hearer and doer," but in leadership terms, being a "sayer and a doer." A useful research-based framework that relates key aspects of HR policy and practice to hypocrisy is that of organizational justice. SLHRM organizations embrace fairness as a foundational value at all levels (individual, work group, collective). The legal and public policy framework of fair employment laws provides only a floor on employee fair treatment, but does not address the heart-based trust issues related to everyday employer–employee relationships.

The three main components of organizational justice are distributive, procedural, and interactional. Procedural justice refers to the overall fairness of organizational decision-making processes (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Beugre & Baron, 2001). For example, are performance appraisal decisions supported by a comprehensive array of evidence and sources? Does the employee have the option to participate and rebut evidence or information that is inaccurate? Distributive justice relates to the fairness of the outcome associated with HR-related decisions (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Was the pay increase a fair reflection of the employee's contributions? Interactional justice relates to the fairness of employee

treatment by supervisors (Cropanzano et al., 2001). Do supervisors bully, harass, and humiliate employees, or are they treated with respect and dignity? The magnitude, scope, and effect of deficiencies in organizational justice dramatically increase if management espouses values of fair treatment, but fail to implement accentuating perceptions of hypocrisy. What are some of the common factors that contribute to these visceral feelings of hypocrisy?

One key constituent element of hypocrisy is judgmentalism. Judgmentalism can take many forms. One manifestation is speaking truth not in love, but as means to exalt the self and control and manipulate others. Unless the underlying motive is love as biblically defined to promote the best interests of others, we have a "log in our eye" as described in Matthew 7:5. The sins, problems, and weaknesses of others draw us like moths to a flame, and we fail to see our own transgressions and feebleness. Our "righteous anger" and self-blindness is usually greatest in those areas in which we share the same sin, weakness, or tendency as the person who is the target of our judgment. As stated in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, "thou dost protest too much." We need to pray for our leaders for the courage to assume responsibility for their contribution to a problem before "pointing the finger."

The highly competitive nature of securing financial resources for all types of organizations poses another great threat to organizational integrity contributing to an "ends justify the means" ethical framework. As customers, donors, and the taxpayers demand more evidence of ROI, there is a corresponding increase in pressure to demonstrate results. This generates greater incentives and temptations to cheat or "fudge" the numbers in terms of program performance, administrative costs, and other measures of financial accountability unless a commitment to trusting God for providing the necessary resources is at the center of the organization's DNA. When management adopts expedient practices to relieve these pressures, employees lose respect for the integrity of management, thereby tempting employees to engage in their own moral compromise. Hence, organizations are being subject to greater external oversight through a variety of sources including governmental regulation. SLHRM-directed managers need not fear the increased external regulation as SLHRM organizations thrive on transparency and accountability.

Combating the Culture of Apathy and Defensiveness

When employees perceive high levels of management hypocrisy, a pernicious outcome is disengagement and apathy. SLHRM organizations must address and attack the culture of apathy and disengagement reflected in

the famous cliché "it's not in my job description." Following is a litany of phrases that reflect this poisonous mindset:

- "That's how we have always done things here."
- "I am too busy to help others."
- "I was following orders."
- "It was not in my job description."
- "I have to balance the needs of many competing interests and stakeholders."
- "Helping the client would have adversely influenced mission accomplishment."
- "That's what the rules state."

There are many factors contributing to this malady in addition to hypocrisy, and one key element is the "culture of fear" motivational system that management produces with the imposition of punishment for failures and mistakes. This practice contributes to a culture of defensiveness reducing motivation, creativity, and innovation. As SLHRM organizations and leaders, we must clearly identify and remedy the long-term self-defeating nature of this culture of fear. Another reason is compassion fatigue that occurs when employees are overworked, overwhelmed, discouraged, and "burnt-out," thereby lacking the energy and compassion to step outside of their job description.

It is a great challenge to overcome employee apathy and the mindset of compartmentalization that problems are "someone else's responsibility." Even if there is an office or a designated person to assume responsibility for a problem issue, SLHRM organizations cultivate values and behaviors that encourage employees to assume ownership and become a champion until the problem is resolved. When management and employees hide behind the rules, it is a collective organizational failure. SLHRM leaders must address several key questions when employees fail to assume accountability and operate outside of their job description.

First, what is the root cause of the problem? In some instances, the problem may not be motivational in nature but ambiguous performance management through unclear job descriptions, imprecise standard operating procedures, an absence of performance standards, and blurred lines of authority. However, if these factors are not present and employees are working to the letter of the rules and hiding behind process, then a motivational cause is more likely.

Another key factor is the degree of value internalization. Crisis is a powerful crucible for assessing our moral foundation. SLHRM organizational culture reinforces the necessity of responding to adversity in a

manner consistent with the values of altruism and of placing the needs of the mission and others over self-interest by delaying or denying our self-gratification. Our greatest learning opportunities occur under trial, stress, and interruptions when we are not able to operate on auto-pilot, protect the ego, or engage in image management. Even under the most favorable conditions the ultimate direction and underlying ethical orientation is only as strong as the character of the participants. Only when values become internalized do we respond positively in a crisis, as there is little or no time to think and reflect given the urgency of action.

Unless the character predisposition of altruism and denying self-gratification becomes second nature, there will be an absence of reliable and authentic moral and ethical behavior and decision making. Hence, a key question that management should ask is the degree to which Good Samaritan behavior characterizes management and employees. Can ethical and moral conduct be promoted by external processes (rules), by informal group norms, or is it a question of internal character and integrity (heart-based)? Varying degrees of ambiguity are inevitable in SLHRM decision making, but a consensus on the foundational principles and shared values are the basis for clear decision rules to guide the decision-making process. For example, when faced with a need to reduce the budget, should we lay off employees (high cost imposed on a smaller group) or freeze wages for all (collectivizing the pain). What does it mean to "love your neighbor as yourself" in this situation? In today's highly stressful workplace with many employees strained to the limits of human endurance, it is very difficult to be altruistic without a common recognition that we are both interconnected and interdependent. For example, the military strives to produce highly cohesive, tight knit groups that will risk their individual lives to accomplish the mission. Individuals are valued, and fellow soldiers will endanger their own lives to save others if there is a reasonable chance of success. We need to embrace this same mentality with our own organizations.

One key issue that this problem raises is how worldview influences behavior. Our worldview provides the foundational values and principles that comprise the normative ethics employed in a specific situation. Two common normative ethical positions are teleological, which focuses primarily on promoting the greatest good in a utilitarian fashion and deontological, which primarily focuses on the ethical correctness of the collective motives, means, and ends (Macdonald & Beck-Dudley, 1994; Takamine, 2002). A balanced, ethical decision maker attempts to satisfy both approaches, reflecting the inherent ambiguity associated with complex decision scenarios. Servant leaders must internalize a deontological (servanthood) perspective, but incorporate relevant teleological reasoning

(stewardship reasoning) into our decision calculus. For example, we often face conflicting ethical values related to the employee discipline process. We must balance the principles of forgiveness/grace and correction. In situations that justify suspension according to the rules, we need to weigh the overall context, mitigating circumstances, and the counsel of the Holy Spirit. From a teleological perspective, the suspension may be necessary to promote the overall good order and workplace productivity for successful mission achievement, but an enduring deontological principle of forgiveness and grace may override discipline.

What is the fruit of hypocrisy? One key product is the erosion of trust. Trust is a valuable and scarce commodity in today's Darwinian "survival of the fittest" marketplace. Trust is cultivated through a long-term relationship. As the cliché states, it is easier to destroy than create. Unfair management actions quickly and efficiently demolish trusting relationships that take years to build. SLHRM managers frequently must clean up the "messes" that management leaves in the lives of employees. It places HR in a difficult position of attempting to assuage angry, hurt, and cynical employees with no decision authority to alter policy. HR managers must exercise high levels of spiritual and emotional intelligence to look beyond the pain and hurt of employees, and help them overcome the negative emotions that inhibit effective management.

The Trust Gap and Its Causes

Trust is one of the most precious commodities in the workplace and the most important form of organizational "currency." One of the pernicious products of employees stripped of their dignity and low on trust is an apathetic and disconnected emotional state. Surveys indicate that only about a third of US employees are engaged in their work (Gallup, 2013), and irrespective of the locus of the responsibility in terms of labor and management, we all pay a high price in lost productivity and poor client services for employees who are alienated from their jobs (Tsui et al., 1997). One of the consequences of the loss of trust is cynical employees who are angry, bitter, and apathetic. Cynical employees have lost all trust and confidence in leadership, and hence reject all management change efforts irrespective of their potential effectiveness and the degree of leadership good-faith. As a result, some employees assume an aggressive or passive-aggressive posture, engaging in overt and covert rebellious or aggressive behaviors to restore a semblance of control in an "eye for an eye" fashion. Hence, even when the employer demonstrates good faith, the cynical attitude taints the assessment process given that negative attributions are more salient in memory and experience.

When a climate of distrust is present, employees interpret an ambiguous situation consistent with their overall global attitude. For example, in a union and management conflict situation, labor views the organization's fiscal problems as a ruse or a pretext to squeeze more concessions from suffering employees. Hence, management only cares for the bottom line and views employees not as human beings but as costs to reduce in order to increase profit and shareholder value. Conversely, if there are harmonious relations, employees perceive the exact situation differently. Fiscal stress becomes an opportunity for joint problem solving to preserve the health of the organization as a whole. Communication and transparency are key factors in shaping trust and accurate perceptions. What are some of the factors that reduce trust?

One pernicious practice is the "disposable employee" syndrome adopted by many organizations in all sectors. The "throwaway worker" policy is the equivalent to "slash and burn" agriculture. Employers demand great work effort and high levels of performance but fail to "fertilize the soil" with a sustainable workload, fair treatment, comprehensive investments in employee training and development, long-term job security, and the cultivation of work/life balance. This produces a pernicious product of burned out, cynical employees lacking trust leading to high organizational turnover. The absence of job security creates and elevates long-term stress reducing employee motivation, morale, and performance. A natural discouragement effect reduces confidence and trust. Hence, these organizations seek to maximize short-term gains for the lowest present investments (low present costs for high present benefits), while SLHRM organizations are covenant investors understanding that long-term success requires higher up-front costs in supporting and sustaining employees for greater long-term return.

A second trust-reducing practice is the absence of management transparency in conjunction with micro management and high management surveillance levels and/or electronic monitoring. An employee has a reasonable right to privacy, and it is important that employers do not demand an excessive and intrusive level of oversight that communicates management distrust of employee motivation, ability, or character. With an absence of employee privacy, it generates a global affective and cognitive atmosphere of insecurity and vulnerability. It is critical for employers to possess a more comprehensive information base for decision making, but not at the expense of employee privacy and dignity.

A third factor is the absence of servant leadership in which management fails to accept ultimate responsibility for overall performance and management's specific and global contributions to problems and poor performance. We are unable to see the truth until we remove the log and

scales from our own eyes. The human tendency is to externalize blame. Jesus reserved His harshest criticism for the hypocritical Pharisees, for good reason. When leadership and managerial practice diverges from stated policy, the visible contradiction generates disappointment, distrust, and cynicism toward those in authority. It reduces employee motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors associated with vibrant, productive, and healthy work environments. Employees are less likely to exert the necessary effort and creativity to solve problems and make necessary changes when they lack trust in the integrity of management. For example, when managers utilize the "tell and sell" approach to performance appraisal (Maier, 1958), employees rightly perceive manipulation if there is no employee input and no transparent acknowledgement of management's contribution to performance problems (remove the log first from your own eye) and those factors beyond the employee's control that affect performance.

Another key trust inhibitor is the absence of "honest weights and measures" (Leviticus, 19:36). If the performance management system manifests an unsatisfactory level of reliability and validity with bias in the measurement and decision-making process, employees fail to receive the corrective and encouraging feedback necessary to improve and cope with challenging circumstances.

A common example is in the performance appraisal process with rater bias. The presence of nonperformance factors contaminates appraisal ratings, producing a fruit of perceived and genuine unfairness in the rating process and its outcomes, which in turn links to adverse behaviors such as lower job satisfaction and higher turnover. The various forms of appraisal bias serve as a major fertile source of equal employment opportunity (EEO) complaints and court cases involving contested personnel practices linked to performance appraisal. Rating bias occurs with the contamination of appraisal ratings by nonperformance related factors. Prime examples include person characteristic bias (race, gender, and age), personal relationship contamination (liking or disliking), and failing to gather a representative sample of performance.

Conclusion

The great challenge for management is to recognize and assume responsibility for the valid resentment and distrust produced by ill treatment, which is the first step in beginning the slow healing and confidence building process of genuine support and encouragement. The following chapters will detail the specific SLHRM strategies to overcome distrust and provide authentic care for employees. When human beings made in

the image of God become mere instruments, we are engaging in a dangerous game of idol worship at the altar of short-term gain. The key is to commit to a covenant and, like any relationship, there will be times of pain and conflict that test our commitment to our espoused ideals. The depths of such character testing reveal our heart's motives. If organizations self-promote their adherence to SLHRM values through aggressive public relations "branding," hollow or specious claims will only lead to the development of cynical employees disengaging from the employer, further reinforcing the downward spiral.

CHAPTER 4

THE SLHRM CHANGE MANAGEMENT
PROCESS AND THE BARRIERS TO
EFFECTIVE CHANGE

One of the great management challenges is cultivating long-term
organizational culture change. There are many key decision points
in the success of such a complex effort, and hence many "veto" opportu-
nities to impede change progress. In this chapter, we present a diagnostic
change resistance typology that identifies the various motivational attri-
butes that contribute to opposing change. This chapter concludes with
an outline of a change management process to overcome resistance and
obstacles from a SLHRM perspective. It is important to embrace the belief
that the power to change organizational culture begins with committed
SLHRM leaders who love their employees and other key stakeholders.

Reflections on the Change Process

So where does authentic organizational change begin for the SLHRM
leader? Clearly, the genesis is the restoration of the leader's human heart
based upon a righteous relationship to our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.
We must staff SLHRM organizations with leaders filled with the Holy
Spirit and manifesting "living waters." Unless our life demonstrates a har-
monic balance between our profession of faith and its application, the
credibility of our witness is tarnished. Once our hearts are oriented in the
proper direction, we possess the power and credibility to begin facilitat-
ing the restoration of the hearts of our employees both individually and
through collective HR organizational policies and programs that promote
mission achievement and organizational justice and fair treatment. Hence,
we begin at the executive and/or leadership levels and then focus on the
base. The question becomes how do we foster disciples instead of followers?

Clearly, there is no specific formula, but every single instance of organizational change requires varying degrees of effort in each of these areas.

However, I must provide a "realistic job preview" as it is difficult to apply SLHRM principles to "worldly" organizational cultures founded upon utilitarian values, irrespective of the sector. Espousing a SLHRM-based culture does not guarantee a SLHRM culture. Macro- and system-level change is always difficult, but the focus for SLHRM is changing hearts at the individual level in order to promote God-honoring and eternal system change at the systems level. Our individual free-will decision to embrace Christ is the foundation of changing the culture. We are then empowered to be "light and salt" in all aspects of our lives. One committed, Holy Spirit-led person can make a profound and eternal difference with a co-worker, a work group, a department, an organization, an entire industry, and then the world. Organizations are not monolithic; they provide opportunities for the development of change and the creation of "microclimates," an oasis of servanthood in a sea of self-interest. Even if we are a lone voice crying in the wilderness, our SLHRM actions and prayers for our co-workers are pleasing to God and possess eternal value. In addition, God does use single individuals anointed by the Holy Spirit to do impossible things (consider, for example, St. Patrick's amazing missionary journey to Ireland). Hence, can you place yourself in the role of Joseph in the court of Pharaoh, or Daniel in the court of Nebuchadnezzar? Dare to dream that the Lord can humbly use your love and obedience to bring hope to a hedonistic and self-serving culture. How could you make a difference?

We begin with a cardinal rule of SLHRM change, that we first remove the log from our eye before we remove the speck from our brother or sister (Matthew 7:5). The human tendency, when faced with the many complex individual and system performance and ethical problems and issues related to organizational change, is either to rationalize away or externalize the locus of responsibility. We first must reflect and identify the hidden personal sources of resistance and obstacles to change that are in our own heart. We desire patience and forgiveness (grace) for ourselves, but justice and accountability for others. The nature of sin entails deception and disguise, and unless executives demonstrate servant leadership in word and deed, the organization encourages moral drift on the part of employees. Management must first set the tone and accept responsibility for policies and practices that promote unfair treatment or hypocrisy, or its appearance, thereby reducing the motivation for employees to engage in various forms of protective and self-serving behavior. The foundation is the understanding that there is no victimless ethical violation, and that Christ's vision has no boundaries.

Barriers to Organizational Change

Organizations reap what they sow in regards to employee treatment. When employees trust management, HR organizational change efforts are much easier to implement given the willingness of employees to exert extra effort even when the rationale is not completely clear. Hence, one of the important initial elements of the change process is to assess the attitudes of the key stakeholders toward the organization. A helpful framework for conceptualizing the change process is to visualize a continuum of attitudes from high levels of trust to neutrality, to a skeptical state that requires proof, to a state of cynicism in which trust is lost. When employees lack trust in management, it engenders varying degrees of skepticism and cynicism. Skeptical employees will cooperate with clear evidence that the change promotes the mission and employee interests. When employees have lost all confidence in management, no amount of logic or persuasion can force employees to engage in good faith efforts. When employees are cynical, they possess low motivation levels and exert minimum effort while rigidly adhering to the job description (the letter of the law and not its spirit). The goal is simply to "wait out" the change initiative; hence, irrespective of its effectiveness or necessity, the change effort recipe produces failure. Cynical employees may actively sabotage the HR change effort as well. Indicators of cynical behavior include lack of confidence in HR and other organizational initiatives or programs, a belief that management "goes through the motions" and exerts minimal effort in solving workplace problems that affect employees, dissenting employees are punished or disadvantaged, management is not concerned about employee welfare, management does not listen or respond to employee change or problem-solving recommendations, management is hypocritical toward employees, management only supports employees when they agree with existing decisions, and management lacks the needed skills to solve problems (Reichers, Wanous, & Austin,1997).

If the employees or other stakeholders possess high to moderate cynicism levels, it is important to address the underlying causes before beginning the HR implementation process. The key is to regain trust, which is a long process. However, some changes cannot wait until attitudes improve. Every change effort can be an opportunity to "bridge the gap" and begin the process of thawing cold hearts and challenging rigid views on the ethicality and morality of management.

For example, middle managers are key stakeholders in organizational change situations. Their cooperation is essential, and it is important to determine the breadth, depth, and source of their resistance. Is it a

form of apathy linked to years of neglect, the absence of investment and empowerment, or the hard shell formed from ongoing disappointment or exploitation? It is important to assess whether you have skeptical versus cynical middle managers. Skeptical middle managers will engage and "buy in" with concrete good faith assurances and tangible action, but cynical employees possess a more entrenched negative worldview that repels most forms of reason.

However, it is vital to apply the same assessment to yourself as a manager or leader. Oftentimes it is management and leadership itself that is a powerful source of hidden opposition to change. We pay "lip service" to change, but our hearts resist. Hence, as with other areas, we must test ourselves relentlessly to identify our visible and hidden personal fears, insecurities, and other sources of resistance to change. Unless we are truly willing to "count the cost," our motivation will be superficial and we will lack the integrity to lead others. In fact, our subordinates or others will quickly perceive the discrepancy between our rhetoric and our actions. I recommend that you pray and seek the guidance of the Holy Spirit to uncover the sources of resistance.

However, it is important to recognize that there are valid and invalid rationales for pursuing or not pursuing an HR organizational change initiative. Based upon the work of Nutt and Backoff (1995), inappropriate reasons for rejecting an HR change effort include the unwarranted lack of top leadership confidence in organizational and employee capability, unrealistic expectations relative to success (perfectionism), a belief that the organization is too small to benefit (organizational size mismatch), the HR change effort overlaps with other organizational HR planning efforts, the inability to identify a clear starting point, and the greatest threat, organizational complacency given past and present success. Conversely, Nutt and Backoff suggest several legitimate reasons for opposing HR change efforts including leadership instability, lack of top-level commitment, cynical and/or hostile labor-management relations, and the organization's lack of resources and expertise.

Categories of Resistance to Organizational Change

How can the organization and its leadership regain trust? The first step is to determine the specific change resistance factors as reflected in table 4.1. Managers must automatically avoid equating change resistance to disloyalty, sloth, or an absence of vision. There are clearly valid servanthood and stewardship reasons why employees oppose organizational initiatives; effective servant leadership proactively addresses these valid concerns. The other two categories are more problematic as they

Table 4.1   Source of resistance to organizational change

Servanthood and Stewardship Organizational Change Resistance Factors

Conflict with or adverse impact on mission achievement (deflects from core mission, for example)
Conflicts with foundational organizational values
Deontological conflict (ethical impropriety)
Stewardship: Adverse impact on the efficiency or effectiveness of program, product, or service delivery
Adverse impact on key stakeholders (clients, employees)
Absence of adequate employee support (training, resources, time)

Psychological Organizational Change Resistance Factors

Lack of trust through high levels of skepticism and cynicism. For example, the organization engages in pseudo-participation in which managers ask for employee input but never use it or punish employees who make recommendations contrary to management desires (I will let you participate as long as you follow the "party" line)
Fear of the unknown
Lack of efficacy (confidence) to cope with the demands of the new situation
Fear of failure
Disruption of comfortable routine
A perfectionistic spirit that inhibits innovation and trial and error learning

Ego and Political Organizational Change Resistance Factors

Loss of power, resources, and influence
Loss of prestige
Lack of trust in organization
Personality conflicts and power struggles and the desire to punish through failure and delight in the misfortune of others

represent self-interested motives for opposing change. The psychological resistance factors embody the general tendency to fear the unknown. This fear increases with an absence of trust, faith, and reliance on God in general, and in the motivation, credibility, and intentions of others. Fear is the counterfeit to faith, and when we forget that "all things work together for good for those who love God, who are called according to his purpose" (Romans 8:28, NRSV), employees develop insecurities that inhibit growth. The third category, ego and political factors, is more pernicious given the employee's motivational intentionality in the promotion of selfish interests over the mission and the well-being of others. Ego and political resistance are the dark spiritual antithesis of servant leadership. These barriers can appear anywhere in the organizational change process.

These three categories of change resistance require varying strategic and tactical change management approaches. However, the foundational

line of attack remains increasing stakeholder trust. When employees trust the organization, they are willing to exert extra effort, take more risks, and give the organization the benefit of the doubt in ambiguous, stressful, and challenging circumstances. When trust is present, it reduces employee and other stakeholder stress levels providing more energy to devote on productive pursuits.

When employees and other stakeholders begin to see a sustained change effort that begins with SLHRM leadership, the mountains of cynicism and skepticism gradually erode. The various sources of change resistance reinforce the complex nature of the relationships and the number of unknown variables. Given original sin and the deception of the human heart, the governance structure in all forms of social institutions consists of various combinations of external controls through rules, policies, sanctions, and electronic or traditional forms of surveillance to provide clear boundaries and accountability mechanisms. However, as a born-again, spirit filled believer I trust that our redeemed state provides the opportunity for the "hearts of stone" (Ezekiel 11:19) to be removed and replaced with a spiritual heart that intrinsically honors God and obeys the Great Commandment principles. The most efficient and effective means for securing organizational change compliance begins with leaders and employees possessing internalized SLHRM character.

Principles of Change Management

Managing the change process begins with developing a learning organization. As the dictum states, those who forget the past are doomed to repeat its mistakes. One of the challenges associated with organizational change efforts is retaining the institutional knowledge of those who exit the organization, while embracing present and future innovation. Another related test is discounting knowledge that lacks relevance for the future. Hence, what do we need to remember? It is important from a Christian servant leadership standpoint to recollect the markers of success from the past as God commanded Israel to commemorate God's intervention that produced victories (see Joshua 4). All policy changes possess both intended and unintended consequences, and a careful evaluation of the plan's implementation and outcome effectiveness is necessary. Group-based differences are important to analyze both globally and divided by key stakeholder groups, as what appears effective at the design stage frequently manifests serious problems at implementation.

The next section summarizes important strategies to increase trust.

Provide a Solid Spiritual Foundation for the Change Effort by

a. *Developing an intercessory prayer team to provide the necessary spiritual covering.* All eternal Kingdom change processes begin and end with intercessory prayer. Prayer acknowledges that God is the source of our wisdom, and He alone produces the outcome. This team should consist of employees, family member, volunteers, church members, and other spiritually vested and passionate organizational stakeholders.

b. *Leadership and management should first hold themselves accountable by "removing the log," taking responsibility first for their sins, problems, and contributions to any performance problems associated with the change effort.* SLHRM organizations set high standards for leaders, and if any sacrifices are required, it begins first with leadership.

c. The change effort should be directed first at the executive leadership and management levels while observing the same or higher performance standards than those applied on other stakeholder groups. SLHRM organizations need to "walk the talk."

d. SLHRM managers share the burdens and the sacrifice in very tangible ways, demonstrating both symbolically and practically their empathy and common interests with employees. A great historical example was Lee Iacocca assuming leadership of a bankrupt Chrysler Corporation during the late 1970s and accepting a salary of a $1 until the company returned to profitability, while rewarding employees for agreeing to wage and benefit concessions (Herbst, 2007). His efforts set a high spiritual bar that increased employee trust and were the catalyst to save the corporation. Management must model and apply SLHRM "Golden Rule" values by listening to employees, demonstrating transparency, and making a commitment to joint problem solving.

e. *Staff the change effort wisely with passionate and skilled change champions and facilitators.* Ensure long-term commitment and continuity in the change process through a clear succession planning process.

f. *Practice transparency and humility through a realistic "change" preview in which there is a clear and systematic communication regarding the individual, group, and organizational benefits and costs using a multi-method and media campaign.* In essence, a key element is illustrating the costs of maintaining the status quo while clearly emphasizing the long-term nature of the change process with higher upfront costs for great downstream benefits.

g. *Cultivate the formation of an ethos embracing the "healthy pursuit of excellence," encouraging employees to take chances and learn from mistakes and forgive themselves and others for failures and difficulties.* It is important to avoid blaming employees for factors beyond their control. This entails actively seeking out contextual information that identifies the external factors that inhibit success.

h. *For all stakeholders, and especially for those employees whose resistance to change is ego and politically oriented, the key is persuade the recalcitrant that either the costs of maintaining the status quo are higher than the costs of changing and/or the benefits of the change exceed the benefits of inertia and remaining the same.* In addition, it may be necessary to transfer or even terminate cynical and politically resistant employees as a last resort option to avoid contaminating the attitudes of other key stakeholders. A place to begin is securing broad-based input through surveys coupled with direct representation by selecting credible change leaders and influencers among the rank-and-file. If the level of opposition is too great, it would still be in the interest of the organization to begin laying the foundation by clearly defining the costs of not changing and the associated benefits.

i. *Promote employee and other stakeholder input and empowerment in the change process thereby aligning interests, facilitating ownership, and improving effectiveness of the change process by increasing trust.* The implementation of employee empowerment/partnership strategies will improve service delivery efficiency and effectiveness. It is important to empower the key stakeholders in the implementation process to enhance ownership and buy-in through convening implementation teams responsible for ongoing improvement efforts.

j. *Provide employees with adequate physical, mental, and spiritual support during the change effort and transition (training, equipment, financial resources, ongoing coaching, counseling, and wellness programs).* Many organizational change efforts lose credibility and employee trust when change efforts add new duties with no infrastructure assistance and/or increased staffing. A very clear biblical example is in Exodus 5:7 when Pharaoh, angered by the demands of Moses for freedom for the Israelites, mandated that the workers must gather their own straw in the brick-making process.

k. *The need to establish and reinforce SLHRM values and competencies through careful employee selection, management development, and reward practices. Systematically reinforce the new attitudes, behaviors, and performance goals through the HR system by linking rewards and corrective actions to results.* Systematically link the various reward systems (budget, compensation, recognition) at all organizational levels to the achievement of

change effort goals, objectives, and metrics. The key is to reward participants for process compliance and outcome success.

l. *Provide financial and other means of support such as innovation grants to support change efforts.* The key is to select pilot projects with a high probability of success (pick the low-hanging fruit) and publicize these early successes in order to inspire supporters and overcome opposition. By engineering early successes, the organization increases employee confidence in the change effort. In effect, these become powerful testimonials that enhance the credibility of the change process (a form of word of mouth marketing). Organizational change efforts require a delicate balance of centralization and decentralization, hierarchy and empowerment—in other words, a harmonic mean of top-down and bottom-up planning. Organizational change efforts are by definition inefficient and time-consuming, especially with multiple stakeholders. The costs are high upfront, with the benefits realized downstream. Hence, patience is required. It is very important to set measurable goals at the early stages and to provide a clear demonstration of success, progress, and momentum.

m. A key factor with managing organization change is inviting the key stakeholders into the decision-making process. When there is conflict and distrust, begin the relationship restoration process with cooperation in areas of mutual interest that are important but not essential with clear, verifiable, and transparent decision rules (Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (1991)). A general rule of organizational change is to select solvable problems of mutual interest and partner with employees *early* in the change process. Early success is critical in demonstrating the sincerity of management in their claims of practicing SLHRM Golden Rule employee treatment values. For example, appoint a joint labor management team to solve an employee parking problem and demonstrate good faith by reducing the number of management designated spaces, freeing up more spots for employees.

n. *Cultivate realistic performance expectations with ongoing, specific, behavioral, and timely performance feedback on change effort progress through a balanced scorecard set of standards and metrics for all levels, beginning most importantly and visibly with leadership and management.* It is important to set high but reasonable SMART goals (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, timely) and provide feedback that is corrective and encouraging, and respects the dignity of employees. It is critical that the key stakeholders participate in developing the action plan and SMART goals and metrics to enhance acceptance, relevancy, validity, and commitment. It is important for both employees and the organization to exercise patience and recognize that it requires

a season for employees to develop the skill and competency levels to support the change effort. The overall value ethos is to instill a long-term investment value system versus a short-term return focus. It is important to recognize that the costs of many change efforts are "upfront" with the benefits "back-loaded."

o. *Organizations are operating blindly without data-based early warning employee attitudes assessment systems. The most effective "canary in the coal mine" is ongoing communication based upon a climate of trust, but data-based systems are important as well.* This increases employee trust, and can be the focal point of joint labor management quality improvement and problem-solving efforts. "Keeping a finger on the pulse" of the organization is critical from both a change management and employee confidence and support perspective. This entails a systematic data-gathering process that includes surveys, focus groups, town meetings, suggestion systems, and a balanced scorecard. Based on the feedback received, the organization makes adjustments in the communication and implementation of the change effort. These methods also provide the foundation for a multi-method means for providing two-way communication and feedback on the change effort. Through a process called "action research," the organization responds to the feedback and demonstrates good faith attempts to review and make appropriate adjustments (Argyris & Schön, 1974). The stakeholders will not demand that the organization adopt every suggestion or recommendation, but only that management make a good faith attempt to provide honest and transparent responses and a full discussion of their feasibility. There are two approaches: the first entailing direct face-to-face communication, which includes town hall meetings (in-person and virtual), employee work-group meetings, interviews, focus groups, and "management by walking around"; and the second category, anonymous communication, means including suggestion systems, surveys, and blogs. A multi-media communication campaign directed at the key stakeholders to provide ongoing updates on the status of the change management process is another critical element in engendering support and overcoming opposition. One of the SLHRM objectives is to reduce unnecessary stress on employees through information vacuums. If the organization fails to keep the key stakeholders informed, it generates a vacuity that demands fulfillment through rumor and speculation, thereby increasing employee anxiety and fear.

p. *Systematically evaluate the effectiveness of the change process and adjust the implementation process and/or goals based upon the evidence.* Promote a flexible approach to the change process that recognizes the need to

make adjustments based upon evolving circumstances and conditions. The key is to develop the appropriate balance between persistence and consistency to avoid the errors of stubborn rigidity or excessive reactivity. Provide ongoing evaluation of the organizational change progress. SLHRM organizations integrate organizational change into the fabric of managerial decision making through conducting yearly assessments of the plan's progress and engaging the key stakeholders in the evaluation process. Implementation teams accomplish this through reviewing change evaluation data and making recommendations for adjustments in the change goals and implementation plan.

There is clearly no formula or checklist that can assure an effective change management process. The strategies above are critical in overcoming resistance to HR system change, and their embrace is necessary, but not sufficient. Hence the need for ongoing prayer.

Other Change Management Challenges

There are many other challenges to practicing change management from a SLHRM foundation. These include overcoming the ubiquitous obstacles of adhering to God-honoring servant leadership values in the midst of decisional problem pressure and uncertainty, including lack of clarity on the nature of problems or challenges and their causes, resource scarcity (time, information, money), and stakeholder conflict. SLHRM values are the moral compass for our managerial decision-making journey. The management challenges include:

- The challenge of maintaining a uniform SLHRM culture as the organization grows in size, expands its number of work sites and geographic scope, and diversifies its services. This begins with developing management policies and practices to systematize the internalization of foundational system values while encouraging an appropriate degree of autonomy and empowerment.
- The personal leadership challenges of maintaining a consistency of policy and practice as an organization grows and managerial decision-making scope and responsibilities broaden. Often managers promote a personalized management approach emphasizing empowerment for the immediate staff, but retaining an excessive degree of decision-making authority as the organization grows. The SLHRM practices that are effective with smaller organizations (management by walking around, town meetings) become a liability if the chief executive officer fails to delegate these tasks to subordinates and lower

levels. From a biblical standpoint, many managers become a Moses and need a Jethro (Exodus 18) to remind the leader of the need to delegate management authority and duties. The entire management team must engage in ongoing prayer to stay "connected to the vine" (John 15:5) given the need for ongoing leading by the Holy Spirit for the many complex decisions and spiritual warfare obstacles.

SLHRM is the foundation for our holy organizational "temple." My prayer is that the readers will collectively dedicate themselves to building our vocational homes on the only solid foundation of Jesus Christ as guided by the Holy Spirit. Let us "count the cost" (Luke 14:28) of personal commitment and sacrifice so that God can finish this good work He began in us (Philippians 1:6) and help us to embrace an unswerving commitment to God-honoring actions that construct our house with building materials that stand the test of fire (stone, precious metals, and jewels) (1 Corinthians 3:12–13).

Best-Practice SLHRM Organizational Change Character and Behavioral Attributes

Effective organizational change requires an unswerving commitment to mission achievement. All the involved stakeholders must work together in a spirit of cooperation, patience, and a willingness to sacrifice personal interests for the common good. Just as tone of voice and body language contribute to the majority of meaning in verbal communication, the organizational change process requires attention to key Christian character elements, which ultimately determine long-term success. Behaviors matter. Table 4.2 provides a list of key elements that SLHRM managers must embrace.

Table 4.2   Principles of SLHRM strategic change management servanthood

1. Unwavering commitment to achieving the organization's mission.
2. Practice humility by promoting the needs of others over the self and the greater collective good over narrow special interests.
3. Demonstrate a spirit of forgiveness for good faith mistakes. Encourage employees to innovate and be creative, and acknowledge that organizational learning involves blunders and trial and error.
4. Practice empathy to understand the positions and views of others by active listening (do not interrupt, listen instead of thinking of your reply when others talk, frequent paraphrase and probe when don't understand).
5. Reduce status differences between executives, management, and employees to promote honest, two-way communication.

Table 4.2   Continued

6. Be a polite listener and avoid side conversations when others are speaking. Be mindful and self-aware of our body language and avoid exhibiting distracting facial expressions such as frowning, rolling eyes, snarling, snickering, and shrugging of shoulders in our interactions with others. Monitor our tone of voice to identify and suppress impatience, anger, hostility, and judgmentalism.

7. Practice the Golden Rule and always treat the other person respectfully. Respect and dignified treatment is a foundational character virtue and reflects the principle that we assume that others are inherently worthy of respect.

8. Embrace and promote a collaborative approach to conflict resolution that identifies the mutual underlying interests and a trust that a solution will be found. The key is to recognize areas in which both sides can achieve common goals and needs.

9. Practice a spirit of openness to the views of others through a non-judgmental spirit and assume a humble posture recognizing the existence and validity of other perspectives and views and that our own personal perspectives are limited and error-prone.

10. Disagree in a polite and loving manner. It is critical to separate the person from the position; we must differentiate the individual from their behavior. Hence, when we personalize disagreement and conflict, especially with the strong emotions produced by a history of personal conflict, betrayal, and competition, it clouds our judgment about the merits of the issues. Hence, it is critical to practice emotional regulation and reject personal or personality-based attacks, and a rigid cynicism of the person's motives. In those situations in which we cannot achieve consensus, agree to disagree. Do not personalize the discussion, forgive others for their mistakes and transgressions, as we desire forgiveness for our own. The human tendency is justice for others, but forgiveness or mercy for us. It is vitally important to reject the critical spirit.

11. Embrace the marketplace of ideas in which truth emerges from an honest discussion and debate. We learn from others and views that are different from ours. However, this does not entail compromising key values and principles. We acknowledge that some conflict is necessary and inevitable given the servant leader worldview, which embraces the existence of moral standards and principles and the existence of mutually exclusive truth claims.

12. Enter the process with an open mindset that avoids fixed agendas or preset outcomes. Embrace a genuine commitment to the process, which means accepting the consensus of the group (within stewardship and servanthood guidelines) if it diverges from your own views or preferences. If the executive shapes the outcome, participants will feel manipulated thereby reducing trust, acceptance, and support for the plan.

13. Avoid self-censorship of our views to avoid the Groupthink phenomena in which a group reaches a premature consensus and resists ongoing feedback, discussion, and alternative views. Encourage in others a questioning attitude to provide honest feedback and opinions. Assume the courtroom perspective and subject your own views to cross-examination in an attempt to understand the views of others from their perspective (practice empathy).

14. Commit to a spirit of excellence and diligence in completing all assignments (read assigned materials, attend meetings, be on time, and offer opinions).

15. Demonstrate personal commitment to the organizational change process by attending all meetings, provide adequate support resources and release time, and appoint skilled facilitators to conduct the planning process.

16. Develop realistic standards of success and embrace the inherent inefficiency of the organizational change process, upfront costs and down-stream benefits.

Conclusion

As in the old comic strip Pogo, often "we have met the enemy and he is us" in the organizational change process. SLHRM change efforts begin with a self-inventory of our commitment level and the sources of resistance. Unless we can first manage ourselves, we will lack the vision, strength, and credibility to serve others. As Jeremiah 17:9 states, the human heart is deceitful above all things. To complicate matters, we judge on appearance, while God views the heart (1 Samuel 16:7). Unless we relentlessly seek the truth through the guidance of the Holy Spirit, our change efforts will be ineffective.

CHAPTER 5

SLHRM: PRINCIPLES OF EMPOWERMENT AND DISCIPLESHIP MAKING

Empowerment is a vitally important element in the successful implementation of SLHRM and requires the possession of virtuous character, maturity, and spiritual intelligence on the part of both the manager and the employee. Empowerment begins with followers who embrace the role of conscientious servants. Hence, it is important for SLHRM organizations to cultivate the principles of servant followership as both the foundation of servant leadership and empowerment. Employees need to demonstrate the maturity, ability, and character to be faithful performers in small and great aspects of their work. Servant followership is a great safeguard to leadership self-deception, as servant followers provide honest feedback, which is frequently a "shock" to leadership self-image and beliefs, forcing leaders to re-evaluate the foundation of their actions. That is why servant followership in tandem with employee empowerment are such powerful tools for overcoming resistance to change at all levels as it forces leadership to interact with the key stakeholders exposing them to alternative views, thereby altering how leaders assess the situation and the roles and intentions of others. Peter Drucker's advice in his book *Managing the Nonprofit Organization* (2006) is to ask staff and volunteers what areas require help, assistance, or improvement and how to solve the problems. Employee feedback provides important information to adjusting our perceptions that inform our decisions.

As SLHRM leaders, our goal is to shine a bright light of hope, direction, and security in the midst of the dark storms and chaos that affects employees. In essence, servant leadership is that "city on a hill" that provides a hopeful vision of a better future on clear days, and a lighthouse on dark nights that points the way to safety. Servant leadership is the brightness that illuminates the sources of support and is the preserving salt for

life-sustaining foods during the organizational famine and desert experiences. Servant leaders understand the motives, goals, and tactics of power politics in various organizational settings, but embrace a gentle but firm trust approach that enables them to reject Machiavellian power tactics. Servant leaders are able to function effectively in systems with a variety of worldviews and ethical perspectives without embracing or adopting those values, tactics, or strategies. Organizations assume an important role in this regard by minimizing the motivation and contextual circumstances that tempt our employees to take ethical shortcuts. Management becomes complicit when we make it easy for employees to act on their self-serving needs and wants.

SLHRM empowerment entails a covenantal approach with mutual obligations. This includes instilling a collective recognition regarding the team nature of success, cultivating forgiveness and grace, taking joy in the successes of employees and empathizing for failure, and assigning the locus of responsibility for accomplishments externally while assuming management responsibility for failures and weaknesses. SLHRM empowerment entails the cultivation of key character elements such as altruism, the ability to defer gratification, and the desire to promote the needs of others over the self. A major element of the framework is the development of policies and practices that (1) link leadership effectiveness and advancement to success in developing employees, thereby helping employees identify and "unbury talents" and apply them in an appropriate manner, and (2) preparing successors who are more successful and effective, thereby promoting genuine succession planning and making leaders "dispensable." The following section more fully explores the foundation of servant leadership—the heart of a disciple servant follower.

Servant Followership

Improving our leadership skills is a lifelong pursuit. From a servant leader worldview perspective, when we seek leadership skills first, we are placing the proverbial "cart before the horse."

Thus, we cannot learn to lead like Jesus until we learn to serve like Jesus. An excellent book on this subject is *Jesus on Leadership* by C. Gene Wilkes (1998, Tyndale Publishers). Servant followership gives birth to servant leadership in which employees develop the essential character traits that enable leaders to use their gifts and skills in a humble, responsible, mature, and unselfish manner. Servant followership entails such key attributes as enduring trials and tribulations patiently, learning from mistakes, teachability, obedience to authority, accepting responsibility

for solving problems, exercising initiative, and helping co-workers and clients even when inconvenient or contrary to personal interests. Another key element is self-awareness and knowledge. Servant followers understand their motives, strengths, and weaknesses and select jobs based upon their gifting and passions, thereby reducing stress on themselves and others.

Servant followership entails committing every aspect of our work to excellence irrespective of the obstacles and situation. Even when we work for unjust superiors, it is important to give our best efforts as patiently enduring the offenses. We are then able to achieve the challenging balance between enduring unfair conditions and persecution silently and exercising voice to correct the injustices. We need to reflect carefully and craft a response that balances "voice, endurance and exit" (Hirschman, 1970). The decision on which strategy to employ requires a careful moral, strategic, and tactical reflective process that entails seeking confirmation through wise counselors.

These character elements require a conscious and deliberate dedication to growth. When we practice servant followership in today's troubled and stress-filled workplace, we become that candle in the dark, shining hope and love into the gloomy recesses of our workplaces. I have listed below important key attributes of servant followership.

Twenty-Five Key Attributes of Servant Followers

Principle 1: The Great Commandment

The first principle is to receive the vertical strength and power to love others. This entails loving the Lord our God with all of our heart, mind, soul, and strength, so we can love our neighbors as ourselves (Mark 12:30). With this power from God, servant followers are able to complete all of their job responsibilities with excellence employing moral and ethical motives, means, and ends irrespective of the obstacles. This is a high moral and ethical standard that requires great courage, emotional intelligence, and patience.

Principle 2: 360-Degree Forgiveness

The practice of 360-degree forgiveness in which we forgive all those who disappoint or fail us is a foundational character attribute (Matthew 18:22). An absence of forgiveness is a powerful impediment to healing, growth, and healthy interpersonal relationships at the physical, spiritual, and emotional levels. A prison of toxic emotions holds us captive

when we are unable to surrender the wrongs committed against us as we repeatedly relive the events precipitating the pain. Forgiving the person who wronged us demonstrates our commitment to loving others uncon-ditionally. In the workplace, the absence of forgiveness produces a host of pathologies including the inability to learn from mistakes, a hostile cli-mate toward innovation and creativity, and a repression of growth. A lack of forgiveness is a form of relationship pollution producing toxins that destroy the fabric of healthy human interactions, creating elevated mental and physical stress. With the ongoing practice of forgiveness, there is a higher degree of transparency, honesty, and problem solving, and conflict resolution.

Principle 3: Serve Just and Unjust Masters

The third principle of serving just and unjust superiors with excellence is a very demanding standard. One of the greatest tests of character is to serve with excellence when those in authority attack, malign, betray, marginalize, ignore, and humiliate. How do we respond when our efforts are not valued or are distorted and our good deeds are punished or unrec-ognized? An example of this behavior in the Bible is David serving Saul (1 Samuel 18) in spite of Saul's attempts on David's life.

Principle 4: The Exercise of Situational Leadership

One of the great distinguishing characteristics of a mature servant follower character is asserting leadership when the situation warrants our inter-vention. In today's more complex and rapidly changing environment, SLHRM organizations encourage and require employees to exercise leadership in solving work-related problems on their own initiative. One of the great impediments to a genuine servant leader witness is adopting a defensive and legalistic approach to our jobs. When we are reluctant to use our talents, assume responsibility, and exercise leadership in solving problems, we impose costs on our co-workers and clients, and depreciate organizational effectiveness. One of the great servant follower character attributes is the embrace of the "ministry of interruptions" in which we take time from our busy schedule to assist others. Jesus interrupted His normal schedule to interact and serve those with great needs irrespective of the delay or cost (see the story of the woman with the issue of blood in Luke 8:43–48 and the story of blind Bartimaeus in Mark 10:46–52). We all have natural job descriptions written by our employer, but of greater importance is our moral job description that entails loving our neighbor as ourselves.

Principle 5: Embrace the Healthy Pursuit of Excellence

SLHRM organizations understand that growth is a long-term process entailing mistakes, errors, and failure. The healthy pursuit of excellence is the orientation to institute realistic standards of performance, accepting the inevitability of mistakes, and embracing the value of trial and error in the learning process. Perfectionism is the antithesis to the healthy pursuit of excellence. Perfectionists "game the system" and do not take the risks needed for personal and organizational growth. Our moral job descriptions call for us to work with excellence. What does excellence entail from a servant leader standpoint? The key element of excellence is love-based obedience. We perform to the best of our ability and treat others according to the Golden Rule, but recognize that we can only do our best and trust God for a good outcome (see Galatians 6:4–5). This enables us to maintain a calm demeanor irrespective of the situation and associated consequences, thereby reducing stress, anxiety, and fear. When we fail, we "fall forward with grace" confident that we will learn and grow from the situation, given our trust that we can learn from all situations. SLHRM organizations reinforce this principle by "going against the grain" through such management practices as positively recognizing individuals and work groups for good faith efforts that resulted in failure. When management demonstrates appreciation for efforts as well as results, it reinforces confidence in employees and strengthens trust and credibility.

Principle 6: Practice Initiative and Creativity

Servant followers understand that there are instances and seasons when status-quo job performance is not sufficient. Hence, solving problems requires novel approaches. Traditional problem solving will not work, and there is need for "outside of the box" thinking. Hence, employees must both work within and outside of their normal job description and work requirements. The goal is to use all employee creative gifts and talents to take authority over our work environment and be fruitful in our job domain. We are made in God's image of endowed with creative gifts (Genesis 1:27). When we consistently make the choice to withhold our skills, time, and talents, we impoverish the work environment. Conversely, management must embrace and cultivate a culture that rewards risk-taking and innovation.

Principle 7: Reliable and Conscientious Work Performance in All Situations

Servant followers understand the importance of being faithful in the routine and exceptional, in the minor and major job duties, and in the unobserved

"behind the scenes" and the highly visible public settings (see Luke 16:10). Good and faithful servants possess a passionate conviction to promote servanthood and stewardship interests as we must strive to perform our job to the best of our ability to serve irrespective of the circumstances.

Principle 8: Honor Your Employer by Providing Honest and Constructive Feedback

Servant followers understand the importance of speaking truth in love (Ephesians 4:15) and reject walking in a critical or cynical spirit. As servant followers, we must provide clear information on performance issues, both positive and negative. Withholding, distorting, or selectively presenting information to promote gain or avoid punishment for self and others impedes truth and problem solving. It requires great courage and wisdom to honor this requirement.

Principle 9: Commit to Supporting Your Leaders, Subordinates, Peers, and Clients

It is vital as servant followers to support every member of the organization by a mindset that earnestly hopes for their success and prosperity. The "path less traveled" is to take joy in the success of others while being sorrowful over failures, even with the "tough love" and "sandpaper" people that we dislike or who view us as enemies (Matthew 5:44). One of the most human of emotions is to take joy when those who have hurt us fail or suffer. As the cliché states, "misery loves company." If we are to develop the courage, wisdom, and discernment to love others, to complete our work duties with excellence, and resist the darker impulses and pressures to compromise our ethical and moral integrity, we must commit to a positive and supportive mental attitude toward others. The only effective eternal weapon is to respond in love, and an attitude of support is the foundation. To promote the best interests of our enemies is a powerful statement of forgiveness and faith. When we make the choice to "love our enemies," in spite of our feelings, our obedience to this principle changes the work climate in a very profound manner. It clearly releases a power that melts hardened hearts as it requires courage to surrender our natural self-protective mechanisms.

Principle 10: Practice Gratitude for Past, Present, and Future Blessings

Servant followers are grateful for the blessings in their lives. A great means for insuring inner peace and tranquility is to assume a mindset of

contentedness irrespective of the circumstances (Philippians 4:12). We can only embrace this principle if we truly believe that all the experiences of our lives can eventually produce good (Romans 8:28). We must look beyond what we see and feel, and by faith believe that we will never be tested or tempted beyond our ability to bear (1 Corinthians 10:13). As servant followers, we go beyond the "half-full" principle. We are realists in that we see that the glass is half full, and we are grateful that it is not empty, but by faith we have an earnest expectation of hope that the glass will become full and overflowing in due time.

Principle 11: Commit to the Success of Your Supervisor and Coworkers

Servant followers understand and are comfortable in their identity as team players and the necessity for others to "shine brightly." One of your prime work duties is to help others around you to achieve their work goals. There are times when we "He [Christ in us] must increase, but I must decrease" (John 3:30). An active embrace of support entails such factors as helping others when they are overwhelmed with quantity or quality of work, require assistance in learning new tasks, provide moral support and encouragement in stressful situations, and simply take time to listen. When we take time to assist others, we release a spiritual power that brings encouragement, love, and support into the workplace. A mark of maturity is our commitment to helping others unbury and develop their latent talents and use them in appropriate ways.

Principle 12: Discover and Be Content in Your Unique, and Priceless Identity

One of the great sources of ineffectiveness in the workplace is to live someone else's life. It requires a tremendous amount of energy to direct and channel our gifts and abilities away from our natural proclivities, like forcing water to run uphill. When we misunderstand and misperceive our purpose, gifts, and abilities, we are never "good enough" and always searching for fleeting confirmation and reassurance. The goal is to learn from colleagues, not to assume their identity. One of the great psychological and spiritual warfare weapons in all settings is for our misplaced focus to steal our genuine distinctiveness, thereby impeding our ability to fulfill our purpose and calling, hampering the distinctive purpose and attributes that only we can provide in meeting the unique needs in others (Bolles, 2013). We find great peace when we accept our gifts and roles both individually and as part of a teamwork focus (see 1 Corinthians 12).

The reciprocal side of the equation is for management to clearly value and provide dignity to every employee.

Principle 13: Do Not Compare Yourself to Others

Personal comparison leads to many immoral and deceptive emotions, beliefs, and actions from envy, jealousy, and lust to fear, anxiety, pride, complacency, and judgmentalism (2 Corinthians 10:12). Misguided interpersonal comparison is the source of much misery, stress, and strife in the workplace as we use inaccurate standards and knowledge to assess others. We judge by appearance, missing the key details of the heart. As any lawyer will state, inferring intent in others is a very difficult standard. The goal is to learn from others, but not to allow our perceptions of their strengths and weaknesses to control how we view ourselves. We all have a tendency to hide our weaknesses and showcase our strengths, making accurate assessment under any circumstances challenging. We can learn from others, but not judge them or us.

Principle 14: Humility Is a Foundational Servant Follower Virtue

We must recognize God as the source of our God-given gifts and strengths (Philippians 4:13), while assuming personal responsibility for our weaknesses and limits. Humility is not the self-depreciation, degrading, or discounting of our strengths and accomplishments. It is a humble but grateful recognition that all of our capabilities and successes did not occur in a vacuum and we are all part of a collective, integrated system with God at the foundation. Conversely, humility acknowledges that we all possess weaknesses but we are not defined by our failures or shortcomings. We must recognize that there are no "self-made" men or women and that we are debtors to many. Humility recognizes that we have much to learn, and embraces a teachable spirit as we seek out corrective feedback.

Principle 15: Servant Followers Passionately Embrace Truth Telling

Servant followers speak "truth to power" through honest feedback (voice) to protect the integrity of mission achievement and the interests of other key stakeholders, and demonstrate their love of their superior by providing input to avoid mistakes. One of the greatest tests of character in the workplace is mustering the courage to inform superiors of performance problems, interpersonal dynamic dysfunctions, or waste, fraud, and abuse (see Proverbs 27:6). Can we speak truth when the risks are high? This requires great courage and trust.

Principle 16: The Practice of Personal Transparency

Servant followers recognize that they are not perfect and that others can learn from their mistakes. When we admit our weaknesses in an appropriate fashion, it demonstrates our humility and trust (see James 5:16). Clearly, this practice requires a climate of faith, mutual respect, and confidence in the integrity of co-workers and supervisors. We must be prudent in our disclosures to avoid needless attack or disadvantage. However, when we are open about our mistakes and problems, it encourages others to practice transparency and improves the climate for learning and problem solving greatly.

Principle 17: Reject the Temptation to Harden Our Hearts and Externalize Blame

Servant followers understand that the natural response to failure is to blame others or circumstances beyond our control. We desire grace for our mistakes and sins, but are more prone to anger and holding others accountable. As Adam blamed Eve for eating the forbidden fruit, humanity is always searching for reasons to avoid responsibility (see Genesis 3). One of the great enticements is to fault others or external factors for our mistakes and failures. To resist this tendency we must assume personal responsibility for creating and solving problems. The key is to relentlessly review our motives and actions to first determine our contribution to the problem (see Matthew 7:5). In effect, servant followers search a situation and reflect on their contributions before addressing other factors, regardless of actual personal responsibility levels. Another key tendency is what scientists term the "fixed response bias" in which in order to protect our egos and image in decision making (few of us enjoy being proven wrong), we seek information that confirms our decision and view and discount more readily information that contradicts our beliefs (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). Hence, this is a form of "hardening our heart." To overcome this tendency, we must learn to seek information that challenges our views and assume "an innocent until proven guilty" perspective given that this is a higher standard of proof.

Principle 18: Be Patient and Faithful in Trials and Tribulations

Servant followers persevere through trials and communicate hope and optimism while avoiding complaining, grumbling, and faultfinding. Be willing to "pay your dues" and wait patiently for recognition and promotion. When we make the decision to be thankful in the midst of our trials

and suffering, we are making a very powerful statement that our faith in a better future is greater than our fear of the problems (Romans 5:3, James 1:2). One important means is to list every day areas of our lives that we are grateful for even as we experience the "body blows" of difficult situations. Complaining demonstrates a lower degree of faith and impedes our ability to cope and adapt. When we become discouraged, begin to complain, or respond in anger, we are worshipping the problem and stating implicitly that the circumstances and problem are more powerful than hope for a future solution.

Principle 19: Learn to Live in the Present

Servant followers are mindful of the "precious present" and fix their internal vision and attention on how to both enjoy the moment and trust for a better tomorrow and future (see Mathew 6:27). This attitude of trust promotes patience and perseverance. One of the great tools of spiritual warfare is to focus our mental and physical energy on reliving the past or projecting doom, gloom, and fear endlessly into the future. When we permit the past or the future to rule the present, we fail to fully live in the moment and love others. It provides a fertile ground for both pride and fears to rule our emotions and generate powerful forces that deflect our attention from the precious present. When fear and anxiety dominate our thoughts, this torment impedes our ability to solve problems and address the needs of the present. When we nostalgically live in the past, we overlook the problems of those bygone times, the blessings of the present, and the hope of the future. When we live continually for the future, we forget the lessons of the past and the blessing and advantages of the present. We must actively seek to be content in our present situation while praying for the future in faith, pursuing healing from the traumas of the past, and avoiding resting in complacency in the present.

Principle 20: Practice Unconditional Altruism

Servant followers assist fellow employees in need (mentor and coach new employees, support and assist coworkers) even when inconvenienced or disadvantaged and "go the extra mile" (Matthew 5:41). When we make the choice to assist others in spite of the obstacles and the costs, it demonstrates our commitment to esteeming others greater than ourselves (Philippians 2:3). It is also provides the foundation for a Golden Rule work place in which others take time to help us when our time of need arises.

Principle 21: Practice Courtesy, Tact, and Politeness to All

Servant followers respect and treat others with gracious and loving esteem. One of the great contributors to workplace stress is the loss of civility and respect. Servant followers assume that others are inherently worthy of respect and do not have to earn fair treatment. This foundational Golden Rule attribute reduces tension, defensiveness, and aggressiveness in the workplace. Honoring this principle is especially important during interpersonal conflict and interacting with difficult personalities. Other employees are always watching, and such principles as "a soft answer turns away wrath" (Proverbs 15:1) will defuse many confrontations.

Principle 22: Practice Active Listening

Servant followers hear with the heart as well as the mind. The key is to be content in listening more than we speak (see James 1:19). Active listening is a powerful demonstration of "other centeredness" and a manifestation of Golden Rule love. Active listening reinforces through words, body language, and tone of voice the importance and high priority attached to the other person's views and needs as we concentrate intently on understanding and developing empathy. Empathy and understanding neither implies agreement nor condoning what others say, but is a powerful form of humility that rejects overt judgementalism. Active listening entails paraphrasing to demonstrate understanding, probing to generate enhanced detail, a posture in which we listen more than we speak, avoiding interrupting or make leading statements, and resisting forming rebuttals in our mind while the other person speaks (we can think much faster than we or others can talk). Active listening requires practice and commitment, but the fruits are considerable.

Principle 23: Supporting Coworkers through Encouragement and Accountability (Tough Love)

Servant followers embrace the harmonic balance between high standards of performance supported by encouragement and grace. Excellence of character entails love in its full form. Discipline and loving feedback is a form of love (Hebrews 12:6). Providing correction with the appropriate motive is a foundational element. When we are dedicated to promoting the best interests of others, irrespective of the nature of our personal relationship, it sends a very clear message that we are persons of character and can be trusted.

Principle 24: Do Not Exploit Your Employer

When in a position of bargaining strength relative to your employer, do not make excessive or unreasonable demands that take advantage of an employer's vulnerable situation. Servant followers commit to a long-term employment relationship founded upon trust and grasp that the relative positions of strength and weakness can change. The goal is to promote the mission and honor our moral job description. When we restrain our natural impulses to extract concessions at times of bargaining strength and the vulnerabilities of our employers, we demonstrate a commitment to the higher order Golden Rule principle. Otherwise, we generate a Darwinian "survival of the fittest" environment in which we "live and die by the sword" (Matthew 26:52).

Principle 25: Practice Unswerving Honesty

Servant followers are uncompromisingly conscientious and honest in using organizational resources (money, time, equipment, supplies, etc.). When we are faithful in the small things (Luke 16:10), we earn the trust and confidence of our employers and those around us. When we resist the temptation to avoid work or use organizational resources for personal gain, we shine brightly and set a tone that encourages others to honor moral conduct standards.

Application

The challenge is to embrace these attributes from a love-based relationship standpoint, not purely out of obligation. Servant followers will often pay a high price, but they are confident in their ability to cope and adapt to changing circumstances. We focus on the problems of the day and reject worry regarding the outcome. It is clearly a challenging proposition to embrace a life of trust, but servant leader character is the foundation of our confidence. Servant followers take the road less traveled!

With the foundation of servant followership established, servant leaders genuinely understand that empowerment requires an internal ethos in which the mission requirements and the needs of others are more important than the leader's ego, reputation, and personal needs (esteem others greater than ourselves, Philippians 2:3). This requires an inner patience and contentment to focus on the mission regardless of the circumstances or conditions. It also entails the courage to reject a comparative and competitive orientation that focuses on what employees lack while embracing a patient confidence that they will grow and develop in a unique but

equally or more effective fashion. In the empowerment process, servant leaders must resist the impulse to micromanage and avoid investing in others to retain indispensability and control. Servant leaders understand that one of the most important elements of their natural and moral job description is to develop disciples who will significantly exceed them in skill, success, power, and influence, hence they must decrease, so others can increase (John 3:30) and do greater things (John 14:12). Servant leaders possess the ability to identify hidden talent and gifts as well helping others to appropriately use and channel existing misused talents. Hence, they seek opportunities for subordinates to prosper and succeed in new organizational territories. They are always training their successor and providing a "double portion of spirit" (2 Kings 2:9). In order to lead effectively, servant leaders understand the importance of setting priorities for themselves and their organizations, to focus on the "best" while reducing emphasis on the "good but not critical" elements related to organizational success. A great challenge is to make the difficult decision to reject desirable activities that reduce time and effort devoted to the core priorities. Another aspect is to model and grant permission to subordinates to reject "fire-engine management" with urgent but trivial items. Finally, servant leaders generate a passionate enthusiasm for the mission, their clients, and their employees providing meaning, purpose, and dignity to all.

Encouragement and support are two major pillars of servant leadership empowerment and basic elements of our moral job description in all life domains. God understands our human need for recognition and encouragement (1 Thessalonians 5:11) and commands us to esteem others greater than ourselves as we lift each other up (Philippians 2:3). However, we recognize that our need for encouragement and recognition can become an idol with an insatiable addiction to affirmation (Galatians 5:26). The ideal state is to "die to the self" in which we labor from motives of unconditional love and gratitude neither expecting nor requiring earthly recognition. The comfort comes from loving others. In essence, we hope that our relationships will be supportive and loving, but we do not require human affirmation to feed our soul and spirit as our unconditional love and affirmation comes from the Lord and it is Him we ultimateliy serve and receive our rewards (Colossians 3:23–24).

A basic servant leadership/followership principle is that each person assumes personal responsibility and accountability for his or her contribution to relationship- or performance-related problems. We first must "remove the log in our eye" (Mathew 7:5) and then make the necessary sacrifices and actions to solve the underlying factors. Implementing this principle is very difficult in practice, especially with relationship trauma from past wounds and intense performance and financial pressures. Given

today's fiscal and other performance pressures, employees and managers are in desperation mode, and the typical Darwinian survival of the fittest cultural mindset dominates. For every organization that remains true to the ethos and values of SLHRM, many more have taken the "low" road. Servant leadership/followership is a precious character attribute.

A great challenge for organizations is in selecting and developing servant leaders who inherently desire to empower others. Is an orientation to servant leadership empowerment a function of a relatively fixed and stable human development nature and nurture process that produces a temperament and character "genetic signature," or is it a learned set of behaviors? In reality, it is likely both. There are several key facets at the heart of servant leadership. We should be assessing both character and competence, but there are both legal and ethical challenges to character assessment. One frequent error is to focus selection efforts on recruiting the "star" performer. Research and servant leader principles agree that focusing HR recruitment strategies on the best performers ignores the reality that the success of our "stars" is dependent on the team (Groysberg & Nohria, 2004). Hence, it is more effective to assume a long-term developmental approach.

Another key SLRHM practice is the intentional cultivation of servant leaders who intrinsically embrace empowerment through formal succession planning and mentoring. Servant leaders who were themselves developed and mentored are more likely to make disciples themselves! Servant followers understand that they require instruction by "masters" with greater levels of experience and understanding. The development and mentoring process is central, but given the limited time and number of SLHRM managers, how practical is it? The first element is to carefully select mentors and offer organizational support, training, and boundary expectations. One option to increase the number of mentors is to redefine a senior mentor to include one or two levels above, but that may not provide insufficient distance in expertise and experience level for some employees.

When we select managers who will empower employees, it is crucial that they possess desirable character traits such as conscientiousness and honesty, and manifest a strong internal motivation to serve with excellence, meet the needs of others, and promote the mission. With the establishment of character, the next set of selection factors include a composite criterion consisting of emotional intelligence and technical skill related to the core job duties and responsibilities along with behavioral, personality, and attitudinal "fit" with job requirements, well-developed and honed interpersonal skills, and positive peer input regarding teamwork and interpersonal skills. Another key element is to empower middle

managers. Organizations often focus on the lower and upper levels of management investing less time and energy in the development of mid-level managers. It is important to assume a balanced approach of engagement with middle managers, while at the same time bringing in outside expertise to provide new perspectives. The key is to forge a partnership to retain the valid institutional knowledge.

The empowerment process entails a reciprocal set of obligations. Servant leaders understand that empowerment is not cultivated in a vacuum. It is important to systematically plant, nurture, and water the seeds of empowerment. To support empowerment, we need ongoing human capital investment in group processing skills including the competencies associated with self-directed work teams such as goal setting, feedback, empowerment, conflict resolution, performance planning, and ongoing team-building exercises. Effective empowerment also requires the development of a performance management support system of valid and reliable performance standards and metrics that assess teamwork skills and periodic recognition of exemplary teamwork skills (i.e., an awards ceremony for the "solid citizen"), interpersonal skills evaluation, work process and outcome performance metrics, and a balanced system of group and individual rewards.

However, the foundation is always the cultivation of positive character traits and identifying and proactively remedying negative traits, attitudes, and behaviors. One strategy is to implement a spiritual intelligence support program. Spiritual intelligence counseling identifies cognitive distortions and replaces with healthy coping thinking and behavioral patterns. These distortions include unrealistic performance standards and goals, judgmentalism, the martyr syndrome, perfectionism, pride in various forms including viewing performance as overly dependent on individual abilities, comparison envy that contributes to jealousy and externalizing blame, and failure in lieu of assuming personal responsibility. Healthy spiritual intelligence principles include promoting a foundational humility in which we measure ourselves only by our humility and how we use our gifts for the greater good recognizing that God is the originator and determiner of our gifts and accomplishments. Other key elements include being joyful over the success of others, and viewing mistakes and failures as essential learning and character development experiences.

Another key element is cultivating shared values through team activities such as community service and social events. The ability to develop a team, work as a team member, and manage a cohesive group is an invaluable managerial competency that is increasing in importance as the nature of the production and service delivery process evolves from a hierarchical to a shared and organic process.

We impede the healthy development of empowerment by common organizational practices such as not enabling job candidates to meet with supervisors, thereby losing an opportunity for additional information gathering, in effect, a form of realistic job preview. Another key weakness is the absence of systematic management training and development program and the lack of managerial accountability for employee development and advancement. Organizational solutions include the use of 360-degree feedback to hold managers accountable, and in the selection process arranging for candidates to meet with direct supervising managers.

Servant leaders guard against the spirit and practice of compartmentalizing our servanthood and stewardship obligations into a narrow manager and employee dichotomy. In essence, the servant leader embraces 360-degree servanthood and believes passionately that demonstrating love and excellence in all situations is in our vocational and spiritual job description. Cultivating a workplace of spiritual excellence entails an unswerving commitment to mission, an altruistic spirit of self-sacrifice, and a commitment to ethical integrity of motive and action. The levels of accountability for remedying these problems include organizational level policies and practices that promote accountability (training, performance management process oversight, mediation, counseling), God-honoring SLHRM character in managerial behavior (support, forgiveness, clear expectations), and promoting servant followership-oriented peer group relations (support, collegiality, and assisting and helping co-workers).

Conclusion

As we conclude this chapter, recognize that empowerment is a signature element of SLHRM. There is no recipe-like formula guaranteeing success. Empowerment capacity develops slowly through the crucible of ongoing development and growth in our level of character, job knowledge and general life experience. However, organizational policies and practices can either accelerate and accentuate or impede and suppress empowerment values and skills. Let us dedicate ourselves to this noble quest and take the path less traveled!

CHAPTER 6

SLHRM: PRINCIPLES OF FAIR EMPLOYEE TREATMENT

SLHRM organizations possess a passionate commitment to dignified employee treatment. Employees are not just "resources," but souls made in the image of God. Promoting employee rights is a foundational Christian servant leadership principle. How we treat employees is an essential interface between core servanthood and stewardship values in an organizational decision-making environment that typically possesses a schizophrenic view toward employees. In one perspective, employees are human beings with souls while from another standpoint they are instrumental "costs" of production that must be minimized in our hyper-competitive marketplace. Which of these views prevails? For SLHRM organizations, the response is simple: employees are not costs, but the human flesh and blood foundation of the enterprise.

It is important to relate the system issues with the individual restoration of the human heart from the bonds of deception and sin. The sanctification process in which we grow in spiritual wisdom and we model Christ and allow the Holy Spirit to change our hearts is a lifelong and intermittently painful process. We can all relate to the central role of trial and tribulation in the shaping and restoration of the heart. A mountain-top experience inspires given the breadth and depth of vision, but the close quarter spiritual warfare combat involved in the Christian maturation process is waged on a daily basis in the dense undergrowth of the organizational spiritual jungle with limited lines of sight. We must rely on the Holy Spirit for direction, strength, and wisdom to resist the hidden dangers of ambush by the idols of this world. The great enemy to our success is the internal mental and physiological effects of the internal battle of the mind, the fog and confusion produced by negative thoughts and emotions such as fear, anxiety, discouragement, anger, and lack of

forgiveness, among others. We must make several key decisions to address the root cause of our mental warfare temptations, as there are specific actions we must embrace while relying on God to do the rest. One key element is the need to rebut negative thoughts and emotional states with the countervailing word of God. The development of such a balance is a major challenge of our walk with Christ. When we assume an excessive degree of responsibility, the yoke of legalism binds us with a works mentality, which produces bondage and despair. When we fail to assume the proper degree of ownership, we shirk our free-will responsibilities and fail to grow in faith. Achieving the harmonic mean is an ongoing life challenge. The next section illustrates fair employee treatment principles in key SLHRM functions.

Leadership Abuse of Power

We recognize, however, that employee–management disagreement and conflict is inevitable given difference in interests, belief systems, and fallen human nature—but these differences need not metastasize into the violation of dignity leading to the abuse of rights, producing dysfunctional and destructive behavior. These violations of dignity take three forms: management violation of employees, employees violating management, and employees violating the dignity of each other. When any form of rights violation or abuse occurs in the workplace, it distorts the God-given image of both the offender and the recipient.

Let us begin first with leadership abuse of employees, which is the most pervasive and serious. Historically, leadership exploitation and abuse contributed to the need for employment and safety laws and the advent of unionization. These institutional accommodations are a reaction to abuse of employee rights and dignity through the operation of the employment-at-will doctrine and the instrumental view of labor as another cost of production to be minimized. The instrumental view of employees dehumanizes the workplace, impedes employee growth, and hinders workplace transcendence. It is a form of idol worship deifying financial goals (teleopathy) over human welfare ("mammon" over human needs). An instrumental worldview fails to promote a public interest perspective and necessary altruism to serve as our "brother's keeper," both within the organization, with clients, and the larger community of stakeholders.

Instrumentalism is the product of the ruling worldview in which profit is the primary goal buttressed by underlying causal character and spiritual sins and dysfunctions of pride, greed, fear, envy, jealousy, power, control, and narcissism, among others. The fruit of these organizational

spirits are arbitrary employee treatment and the abuse of authority exacerbated by the absence of due process protections and the inequality in power between individual employees and management, resulting in exploitative and unsafe working conditions and performance expectations, wrongful terminations, and unfair discipline. When management views workers as instruments, it is easier to rationalize the imposition of labor cost reduction strategies that increase work effort and reduce compensation.

One very useful framework for viewing employee fair treatment is through the lens of procedural, distributive, and interactional justice. Research demonstrates that employee perceptions of fairness influence a whole host of attitudinal, behavioral, and performance outcomes (De Cremer et al., 2010). Procedural justice entails employee perceptions of the fairness of the organizational decision-making process including elements such as the presence of due process, the degree of employee input, voice, and participation, the presence of clear, specific, fair, and transparent decision rules, unbiased and fair decision makers and the comprehensiveness and accuracy of information. If employees are confident the process was fair, they are more willing to accept actions and decisions, even if they disagree or fail to promote their interests. Distributive justice is the perceived fairness of the outcome of the decision itself, for example the size of a pay increase or a promotion. Interactional justice refers to the fairness of interpersonal relations and dignified treatment of employees. Clearly all three forms of justice are essential to SLHRM organizational integrity.

A powerful means for proactively identifying present or future justice-related problems or liability areas is through a diagnostic "early warning" qualitative research system including employee attitude surveys, focus groups, and retention/exit surveys. Organizations are operating blindly without such systems. However, the most effective "canary in the coal mine" remains open, two-way communication based upon a climate of mutual trust. These qualitative research methods serve as a focal point for joint labor-management quality improvement and problem-solving teams. When the diagnostic instruments identify problematic trends, the organization can implement interventions to address the underlying problem. For example, if the attitude surveys demonstrate employee frustration with high caseloads, labor and management can work together to streamline other work demands to increase time on the core functions. However, if information is gathered and not used as a key resource in organizational change, employees develop a cynical approach, reducing their incentive to provide honest feedback.

Risk Factors for Unfair Treatment

What are some of the risk factors that contribute to potential unfair treatment? A major influence is the absence of servant leadership and employee empowerment gradually leading to a higher level of distrust and varying degrees of overt, covert, and passive-aggressive conflict and resistance. The final stage is an open and sustained conflict-infused employee–management relations climate generating an accelerating cycle of distrust and retaliation for perceived or actual wrongs. Each side views the other as the "enemy" and devises military-like strategies to "defeat" their opponent. This creates a culture that impedes the development of a learning organization in which all stakeholders are viewed as essential and treated with dignity and respect. This toxic environment impedes effective organizational problem solving as each side withholds information to gain an advantage in the employee–management "wars." The result is the "house divided" that cannot stand given the absence of a "body of Christ" mission orientation in which others are esteemed greater than themselves. Organizational history demonstrates that this pathology of conflict can so thoroughly dominate attitudes and behavior that employees and management are willing to sacrifice customers, clients, and the mission integrity of the organization rather than cooperate or admit defeat. This was a major factor contributing to the demise of Eastern Airlines in the 1970s (Zainaldin, 2004). The pernicious effects of a poisoned employee relations climate impedes good faith attempts to solve problems given that the other side is always wary of a "catch."

Another risk factor is a blatant power imbalance. When either employees or management achieve dominance, the potential for abuse is greater. As the dictum states, absolute power corrupts absolutely. Employees can impose unreasonable terms and conditions on employers if they lack a commitment to servant leadership and mission achievement. There are many examples of labor and management working synergistically providing a competitive edge if both sides are dedicated to mission achievement and a spirit of humility. Southwest Airlines and the City of Indianapolis are best-practice organizations that are heavily unionized (O'Reilly & Pfeffer, 2000; Rubin & Rubin, 2006). The common denominator is the embrace of partnership perspective based upon trust, mutual commitment, a common set of mission and vision values, and recognition of their mutual dependency.

The Importance of Employee Voice

These serious ethical treatment issues place tremendous pressure on employees. Executives and managers possess a Christian deontological

obligation to protect employee interests and integrity. When there is a violation of fiduciary obligation, employees must make difficult decisions to address their cognitive and affective ethical dissonance. Organizational dynamics frequently place significant barriers to a righteous organizational response. A major factor that influences an employee's course of action is the degree of employee loyalty to the organization (see the work of Hirschman, 1970). When loyalty is low, employees are more likely to embrace either active or passive exit. Active exit is leaving the organization, while passive exit entails a "checking-out" at work as the employee psychologically disengages thereby reducing job effort and performing at a minimum level. When loyalty is high, the employee is more likely to attempt voice, or an active process of intervention to change the organization. Employee voice is effective when the following three conditions are present: (1) there exists an effective means to express employee discontent; (2) the organization possesses the time and resources to change direction, and (3) the organization possesses self-interested reasons to take seriously employee attempts at voice and exit (Hirschman, 1970).

There is an inherent dilemma at both the employee and customer levels. Organizational loyalty is a function of trust, and reflects a cumulative form of psychic capital that can cause employees to overlook the ethical implication of a policy. Hence, employees may overlook or rationalize away misgivings based upon their confidence in the intentions of the organization (psychological trust). In other words, they are excessively liberal in giving the organization the benefit of the doubt. For voice to be credible, there needs to be a legitimate perceived threat of exit. When employees possess few employment options, or are subject to easy replacement, voice is muted. The same thing occurs at the customer level if new clients readily replace dissatisfied customers. As Christian servant leaders, it is our God-honoring duty to actively seek employee voice and hold ourselves accountable irrespective of the bargaining power held by employees. The best-practice Christian and secular companies possess many formal and informal policies and practices (360-degree feedback systems, employee empowerment, suggestion systems, among others) to increase employee input in order to promote the organization's long-term well-being and interests. When organizations embrace employee voice, a bountiful crop of goodwill is harvested, thereby enhancing organizational problem solving and learning.

There are two categories of employee responses to a stressful superior–subordinate relationship. The first dimension relates to coping strategies that provide internal psychological adaptations to the stressful situation. For example, there is a calming influence by acknowledging and agreeing with scriptural promises that "all things work out for the best for those

who love God and are called according to his purpose" (Romans 8:28). We may have little to no influence regarding the external situation, but we can influence how we react. This is a fertile area for Christian growth through the implementation of applied sanctification principles that contribute to character development (dying to the self). The second dimension relates to what stress researchers term "adaptive responses" that entail changing the external environment through a physical or interpersonal intervention such as engaging in a principled negotiation strategy (Jex, 1998). As Christian employees and managers, we need to develop a career management toolkit inventory of coping and adaptive strategies.

A key factor is identifying the underlying mutual interests that meet the legitimate needs of manager and employee. A third dimension for thought is the development of institutional safeguards to reduce the frequency of dysfunctional work relationships. Christian servant leaders proactively reduce employee stress through a variety of organizational practices.

Another key element that contributes to the violation of employee rights in the workplace is abusive supervisors. Managers who terrorize subordinates, clients, and other stakeholders impose great costs in terms of employee well-being and organizational effectiveness. The presence and influence of "rogue" managers erodes employee trust and increases vulnerability to lawsuits. SLHRM organizations address this issue through such means as 360-degree feedback systems with subordinate appraisals. Federal Express (FedEx) is a "best practice" organization in the use of 360-degree feedback, as managers cannot advance or receive pay increases with poor subordinate assessments (FedEx, 2013). In addition, the organization must clearly reinforce through all aspects of the HR system (selection, training, promotion, retention, performance appraisal) that employees must be treated with dignity and respect and supervisors who abuse employees will not be retained. Of course, the same level of accountability is important with employees given the widespread presence of employee abuse, bullying, and harassment.

Strategies to Enhance Workplace Fair Treatment: Collaborative Problem Solving

This section addresses key organization practices to enhance workplace fair treatment. What are the effective policies and practices to prevent the conditions that contribute to unfair treatment and to correct the problems once they appear? One key element is to cultivate an employee–management paradigm shift toward a consensual and collaborative problem-solving approach.

One pillar of a just and ethical workplace consists of an ironclad covenant between labor and management. Both sides must be committed to the success of the mission, recognizing their mutual dependency and the need to assume the attitude of a servant in which Christ is the ultimate employer. The first step is cultivating mutual understanding. Many corporations rotate their new management or professional hires among service or production level positions to enhance their grasp of the business and develop empathy with line employees. At many companies, professional employees serve in various blue-collar positions. This enhances knowledge of the production process, employee needs, and problems, and increases networking contacts.

Second, it requires servant leaders and followers from both labor and management who are willing to risk personal job security and reputation to bridge the conflict gap. There must be champions on both sides as occurred in the labor-management cooperation initiatives within Indianapolis city government (Rubin & Rubin, 2006). Servant leaders must be willing to love the truth and the praise of God more than the praise of men. As noted previously, a great historical example was Lee Iacocca assuming leadership of the Chrysler Corporation and accepting a salary of a $1 until the company returned to profitability, thereby demonstrating his empathy, support, and solidarity with employees agreeing to wage and benefit concessions (Herbst, 2007).

Another key but sobering learning point is that the ethics of Christians are frequently the same or less than that of nonbelievers. We must ruthlessly commit to integrity in all areas of our lives and admit when we fall short. As such, managers must first acknowledge their contributions to the problem before assigning blame to others. As the nation of Israel wandered in the desert for 40 years (Numbers 32:13), until we truly learn the lesson God ordained for us, the same problems and situations will return until we make the correct choice and the heart is changed. God is infinitely patient.

Another area in which we must remove the "log in its eye" is by assuming our personal responsibility for the leadership and management work system contributions to the organization's problems. As Christian servant leaders, we must model accountability. Externalizing blame by attributing problems to the employees and other stakeholders accentuates negative job attitudes, apathy, discouragement, conflict, resistance, and distrust. Employees resent being held accountable and responsible for factors beyond their control. Leadership must first analyze its contribution to the fiscal and management problems. Total Quality Management (TQM) guru Edward Deming noted the tendency of management to attribute to employees a much higher percentage of the responsibility

for poor performance than warranted (Deming, 1986). Deming believed that 90 percent of productivity problems were the responsibility of systems, hence an overlooked management accountability area. Whether the actual figure is 90 percent or 1 percent employee responsibility, the trust restoration process begins with a critical self-appraisal of leadership's contributions to the problem, to remove the log from our eye first. Only then can we reverse the human tendency to demand justice for others, but grace in ourselves.

This lays the foundation for the next stage, searching for the areas of common ground of mutual interest and gain. When these areas are located, propose a jointly empowered process to develop a solution to a well-defined and readily solvable problem, thus searching for the "low-hanging fruit." The area selected should be limited in scope (start small) with the decision rules mutually developed with accountability and evaluation mechanism equally verifiable (Fisher, Ury, & Patton 1991).

When we achieve success in small areas, it begins to melt the glacial and hardened hearts with hope. The next stage is the development of employee–management teams to solve jointly the common problem areas. Employees and management should be jointly empowered to make changes in work processes, work rules, staffing practices, and supervisory spans of control. It is critical to provide training to support the problem-solving efforts from both a technical (quality improvement techniques) and process perspectives (group functioning) learning from best-practice examples of other employee–management partnerships. It is important as well to publicize actively the results of these efforts to reinforce perceptions of progress in building trust and reducing cynicism. Another key reinforcement practice entails explicitly linking the results of employee–management cooperation initiatives to the performance management and appraisal system. It is essential to develop standards and metrics for management that emphasize the promotion of harmonious employee relations and a high quality of work life. To reinforce a climate of innovation, one effective approach is to reward employees for cost reductions and productivity increases through a gain sharing (sharing a portion of the savings) and bonus system (Arthur & Huntley, 2005).

A collaborative employee–management approach is truly the road less traveled, but provides a great opportunity to change the culture of an organization to promote a more God-honoring climate. Even in the areas of unionization, which is anathema to most organizations, it is important to resist the impulse to oppose automatically union influence, as there are significant system effects for opposing unions producing a measurable negative effect on labor-management relations in the other areas. For example, unions are much stronger in the public sector

(representing approximately 35 percent of local government employees) (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). Many urban areas manifest strong support for unions based on high levels of community and political system support for social justice oriented employment policies. The goal is to benefit minorities through the higher wage and benefits levels of union living-wage jobs. Are labor unions antithetical to SLHRM values? As noted previously, there are numerous examples of successful companies that partner with unions, such as Southwest and Lincoln Electric (Handlin, 1992; O'Reilly & Pfeffer, 2000).

Compensation Elements

A major component of a high level of organizational distributive justice is how the fruit of employee labor are distributed. Compensation should be fair but not excessive. The laborer is worthy of his fair wages, given that organizational compensation level leaders manifest higher retention levels, among other benefits. In all sectors, there is a moral and ethical obligation to share the fruit of the labor with employees. It is my belief that if organizations adopted a salary, compensation, and working condition "market leader" policy, they would be even more successful and profitable in the long run. One question that is important from a wage and social justice standpoint is whether it is better to employ fewer workers at a living wage or more workers at subsistence levels. Should SLHRM organizations choose to pay higher wages than the market? One approach is that employees must assume responsibility for human capital development and obtain advanced skills and training if they expect a living wage. However, SLHRM organizations invest in employees through systematic skills development and such program as tuition reimbursement programs. This demonstrates love and respect for employees. I believe that choosing to pay above market wage levels demonstrates trust, confidence, and a recognition that the organization's success is a product of the skills, character, and motivation of their employees. However, it also demonstrates confidence in God's favor and provision. In essence, it reflects the choice to adhere to the spirit versus the letter of the compensation system law.

Performance Management Fairness

Fairness in the performance management process begins with a developmental and coaching-based process of clear and specific performance goals and standards, specific and timely performance feedback, and the opportunity to to actively participate and provide input into work goals and standards. When performance problems develop and reach a level in

which formal management action is necessary, corrective and progressive discipline is the foundation. When management disciplines or discharges employees for cause through the inability to meet performance standards, rule violations, or ethical and moral transgressions, procedural justice requires providing the following: (1) disciplinary process based on the principles of "just cause" including advanced employee notice and warning, (2) the violation's clear connection to safe, efficient, and effective operations, (3) a detailed, complete, timely, and investigatory (discovery) process with comprehensive employee input and participation, (4) sufficient evidence to support the action, and (5) a consistent and unbiased rule application process (Chief Human Resource Office, 2014). The final ideal element is a fair appeals process ideally before an unbiased and independent review board or official (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Jackson & Schuler, 2006).

Organizational Separation Layoff and Separation

As Christians, we approach all forms of organizational separation decisions with humble "fear and trembling." Employees possess souls, and we must seek the Lord's guidance on the appropriate course of action. As Christian management author Michael Zigarelli (2003) notes, downsizing per se is neither unethical nor contrary to Christian principles. God works for the good in all situations, and there are instances in which this form of "tough love" discipline is necessary for the best interests and well-being of the employee or the well-being and/or survival of the organization. We certainly do not state this flippantly, recognizing the breadth and depth of the consequences for the employee and his or her family.

The various separation categories include fiscal, performance, and mission-based mass layoffs, and performance or conduct-related individual terminations. Our first obligation is to seek the Lord in prayer for guidance. The scripture passage in Proverbs 3:5–6, NRSV states that we must "Trust in the Lord with all your heart, and do not rely on your own insight. In all your ways acknowledge him, and he will make straight your paths." We cannot make any decision of this nature without the wisdom of God through the Holy Spirit. SLHRM managers should begin by analyzing the implications of layoffs relative to four key areas: (1) morality, ethics, and values; (2) human resource implications in terms of employee attitudes, and behavior; (3) financial integrity; and (4) performance/mission impact.

A key question is how the layoffs will influence organizational trust. The decision to terminate or lay off employees entails a profound ethical

and values-based dilemma on multiple levels. These include the inherent morality of separating employees in a time of economic recession, the impact on families and the community, the procedural justice implications (the fairness of the process and its associated criteria), and the distributive justice consequences (who is deserving of layoff). When narrow fiscal self-interest drives the decision-making process, it impedes the genuine expression of love and support in the workplace, and contributes to moral compartmentalization (e.g., "I am not responsible for the consequences of organizational actions relative to the lives of employees.") Layoffs generate stress, fear, and "survivor's guilt" for those who remain. The addition of higher workloads increases job demands and pressures contributing to job disengagement and burnout. Employees who are stressed and afraid develop a defensive posture that reduces compassion in the workplace (helping others), and contributes to minimal levels of work effort (not-in-my-job description syndrome). Chronic job insecurity is a source of employee job stress, which adversely influences employee job satisfaction, commitment, work motivation, productivity, and citizenship behaviors (compassion fatigue), hence a vicious circular casual path (Hellgren, Sverke, & Isaksson, 1999; Marchand & Blanc, 2011).

Layoff decision rules clearly should include financial viability. However, economic criteria are necessary, but never a single sufficient criterion from a SLHRM perspective. From a Christian worldview, an organization provides services and goods that promote God's greater purposes and calling. SLHRM organizations understand the importance of a long-term covenant, and are willing to incur significant short- and long-term financial loss and hardship and lower levels of long-term profit or net revenue to honor core relationship obligations. From a Christian worldview, if love is the ultimate "currency," then relationship viability is the moral key end goal necessary for mission success.

SLHRM organizations imbed layoff decisions within the achievement of greater purposes. Hence, the financial standards that justify immediate or future layoffs for SLHRM organizations are very demanding. It is important to assess both the short- and long-term effects and the consistency with SLHRM values. Hence, they frequently contribute to a conflict between traditional financial metrics and servant leadership values. For example, are the short-term financials improving? If so, this provides evidence to support delaying layoffs until clear evidence of sustained long-term negative fiscal trends emerge.

As with mass layoffs, individual performance or conduct-based terminations should be the option of last resort and only after the institution of a progressive discipline process. As Michael Zigarelli (2003) notes on an article on the termination procedure, grace with accountability should be

the default decision-making approach. One reason for this attitude is that the necessity to terminate frequently reflects a collective failure apportioned between the manager (e.g., the absence of mentoring), flawed organizational systems (e.g., poor selection and training practices), and the employee's behavior (e.g., failure to receive and integrate performance feedback). SLHRM organizations grant employees ample opportunities to correct deficiencies, but employees possess a concurrent good faith obligation to be teachable and make good faith efforts to apply the feedback and guidance.

In deciding on the correct course, we have the benefit of hindsight and many years of research to shed additional light on the situation. Servant leadership requires a 360-degree stakeholder-by-stakeholder justice assessment to identify the consequences of the layoffs (employees, shareholders, and the community). This entails addressing the procedural and distributive justice implications of termination decisions for all relevant stakeholders. Another important principle is that as managers we are the shepherds of the flock. None of us wants to stand before our Maker with ineffectual excuses as to why we worshiped at the idols of mammon and failed to protect the interests of our employees, their families, and the community. As such, it is our responsibility to safeguard our employees to the best of our ability, even if it entails significant personal cost. There is an increasing body of research demonstrating that the various forms of downsizing (layoffs and contracting out) as a cost reduction and profit-maximizing strategy is ineffective and actually delays a return to profitability (De Meuse et al., 2004; van Dierendonck & Jacobs, 2012). What is clear is that there are a host of dysfunctional consequences such as higher levels of employee stress, a loss of institutional memory reducing productivity, and higher degrees of anxiety and insecurity (Brandes et al., 2008).

The establishment of a servant leadership covenantal relationship (as with Southwest airlines) entails the adoption of a policy in which layoffs are a last resort remedy. This entails empowering employees to increase efficiency and effectiveness and use the creative energy of employees to solve organizational problems. When employees are active participants in the quality process, they are more likely to accept layoffs when there are no other options. Accountability begins with management making the initial sacrifices through reductions in compensation, bonuses, and stock options before engaging in downsizing. When organizations view the employment relationship as a covenant, there is reduced reliance on layoffs and a greater embrace of strategies such as hiring and salary freezes/reductions, voluntary furloughs, early retirement, and employee layoff "volunteers."

If financial conditions mandate layoffs, servant leadership requires that we support employees adversely impacted by organizational stewardship decisions. This sends a clear message that the organization values employees and actively considers the consequences of its decisions. The decision to terminate employees entails a profound set of ethical and values-based issues, including the procedural justice implications (the fairness of the process and its associated criteria), and the distributive justice consequences (who is deserving of layoff). The ethical challenge is especially acute in a time of economic recession given the impact on families and the community. How an organization manages this process reflects essential character and integrity issues for leadership and the organization as a whole.

The list below provides a summary of the main principles related to SLHRM downsizing decisions. These principles are "ideal" type and foundational to a workplace culture that places employee and human relationships at the center. We cannot love our neighbor as ourselves if we treat employees as mere instruments of production. These principles clearly increase the short-term costs of operations, but like our Christian walk, we must sacrifice short-term gain for the term well-being of all stakeholders.

- *Establish a workplace covenant with employees that embraces job security with layoffs as a strategy of last resort.* SLHRM organizations cultivate an ethos of mutual sharing of the financial pain and loss between employees and management. This reinforces the commitment of the organization to its employees and its employees' commitment and humble submission under management's authority. Hence, management and employees should share the costs and burdens of economic problems. The strategies of "first resort" include:
  1. *The key factor for the Christian servant leaders is the confirmatory evidence provided by the Holy Spirit.* God is the same yesterday, today, and forever (Hebrews 13:8), and will provide that "cloud by day and pillar of fire by night" guidance (Exodus 13:21) if we earnestly seek His will.
  2. *Management and leadership empower employees to engage in continuous improvement to enhance organizational efficiency and productivity.* Employees should share in the benefits of increased efficiency and effectiveness (a gain-sharing system that provides employee bonuses, for example). This will improve the organization's effectiveness to reduce the probability of downsizing.
  3. *Empower employees at all levels to develop solutions.* This entails productivity improvement suggestions, new product development, and innovative marketing efforts. Tap the expertise and

good will of employees to develop creative solutions. In addition, higher levels of employee input reduce employee stress and anxiety and increases organizational trust.

4. *Empower employees to develop a collective commitment to sharing the costs and the associated pain.* It is unlikely that employee efforts to develop creative solutions will solve the problem in the short term. At this stage, it would be wise to empower employees to devise methods for sharing the burden including hiring freezes, pay reductions, early retirement options, relaxation or work rule restrictions, work hour reductions, and voluntary reductions in grade or job classification systems, transfers, or reassignment to lower-skilled positions, among others. These options must be carefully managed and balanced to avoid a loss of institutional expertise and disrupting established work relationships and routines.

5. If reducing costs and increasing efficiencies are insufficient, consider voluntary/involuntary furloughs and salary and benefit reductions as the next stage for leadership, management, staff, and line positions.

6. If downsizing must occur due to a serious and prolonged fiscal crisis, adopt a fair and transparent protocol for separations with the following attributes:

   ○ Openly share the fiscal or other mission-related rationale with employees, including access to budget, financial, and performance data to validate the financial exigency. Organizational leaders then consult with employees who provide input into the downsizing implementation plan. This reinforces management trust in employees.

   ○ Leadership commits to ensuring that as many terminations as possible will be accomplished by attrition or other noncoercive means (i.e., a hiring freeze, buy-outs, early retirement, etc.).

   ○ Ask employees voluntarily to assume the role of a contractor or part-time employee with a commitment to rehire when the financial position improves. This would work most effectively if done on a voluntary basis. If organizations mandated this step, most employees would view it as exploitative.

   ○ Leadership provides as much advance notice as possible for all layoff decisions (ideally at least three months).

   ○ Leadership clearly communicates the impact and scope of the separations and how remaining employees will be affected and supported.

○ Provide a relevant severance package including education and training assistance.

○ Provide job counseling services, job training, and outplacement assistance.

○ Provide life transition or mental health counseling.

○ Provide paid benefits for six months or until the employee obtains a new position.

○ Provide viable reinstatement options if the economic conditions improve.

○ Promote pensions and health insurance portability to reduce fiscal and family stress.

○ Provide each separated employee with a personal thank you and statement of regret from leadership.

Many will "roll their eyes" over such an extensive list, but organizations that "walk the extra mile" and truly "count the cost" reap precious fruits of support and trust. A great historical example of these principles is Malden Mills, the Massachusetts textile company. In 1995, the plant burned to the ground, and the company was faced with closing its doors and laying off 3,000 employees with devastating consequences to the community (Leung, 2003). The owner of the company, Aaron Feuerstein, rejected the path of expediency, embraced the Golden Rule, and paid the employees while the plant was rebuilt, generating tremendous good will and loyalty leading to long-term prosperity. If more employers would embrace a covenantal, long-term approach, we would create a more just, equitable, and prosperous workplace and society. Hence, when servant leaders take the path less traveled, it produces a treasure trove of employee benefits.

The Recruitment Process

SLHRM organizations frame the workplace in the terms of a covenant. This entails establishing a set of mutually recognized and observed obligations and benefits that govern and order workplace interactions, terms and conditions. In essence, the employment relationship is one of the most important life roles, expressing the redemptive and sanctifying love of Christ. Managers are shepherd of the flock, possessing a humbling and fearful level of accountability, while employees must work diligently as if working for the Lord. The recruitment process establishes a foundation for the communication and demonstration of the organization's values.

Organizations are often tempted to terminate newly or recently hired employees when fiscal problems emerge. From the employee's perspective, it is a breach of faith when a candidate accepts a job offer and the organization suddenly informs him or her that his or her services were no longer required. Employees accept organizational offers of employment in good faith. An early termination imposes high costs on employees relative to relocation expenses, the stress of job change and moving, lost income, and most importantly, adverse career development effects. The organization violates the psychological contract, generating a pernicious fruit of anger and dissatisfaction. In addition, employees can suffer adverse effects related to their reputation even with economic layoffs, given the widespread practice of using fiscal exigency as a convenient excuse for terminating problem employees.

Contingent Labor

It is important that SLHRM organizations use contingent labor in a God-honoring fashion adhering to servant leader principles and values. Contingent labor consists of contract, temporary, and part-time employees. Contingent labor when used judiciously is an effective means for providing services at lower costs. The benefits of contingent labor for management include lower staffing costs, a more accurate assessment of employee ability and performance before a permanent hire, and increased staffing flexibility. For employees, the advantages include the promotion of work life balance (job sharing, part-time work), enhanced learning and career development opportunities, and the flexibility to "test-drive" careers or employers before a long-term commitment.

The use of contingent labor is becoming standard practice in today's flexible, "just-in-time" service delivery and manufacturing processes. Many employers are reducing the cadre of permanent employees while utilizing contract employees at times of peak demand. However, it is also a great source of temptation to replace full-time employees simply to reduce labor costs. This increases the job insecurity of permanent employees. In addition to the lower wage and benefit levels, contingent employees frequently endure higher workloads and reduced investment in employee training, health, and safety. In addition, managers and full-time employees frequently view contingent employees as "second class citizens" creating an "in-group and out-group culture" in which the organization refrains from the communication and relationship investments needed to adequately empower, support, encourage, and mentor their contingent labor. In essence, the organization denies contingent labor of the requisite level of dignity ascribed to full-time workers. Temporary

workers are frequently disengaged given the lack of investment in their future (Boyce et al., 2007). Managers possess a higher degree of position power relative to contingent labor given their contractual, at-will status, but this coercive power to terminate does not engender genuine, heart-based motivation. Employers have the power of sword, but fear produces only minimal engagement, commitment, and motivational levels. The lower adherence of temporary and contract employees to the mission is a very real and present danger.

Case Discussion: Absenteeism and Presenteeism

One key aspect of SLHRM ethics is the systematic assessment of how organizational policies influence the incentive and motivational system of employees. Are we tempting our employees to sin? In an ideal world, the internalization of Christian moral values is the essential immuniza-tion as employees recognize that honesty is the best policy, and that their character flaws will ultimately sabotage both their personal success and that of the organization. One area that illustrates the interface between management policy and employee motivational response temptations is the litmus test related to employee absenteeism. It is very tempting for employees to abuse paid time off, and easy for management to look the other way. However, there are significant monetary and nonmon-etary costs to unscheduled absenteeism and it is essential to communi-cate clearly the nature, magnitude, and effects of those expenses in terms of their ethical and utilitarian aspects. These include that misusing sick leave imposes a spiritual tax on all employees through higher workloads and the associated mental and physical stress in addition to the increased labor and production costs. It is important to recognize that when there are chronic attendance problems, there is a collective systems failure. If employees abuse the system, the organization must carefully assess the factors that encourage employees to abuse paid time off. In many cases, it is the unrighteous treatment of employees through unrealistic perfor-mance expectations, unfair supervision, poor compensation, abusive and dysfunctional relationships with supervisors, peers and/or clients, sexual harassment, and other forms of discrimination. In other instances, it sim-ply reflects a lax moral climate in which management and HR fail to monitor the system.

Hiring for character is a major element of an effective servant leader SLHRM system, but given prolonged temptation, even virtuous employ-ees succumb. The formula requires treating employees with respect and dignity but requiring a concurrent level of integrity and responsibility. Many employers provide immature employees with unwarranted and

unwise degrees of freedom and autonomy, thereby providing the means to support their own ongoing moral failures. As scripture states, a little yeast leavens the entire batch (Galatians 5:9). Permitting chronic abusers to manipulate the system provides additional rationale, motivation, and temptation for others to act upon their negative impulses. The key here is to set high ethical standards, provide incentives for correct behavior, and administer appropriate discipline. Absentee control responsibility is a partnership with employees and management with each side possessing important obligations and roles. It is always easier to blame the other party before looking in the mirror. The key is to train managers to administer the system in a uniform but flexible manner that takes into consideration mitigating circumstances. There should be no compromise on foundational principles and ethics, but reasonable grace. It is important to move beyond the confines of the absenteeism control plan to address the key intrinsic motivational issues. The long-term solution is to change the underlying value orientation of employees by increasing the intrinsic motivational attributes (Hackman, & Oldham, 1976).

Attendance policies encapsulate the clash of competing motivational philosophies. Should we reward employees for meeting a basic term and condition of employment such as showing up for work? The answer to that question partially relates to your worldview. A teleological behaviorist worldview adopts the utilitarian approach of embracing practices that produce the greatest good. Recognizing employees for high levels of attendance clearly communicates an elevated degree of employee regard and appreciation. A deontological principle approach states that rewarding people for doing the correct thing ultimately weakens motivation. This occurs when the reward is no longer provided (extinguished), hence the motivational force behind the behavior loses its power. In many cases, the heart of the issue is character and ethical integrity, hence system behavioral management only addresses the symptoms, not the root cause, and there is always room for manipulation for the ill-intent motivated employee. Managers bear responsibility for anticipating attendance-related motivational temptations and how the system affects employees and their incentives for maintaining proper conduct. We cannot change the heart of our employees, but we can provide the godly role models and boundaries that protect employees from their negative impulses. Using positive reinforcement for improvement in the behavior of the chronic abusers has its place, but unless they demonstrate good faith and improvement, it is in management's best interest to terminate with due process.

The important issue here from a servant leadership perspective relates to the mutual responsibilities of employees and management. The research clearly indicates that the majority of absenteeism is not for employee sickness (Bonacum & Allen, 2007). The decision to call in sick is the employee's alone, but does the employer bear any responsibility here for the underlying incentives? There is an important need to involve the supervisors. Front line supervisors bear the greatest burden in terms of absenteeism control, and their input is critical from a diagnostic stand-point in identifying the cause of absenteeism as well as potential strategies for addressing the problem.

There needs to be a balance of flexibility and standardization in absen-teeism reduction systems. However, there are significant administra-tive and legal complexities generated by a flexible system. How can the organization balance the two interests? First, clearly reinforce a point of "Christianity 101," that God provides rewards for those who love and obey Him. Concurrently, God disciplines those He loves; hence, convic-tion always entails loving discipline that brings clarity to the reasons for the negative consequences, and most importantly, the ability to confess, repent, and renounce thereby engendering genuine change of heart and behavior. A sole reliance on a punishment and rewards system is operant conditioning, a hedonistic worldview strategy.

A very important element when trust is absent is providing mutually agreed upon decision rules and mutually verifiable information and data. Providing data on the negative consequences of an absenteeism control plan is a key element of a partnership in solving the problem. For example, consider developing a paid time off system that lumps together, sick, personal, and vacation days, compensating employees for unused time. These systems provide more flexibility for employees and reduce management monitoring requirements. Employees can take time off for any reason with advanced notice, and then use the days for unscheduled absenteeism as well. These systems remove management from having to police employee behavior while reducing the tempta-tion for employee deception. However, from a Christian worldview, is this simply another policy decoupling moral responsibility from decision making? I understand and generally embrace the use of positive incen-tives, but my question relates to our obligation as employees from a Christian worldview. Servant followers and leaders understand that we obey not to receive rewards, but to please and honor God. Hence, we pursue the good as part of our redeemed nature, knowing that when we commit sin, there are consequences. God convicts us, but does not condemn.

Employees need to receive clear and specific communication and training on the various key HR policy areas, including absenteeism and its consequences, and sign an accountability pledge committing themselves to honoring both the letter and spirit of the policies and practices. It is important that employees read the employee handbook and absenteeism policies and discuss the policies in orientation and training sessions. In this regard, having employees sign an agreement that they have reviewed the handbook and the various attendance policies is another means to reinforce employee moral responsibility.

The opposite end of the continuum of paid sick time abuse is presenteeism, or working while sick (Bonacum & Allen, 2007; Cocker, Martin, & Sanderson, 2012). Both presenteeism and absenteeism contribute to organizational ineffectiveness, though presenteeism is more difficult to measure. In making the decision to work while ill, should workers be trusted with autonomy, or do they need strict controls? Another key element is the type of error and cost produced when working while ill. In many settings, it is more costly to have workers on the job who are sick and not 100 percent productive than in others. In other settings, the absence from work has serious performance implications thereby enhancing the importance of both attendance rewards and accountability. In other settings, the absentee policy may be more effective with less stringent controls and reduced penalties for unscheduled absences. Management and employees need to grasp the many ethical issues surrounding chronic employee absenteeism. There are significant costs related to the employee who needs to take time off, but will not. Employees can become legalistic and works–based when work assumes the status of an idol. Employees become addicted to the affirmation and recognition related to their essentiality and thereby believe that their presence is indispensable for success. Only a more balanced view of life and God's healing power breaks this vicious cycle. Are we being our brother's keeper when we come to work sick? What are the costs on other employees and productivity? Will working while sick impede recovery? Employees must grasp that their decision to work while sick has broader consequences.

One issue that increases the complexity of absentee management programs is the interaction between the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in relation to mental illness and stress-related illnesses. These illnesses are more difficult to diagnose reliably and hence can be an area in which employees can manipulate the system. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of the key principles related to promoting a climate of fair employee treatment, principles of Kingdom business and competition.

Kingdom Business Principles: Competition

Kingdom principles embrace an inequality of rewards. Scripture is clear that there is a diversity of gifts, talents, and resources according to God's will (Matthew 25:14–30). Salvation is by faith and grace alone, but there are different levels of eternal rewards once we enter the Kingdom. However, God distributes these rewards upon a standard of God-honoring motives, means, and ends embedded within a spirit of humility and agape love. If our motives are anything but love, our accomplishments are burnt in the fire and are not eternal, as is very clearly illustrated in 1 Corinthians 3:12 and 1 Corinthians 13. Our pride and self-interest corrupt virtue. We must ruthlessly subject our motives to the review and discernment of the indwelling Holy Spirit. Power and success corrupt subtly and incrementally in the heart ungrounded in the truth. We must define success in godly terms in which growth in revenue and budgets are a means to support larger more noble ends. Servant leadership is a constant struggle.

There is much confusion about competition. God calls us to excellence, but we do not compete against others, only ourselves, to perfect the faith, gifts, talents, and Christian character traits God has given us. The competition, however, is a loving and grace-filled exercise in which we realize that we learn as much or more from failure as we do from success. We confuse godly excellence and worldly excellence much too frequently. We must learn that godly winning entails humility and practicing self-control. As the Apostle Paul states, God's strength is made perfect in my weakness (2 Corinthians 12:9). To be moral and God-honoring, there is a tripartite set of conditions that must be present. The competition must possess a godly root motive based upon a form of godly love expression, must be conducted in a fair and ethical manner (means integrity), and must be directed at a goal in harmony and directed by the Lord's will improving the human spiritual and physical condition. As such, competition frequently fails to meet these standards of godliness. Godly competition stimulates innovation, creativity, and learning in both organizations and individuals. Godly competition entails rejecting a destructive, "take no prisoners" mentality, but a grace-filled pursuit of excellence to glorify God and help others. Godly competition is a form of motivation and learning at the individual and group level. God-honoring competition builds up all competitors in character and performance, is a process designed to improve all participants. It is like a rising tide that lifts all.

As the body is composed of many parts of different size and purpose (1 Corinthians 12:14), we all possess a unique mission function that

requires a variety of resources to accomplish the tasks that God sets before us. The real key is the stewardship issue, that we must obey the Lord in how we use our diverse resources, gifts, and talents to promote the Kingdom of God in word and deed. From a Christian worldview perspective, work is an attribute of God and therefore job creation is a prime criterion for a Kingdom organization.

A private sector company that provides excellent illustrations of Kingdom business principles is Pura Vida. Pura Vida is a company that grows fair trade, organic coffee while supporting many charities. Its business plan provides letter and spirit integrity regarding its emphasis on community investment and promoting social justice. It is a collective expression of shared values across many different producers. Pura Vida reinforces the principle that a Kingdom organization invests in the spiritual, emotional, and physical well-being of workers, their families, and the larger communities in which they operate.

Kingdom businesses do not manufacture "needs" that are really "desires" based upon lusts. Hence, they reject marketing campaigns that persuade consumers to believe that luxuries are really necessities. There are powerful spiritual warfare elements in business. God created man in His image, and God blessed us with the ability to generate wealth through our labor. However, as with every godly blessing, a satanic counterfeit corrupts and destroys. The root of the deception relates to the locus of responsibility for creating wealth, who owns the increase, and the proper use of the fruits. The original sin of pride is the most powerful corruptive force. We violate God's commands and worship the creature when we begin to believe it is thorough our efforts that wealth and value are created and the fruits are mine to do with as I wish. A true satanic deception!

One of the most damaging misconceptions is to construct a caste system of Christian ministry, the elite and spiritual full-time ministry workers in a church or para-church, and the bulk of lay believers who toil in organizations. In reality, as Sherman and Hendricks note (1987), we are all ministers of the Lord wherever we are. From a theological standpoint the compartmentalized view is false because it places limits on the scope of God's impact, both in terms of the believer and those who need the Gospel. A Kingdom business is a powerful tool for demonstrating the love of Christ in a 360-degree format (employees, customers, the community). Pastors need to be educated more formally in the faith-at-work movement. I personally believe that each church should have an active workplace ministry with an organized discipleship program in the areas of Kingdom business, servant leadership/followership, and spiritual intelligence.

Conclusion

Fair employee treatment is not an optional element for servant leadership. How we treat others is a reflection of our own hearts and its foundational motives. When leaders embrace a self-serving, instrumental approach, employees become means to an end. This is the ultimate dehumanization process. This chapter reinforces the importance of more than a superficial embrace if we are truly to adopt a moral perspective.

CHAPTER 7

SLHRM: PRINCIPLES OF WORK/LIFE
BALANCE AND MARGIN

How many hours should we work? This is a profound and essential question, answered by addressing a series of principles noted below:

1. The will of God as discerned through prayer, scriptural reflection, and other means for hearing God should be the directing force for our work hours and effort. We need to believe that God has a unique plan, purpose, and calling and that His direction, leading, and guidance are the best course for our lives.
2. The goal is neither a static nor a moving balance, but a shifting and dynamic harmony with God's will and purpose. As Pastor John Ortberg (2002) noted, the Apostles did not lead balanced lives, but lives of order and seasonality as directed by God's ongoing direction and priority setting.
3. God's will for our vocational life encompasses the following characteristics:
   a. Performing our work with excellence as broadly defined (efficient and effective, mission enhancing, ethical, moral, and treating others by the Golden Rule)
   b. Providing sufficient time and energy for our other life domain obligations (family, church, community, etc.)
   c. Providing sufficient time for self-care (relationship building, sleep, nutrition, exercise, recreation, etc.)

Returning to our original question, how many hours should employees work? The conventional standard is the 40-hour, 5-day work week. However, is 40 hours a biblical moral standard? Clearly not. The biblical workweek is six days (Exodus 34:21), with no guidance on the number of hours. This is not by accident. The honoring of the Sabbath entails

a six-day work week, which is founded upon God's creation of the universe in six days and the need for one day to rest and enjoy His (and our) creation (Genesis 1). Jobs and occupations vary in their effort and time demands. There are two separate, but interrelated aspects. The first is the ability to work long hours, the second is the most important, should we be working longer hours? The normative question is the most important. Is it God's will for us to work longer hours, carefully addressing the factors as noted above? The question of ability relates to such elements as our health and energy levels, family demands, our passion, interest and love for the work, the degree of intrinsic motivation experienced, our degree of control and autonomy related to the quantity, quality and timing of work, and the degree of fit with our gifts, abilities, and skills. We can work safely and intensively for many hours if we possess good health, a favorable family care-giving situation, possess great love and passion for our work, our level of intrinsic motivation is high, enjoy a significant degree of job autonomy, and experience a symmetry between job demands and attributes and our skills, giftings, and abilities (round-peg in a square hole). Our ability to work longer hours without adverse health, relational, and spiritual effects depreciates with lower levels of the factors discussed above. Hence, even a 40-hour work week can be detrimental if reduced autonomy and job demands exceed our ability levels. Hence, the optimal hours of work will vary by life season as led by the Lord. In the biblical model, here are periods of high investment followed by rest.

One of the factors that both enhances and impedes the achievement of this harmony is the technological innovations of the virtual workplace. iphones and the associated cellular and computer technology allows employees to work from almost any location and time. Hence, there is much higher degree of flexibility in work location, hours, and enhanced efficiency levels. However, there is concurrent negative impact as these devices blur the traditional boundaries between work and personal time tempting employees to be in constant communication working through breaks, lunch, and nonworking hours including vacations. This enables the highly engaged to experience freedom with the higher connectivity, contrasted with a new "yoke and chain" for those who desire separation and boundaries from work but are forced to respond to work messages.

It is imperative that organizations develop a culture that encourages and requires employees to "unplug" themselves from electronic devices to safeguard personal time. This is accomplished through mandating that employees be contacted during nonwork hours on a true emergency basis only.

SLHRM organizations manifest a conscious recognition and commitment to employee life harmony and wellness. This entails sustainable

and reasonable work demands and expectations permitting the employee to invest in the full range of life domains. The book *Margin* by Richard Swenson (2004) eloquently illustrates the epidemic of activity overload that afflicts our modern society. Work is one of the major, but by no means the sole or most important, contributors to this pathology. We are an activity- and schedule-driven society. Hence, we become a rest, balance, and most importantly a relationship "challenged" and deficit-ridden society, even within the church and as born-again, Spirit-filled Christians. The values of secular society and that of the modern church mirror each other, defining success in terms of performance, accomplishment, knowledge, power, money, and prestige versus our intrinsic worth and identity as human beings made in the image of God. God is infinitely more concerned about our Christian character development and sanctification than meeting worldly standards of success.

One of the hallmarks of SLHRM is setting realistic standards of work performance and effort. Servant leadership recognizes the importance of godly life balance and the need for rest and refreshment. Secular companies such as SAS Corporation incorporate life balance into their very fabric by limiting work hours. However, they remain the exception rather than the rule. Why do so many organizations fail to honor this principle? The roots of this mindset are complex. Many Christians have internalized a false theological view of their role assuming a much higher degree of responsibility for success than is scriptural or realistic. In essence, we become addicted to a spirit of works in which we believe that we are God's chosen instruments and our labor is the essential element. God does work in partnership, but only God gives the increase (1 Corinthians 3:7). We confuse working for God with laboring in partnership with Him. We internalize these standards both at the individual and the HR system level through unrealistic "face time" and work effort levels leading to ongoing burnout and disconnection from the vine creating a very vicious cycle. One solution, exemplified by mega church pastor Andy Stanley, is the limitation of work hours to 40 per week (Morgan, 2006). The change reduced pressure on the paid staff and produced a higher level of organizational effectiveness through enhanced discipleship by the empowerment of lay volunteers.

Another helpful suggestion is that by Pastor Wayne Cordero recommending we adopt a "back schedule" approach in which we first enter "appointments" for God, family, and rest before work (Cordeiro, 2009). As Christian servant leaders, we must work at a pace that neither exhausts our employees nor leave them vulnerable to the influence of the blinding effects of pride through work-related "empire-building."

Another major factor is that we have conditioned ourselves to resist the rest of mind, body, and spirit that is essential for relaxing in God's

presence and hearing His voice. We must ruthlessly resist the impulse to equate action and activity with virtue. God calls us to serve in the full range of life domains (family, church, community, and leisure). There are seasons of our lives when in a relative sense we need to place more emphasis on one domain or the other. However, we never abandon our responsibility in any of the areas, but shift the relative priority based on the season and God's mission.

Achieving work and life balance is especially acute for working mothers as they shoulder a higher degree of responsibility for child rearing, hence, limiting their time for work. In essence, many women are now realizing the high costs associated with working full time and meeting the needs of their children. That is why more working mothers are opting for part-time work along with higher family care giving time investment by fathers. Understanding our limits is an important element of workplace spiritual intelligence, and the requirements for sacrifice in choosing the best over the good. Agape love requires self-sacrifice and denial, and most families today must choose between material success/ achievement and quality family-rearing practices. Raising children is a higher calling than career advancement in the Christian worldview, and hence a realistic standard of success entails recognizing the limits to time and energy invested in the workplace. The economic value of the homemaker is difficult to quantify, but estimated to be in the range of $112,000 (D'Arcy, 2012). Add the spiritual dimension, and it is clearly off the charts! Whatever we give up for the Lord, we receive a hundredfold in this life plus the benefits of eternity (Mark 10:30). Homemakers make great sacrifices for the well-being of the family unit, and the Lord honors and rewards such commitment.

Compassion Fatigue

When we become burdened with overwork and activity addiction, a common product is compassion fatigue, or the loss of empathy for others. One of the signature emotions of compassion fatigue is guilt and condemnation. These are not from Christ, but the fruits of overwork and burnout (see Romans 8:1). It is clear from a scriptural basis that God expects us to embrace realistic standards of performance and obtain the rest that we need to serve with godly excellence, which clearly conflicts with worldly and legalistic/works-based definitions of success. Psalm 127:2 states, "It is in vain that you rise up early and go late to rest, eating the bread of anxious toil; for he gives sleep to his beloved." There are seasons of intense work of planting and harvesting, when we are out of balance, but only for a limited time, based upon the specific leading of

the Holy Spirit, and rest and refreshment always follow these periods of high activity (see Ecclesiastes 3:1–8). One of the sure signs that Satan is "calling the shots" is that there seems to be no end to the demands and no hope of refreshment. God always provides hope and an outlet if we choose to seek and accept it.

We frequently become victims of our own success. Activity divorced from the Holy Spirit's direction eventually chokes the joy and peace of our lives and we become removed from the vine. In the church and the workplace, one of the main markers of enlightened leadership is setting boundaries and realistic standards of performance. In essence, servant leaders help protect employees by reducing the level of temptation to act on fleshly impulses to overwork. The presence of compassion fatigue demonstrates a need for rest, reflection, and nurturing from the Lord. We as a society make it difficult to engage in periods of restoration given our worship of activity, results and performance, plus the dysfunctional emphasis on victory at any cost. The seasons of rest are necessary, especially after the hidden stress of "mountaintop" experiences with demanding life challenges. As Jesus withdrew from the crowds for prayer and solitude (see Mathew 14:23, Mark 1:35, Luke 5:15), we must quiet our minds and, as it states in Psalm 37:9, "Be still in the Lord, and wait patiently for Him."

There is an ongoing cost of servant leadership and Christ-like devotion. Compassion fatigue gradually extinguishes the motivation and joy received from helping others. When we are in the full clutches of compassion fatigue, there is little to no joy or satisfaction in our job duties. Resentment and annoyance replace a genuine concern for others. The ministry of interruptions becomes very difficult when we lose perspective. Careerism is an ongoing challenge for Christians given the presence of fleshly motives, pride, legalism, and the spirit of works. The sad truth is that the ministry used to be one of the most balanced and healthy professions, now it is one of the most unhealthy (Wells, 2002). The same is true with many other nonprofit organizational positions. One factor that contributes to the absence of life balance is the false dichotomy between body and spirit. The body is the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Corinthians 6:19), and requires care and nurturing.

The typical face-time organizational culture and its emphasis on long hours and short-term performance pressures, significantly reduces long-term commitment. When executives and other management officials support these values, employees internalize the organization's instrumental meta-ethic embracing short-term production and profit over collective servanthood interests. This organizational "spirit" engenders communal "compassion fatigue" thereby attenuating the essential Golden Rule organizational citizenship behaviors (helping those in need) that reduce

overall employee stress. Employees who embrace the organization's dysfunctional values, even though they recognize the pernicious fruits, are unable or unwilling to make the needed changes.

Organizations that are under great stress produce employees who are fearful, fatigued, and risk-aversive. When we lack the energy and time to take care of our own needs, unless Christ is at the very center of our lives, we will walk on past the wounded and needy on our personal road. Compassion fatigue attenuates the precious social reinforcement and support that is essential to enduring trials and tribulations. Employees begin to devour themselves and others. One of the antidotes to this poison is to empower employees to make adjustments in the work place to cope with the heavy burdens. Managers must tap the latent energy and innovation of the work group to improve efficiency and effectiveness.

In conclusion, clearly unbalanced careerism is an evil, but the real challenge for most Christians is identifying its presence. When we see the light and embrace our secular work as a ministry and a mission, this realization generates countervailing dangers. Spiritual warfare is like a chess match of move and countermove. As we explore this issue, it is important to reflect on the intended and unintended consequences that our dedication to life balance may generate.

There will be seasons in which one domain exerts a greater influence, but only for a limited time! We must permit the fields of our life to lie fallow to restore the soil. The sad reality is that most organizations fail to provide realistic and God-honoring standards of success and performance. When organizations place the utmost importance on short-term goal achievement at any price, there is very little room for the upfront investments in employee balance that realize downstream benefits. SLHRM organizations understand the relationship between work/life balance and employee and community well-being. These organizations place employee welfare at the same level of mission and achievement. One heart test of a dedication to life balance is the willingness of an organization to sacrifice short-term gains and financial goals and advantage for long-term employee well-being, which positively affects the bottom line.

We must seek and be in the company of wisdom. As with all aspects of our Christian sanctification walk, identifying godly wisdom is challenging. There are many sources of information and knowledge that compete for our attention both within the Christian and secular knowledge generation traditions. One key is the notion that Christians are in the world, but not of it (Romans 12:2). This entails an implicit understanding of what is truly of value. The only standard of eternal value is that of love in its various Christ-centered forms, *agapeo* (unconditional) and *phileo* (brotherly). God tests all of our secular and Christian ministry work in

the fires of God's judgment using as the standard the motives underlying our actions. Unless our motives promote the unconditional well-being of others, to encourage and challenge, all of our achievements are suspect and tainted, as we see so clearly in 1 Corinthians 13. The key is building our work on the redemptive foundation of Christ and the transformational power of the Holy Spirit. Hence, it is important that we critically analyze the motives for our actions to promote Christian growth. Our agony and confusion is partly a product of our self-deception regarding our motives for our work and family life behaviors. Why do we strive so mightily to achieve success? There are surface reasons such as societal conformity, and there are deep-seated personality attributes that relate to underlying fears and insecurities that disguise themselves in a myriad array of forms including what psychologists deem cognitive distortions such as perfectionism and narcissism. To achieve peace, we must rebut and replace these underlying false belief systems (vain imaginations, 2 Corinthians 10:15) with "sound mind" scriptural principles. We will be in a state of bondage until we make the choice to repent, die to the self, and trust God completely.

Personal Reflection on Margin

I would like to lead with a word of personal testimony. The Lord is taking me to task for my ongoing embrace of worldly standards of excellence and the foundational strongholds of legalism, works, fear of man, and conditional love and acceptance based on merit/performance. One of the most effective tools of the devil is to corrupt our innate desire for recognition and accomplishment. This occurs through adopting ever-shifting worldly standards of success enslaving us to our conscience. Our accomplishments never assuage that disquieting internal voice that we could or should be doing more with greater degrees of effectiveness—a lurking, omnipresent form of doubt derived from our sin and imperfection.

It is important for us to understand that three factors determine whether our work possesses godly merit: (1) are we seeking to achieve God-honoring and directed goals (righteous ends), (2) are we using righteous means, and (3) are we motivated by agape love? If any one of the three conditions is violated, our work is suspect. The Lord has communicated in my own life it is better for me to fail than to succeed while pursing the wrong goals, using inappropriate means, or driven by fleshly motives. If we succeed for the wrong reason, pride will blind us to our true vulnerable state making us more susceptible to a serious future fall. This parable of the tax collector and the Pharisee (Luke 8: 9–14) clearly reflects this principle in which the prideful performance-driven offerings

of the religious expert is rejected while the humble and transparent cry of help from the failed tax collector is received. It is very important for us to receive God's ongoing guidance from the Holy Spirit through godly prayer and the "wisdom of many counselors" (Proverbs 15:22) from mentors and accountability partners to continually "test the spirits" (1 John 4:1) underlying our work.

Human perfection is impossible: it is not the goal. We strive for an ongoing higher level of awareness and surrender thereby permitting the Holy Spirit through His ongoing sanctification grace to change our hearts and motivate our actions by agape servant leader/follower love. This will reduce our level of guilt and work stress dramatically. When we receive God's guidance, we can set a reasonable level of work effort, pace and quality that honors His name and promotes the best interests of our coworkers, clients, and customers. In essence, we do our "best" within the limits set, and trust God for the outcome and the increase.

We then "separate the best from the good" freeing us from the guilt of comparison and meeting the broken and unreasonable standards of ourselves and that of the outside world. The sad reality is that much of the work stress that afflicts employees is free-will embraced and self-imposed. We enthusiastically embrace the siren of worldly success defining luxuries as necessities in terms of power, money, reputation, and prestige. We become prideful, revel in our short-term success, and then become addicted, requiring greater degrees of achievement to produce the "high." We are in effect worshipping enslaving idols that become cruel taskmasters and increasing sources of fear and insecurity as we lose our connection to the vine. Only the Lord can meet our deepest needs for unconditional love, meaning, purpose, acceptance, and forgiveness for our sins.

The practice of margin and simplicity is essential to reducing stress and loving God. In order to complete the Great Commission and Great Commandment and make disciples of all men and nations, we must reassess the scope of our vocational ministry. God must be our Lord in order for us to be light in five domains: family, work, community, church, and our personal time. In essence, Jesus is Lord over all five areas and there is no compartmentalization. As such, we must practice an ongoing ordering of time and effort over the five areas based upon the leading of the Holy Spirit. Only God can set our priorities. This requires that we place boundaries around our work, which is the area that requires the greatest time investment. In most cases, this entails sacrificing the fulfillment of our ego needs relating to achieving workplace success so that we possess sufficient time and energy to fulfill our roles and obligations in the other life domains. Our first love must be the Lord, and we must devote ongoing quality and quantity time to receive the direction, strength, and

energy to meet our obligations in the other areas. This free-will reduction in work effort is another form of dying to the self in which we place the needs of others above our own.

Who needs us? Our families, church, friends, neighbors, community organizations (little league, Scouts, schools), along with the hundreds of daily and seemingly random interactions that provide golden opportunities to reach out and shine the light of Christ to a lost world. When we are excessively busy, we lack the time, motivation, interest, and energy to give ourselves freely in the other life domains. In addition, fear in its various forms will increase in power and intensity further inhibiting our ability to love others and God fully. Even in the workplace, we frequently are too busy to support others. Those with talents, gifts, and abilities to be highly successful face the greatest temptation, especially those employees who are blessed with great energy and drive—the employee who can work 80 hours per week and still feel refreshed, especially in leadership positions. There are two elements to this scenario producing divided loyalties given conflicting values.

The first is "leading by example." It is important to "practice what we preach" in terms of hard work, work hours, and effort levels. However, the leader or organization that deifies the 60-hour workweek tempts his or her subordinates to duplicate the same level of effort at great spiritual, personal, and societal costs. Work absorbs the best and the majority of time, energy, and mindfulness (living in the present), thereby "robbing" God, their families, their communities, and the church of their desperately needed presence, talents, and love. Most employees lack the long-term physical, mental, and spiritual resiliency to work long hours, producing a pernicious fruit of global physical and mental health and relationship problems. Even if an employee is capable of a 70-hour work week, others will suffer because of the life imbalance. This syndrome weakens the family, especially the development of close parental relationships, reducing the child's resistance to the many forms of temptation and counterfeit means for receiving and expressing love creating ongoing spiritual strongholds that burden and oppress. In addition, the cumulative stress of overwork gradually erodes our own foundation leading to long-term health problems. I have walked this road, reaped the negative spiritual, physical, and mental effects of a perfectionist and legalistic view of work, producing burnout and emotional collapse. I am "on the mend" experiencing a healing by the power of grace. Yes, Romans 8:28 is alive and well as what the devil meant for evil is being used to restore and bless. The Lord had been clearly communicating the need to reduce hours, but I did not listen until my body and spirit forced a retreat. I pray that you do not descend into the pit before forced to make deep and painful changes!

Margin Elements

From a Christian servant leadership perspective, the health and well-being of your employees is a foundational element of a God-honoring workplace covenant. Employees are not instruments of production, and progressive organizations monitor employee work conditions and attitudes (burnout, mental and physical illness, family stress, job satisfaction, etc.) to proactively identify dysfunctional management practices and develop long-term solutions.

When the organization embraces "production-first" values it precludes the development of a balanced approach to employee well-being. For example, employees must work through lunch, and commit to "whatever it takes" to complete the job, irrespective of the cost to employees and their families. When "face-time" values dominate, it generates resistance and rebellion, which promotes the development of deceptive protective practices to project an image or the illusion of dedication, high motivation, problem solving and productivity (process over output). Hence, this self-protective effect desensitizes employees to the pathological realities of this form of organizational life.

However, to bring balance, the true obstacles to servant leadership are not primarily an external enemy, but our own personal idols of need for achievement. This phenomenon is widespread, even in "worker-friendly" organizations as many managers and leaders work more hours than necessary. There remain serious policy and practice gaps in most organizations over the balance issue. Studies and personal experience clearly demonstrate that there are dual employment tracks: the fast-track utilizes the traditional performance standards of face-time, and those that utilize family-friendly benefits (flexible schedules, flexi-place, leave programs) are placed in the "Mommy" or "Daddy" tracks that stereotype the users as less loyal, motivated, and ultimately less competent (Elise & Stanislav, 2014). There are clear organizational exceptions (SAS is one), but they are still in the minority, and there is even great variance within family-friendly organizations by department. A superficial adoption of these worker-friendly practices will only intensify employee cynicism. The key is to neutralize the influence of the implicit face-time instrumental cultural values.

SLHRM professionals must address and combat excessive departmental workloads and unrealistic performance goals. Christian servant leaders view the employment relationship as a covenant (an ironclad psychological contract) that balances the needs and interests of the key stakeholders. Christian servant leaders may not be able to change the culture of the company, but they can provide an oasis of reason and compassion within their "flock" (the subordinates under his organizational authority).

The introduction of family-friendly benefits and a more reasonable work pace frequently generates resistance from management and employees conditioned to a dysfunctional environment (they prefer the bondage of Egypt), but "tough love" sacrifices and pain is the price of servant leadership. SLHRM professionals must present a cogent and persuasive rationale to both subordinate employees and upper management for adopting worker-friendly benefits. It is important that organizations develop these benefits upon a needs assessment given limited resources. In addition, it is important that all employees benefit, not just a class of employees such as employees with children or elder care needs (Jungin & Wiggins, 2011). It is vital to avoid generating resentment and the formation of a "caste system" disenfranchising younger or single employees. Hence, the worker-friendly benefits such as flex-time, and flexi-place should be made available and the dollar value of benefits should be roughly equal for all categories of employees. SLHRM organizations reassure employees that when they face work and personal life conflict (family, health, etc.), there needs will be accommodated as well. Hence, a collective support system will provide an organizational safety net.

SLHRM professionals must make the case to upper management that terminating employees who cannot meet traditional face-time expectations would impose excessive short-term costs to the organization including a potential adverse reaction from employees and the associated high costs of hiring a replacement. Most immediate management decisions relative to work/life conflicts are amenable to a variety of alternative options other than termination. There are a variety of relevant short-term strategies that modify the job (e.g., telecommute, hire temporaries) or accommodate the employee's personal situation (e.g., subsidized housing or childcare), or transfer to a less demanding position.

A major factor influencing the feasibility of any organizational change effort is the degree of margin within the system. When employees operate at maximum capacity, any management change in the midst of the present work overload will adversely affect performance. All change efforts, even highly beneficial innovations, impose short-term costs, and employees stretched to the breaking point may lack the energy or the motivation to escape the downward spiral. This is where employee empowerment is critical. When employees receive a delegation of authority to solve a problem for themselves, this generates a reservoir of energy and good will. One of the greatest job stressors is a lack of control over the work environment (Jex, 1998), and a conferral of job autonomy communicates confidence in employee abilities, is a concrete demonstration of trust, and most importantly, provides hope for the future. I am reminded of Isaiah 40:30–31, which states that when we

rely (delegate) on the Lord, we are strengthened supernaturally: "Even youths will faint and be weary, and the young will fall exhausted; but those who wait for the LORD shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings like eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint."

The long-term macro solution is the institutionalization of family-friendly workplace policies. It requires courage and perseverance in combination with a willingness to assume the risk of failure to propose the God-honoring short- or long-term solutions noted above. We need guidance from the Holy Spirit and maturity in our sanctification walk of dying to the self if we are to advocate a just solution for employees requiring work/life modifications. Given first line management's frequent understandable suspicion towards work/life balance policies, how can a work–life balance advocate make a persuasive case, assuming he or she possesses the motivation and courage? One line of reasoning is to make the claim that the stressed employee's situation is the "canary in the coal mine" and an early indicator of a "burned out" staff. The result will be decreased productivity and higher costs that will adversely influence the long-term success of the organization. The champion manager would also need to present a clear ROI analysis that provides hard data on the benefits of reducing workloads and improving efficiency through employee empowerment and family-friendly policies such as significantly lower turnover, as the SAS experience demonstrates (O'Reilly & Pfeffer, 2000). The main impediment to adopting empowerment and family-friendly benefit solutions is that the costs are immediate and the benefits long-term and most organizational cultures emphasize short-term goal attainment.

Reducing workplace stress is a collective effort between employees and management. For example, many employees accept a job with a long commute, thereby accentuating the pressure of a lengthy work day. The employee thereby increases child care stress and reduces family time. In an ideal world, the employer would provide high quality onsite or subsidized childcare, but employees accepted the position knowing that there would be no assistance from the organization. As Christians, we should make it a conscious policy to reduce unnecessary obstacles and distractions that detract from our family obligations. Employees can reduce workplace stress by practicing the following:

a. Develop our spiritual intelligence to promote wisdom in decision making through a more vibrant and passionate personal relationship with Jesus supported by the practice of the various spiritual disciplines (prayer, Bible reading, service).

  b. Selecting a position that is compatible with our gifts, passion, and abilities.
  c. Strive for simplicity by living a modest lifestyle.
  d. Developing realistic life success and job performance goals.
  e. Set clear life goals to effectively and efficiently focus our time and avoid distractions (separate the best from the good).

There remain serious policy and practice gaps in most organizations over the balance issue and there is even great variance within family-friendly organizations by department. A superficial adoption of these worker-friendly practices will only intensify employee cynicism. The key is to neutralize the influence of the implicit instrumental cultural values. However, we must monitor and protect employees from abusive employers who expect employees to work while ill or overzealous, and perfectionistic employees who are unable to rest. Servant leader employers should be concerned first for the welfare of their employees and provide the rest that they need to recover.

From a Christian worldview standpoint, the organization is shepherd and must protect the well-being of employees and customers. Health entails life style choices that promote the holistic integration of mind, body, and spirit. Christian servant leader HR organizations proactively identify and remedy threats to employee well-being. They embrace the following strategies:

  a. *Model and practice servant leadership.* When employees are secure in the knowledge that their supervisors support, encourage, hold them accountable, and forgive their mistakes, they possess the security at the core of the spirit to resist dysfunctional stress-coping strategies that burden and yoke themselves and impede organizational mission achievement. When we possess security as Christians based upon the absolute certainty that God loves and forgives us unconditionally, this vertical love can be applied horizontally within organizational relationships, reducing the stress level of others and a powerful antidote to the spirit of rebellion, insecurity, and fear.
  b. Make an authentic and passionate commitment to employee well-being. In essence, well-being is not a slogan or a superficial marketing claim for the SLHRM organization, it is deeply internalized value that is part of the organization's core DNA. In essence, the commitment to work/life balance is as natural as breathing and embedded in all decision making. Employees will very quickly identify a superficial and manipulative stress reduction campaign

leading to even greater levels of hypocrisy, cynicism, bitterness, apathy, and disengagement. It is better to be honest and clearly articulate the values that production comes first than to superficially embrace work/life balance for manipulative reasons.

c. *SLHRM leaders and managers must model healthy work place balance or else employees will discount the message.* Managers must authentically embrace decision and behaviors that places God first, family second, and work third. This entails reasonable levels of work effort and hours, sensible performance standards, and spending time with family.

d. *Communicate to employees that there will be "seasons" of high work demand, but commit to proactive planning and employee empowerment to reduce the number and intensity of such episodes.* There will be times when extra work effort and hours is necessary to meet unanticipated challenges, problems, threats, or unusual opportunities. Once the crisis is addressed, employees should quickly return to normal work demands as quickly as possible.

e. Managers must demonstrate a healthy and sustainable life style (rest, sleep, eating habits, exercise).

f. *SLHRM organizations emphasize that promoting employee well-being is a major term and condition of a godly workplace covenant with full integration within its mission, vision, and values.* For example, provide a value statement containing the phrase that "our organization commits to helping employees develop a harmony among faith, family, and work by limiting work hours to no more than 40 per week."

g. Clearly communicate an ironclad commitment to employee well-being by leadership and management through word and deed by a sustained and integrated communications campaign. This entails multiple means and methods for communicating both symbolically and through concrete policies and decisions that work/life balance manifests the highest priorities (speeches, meetings, policies, procedures, hiring, and promotional materials).

h. Developing a comprehensive well-being system of SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, timely) performance goals, metrics, and standards that are linked to a balanced scorecard. For example, employees will utilize 95 percent of their yearly available vacation time.

i. All key stakeholders are held responsible and rewarded for promoting a healthy work environment and employee well-being through the performance management system.

j. SLHRM organizations provide meaningful work that reinforces human dignity. One helpful model in this regard is the Hackman

and Oldham Job Characteristics Model (Fried & Ferris, 1987). Intrinsically motivating work possesses five key elements, job significance, job identity, skill variety, job autonomy, and job feedback.

a. Job significance is the presence of a clear linkage between an employee's job duties and their contributions to the mission. There should be a clear connection among the employees work efforts (process) and products (outcomes) and achievement of key goals. The importance of the work is recognized by the key stakeholders including internal and external clients/customers and the community as a whole. Job significance provides employees with dignity and respect.

b. Job identity is the condition when employees produce a good or service that bears the imprint of their craftsmanship, a whole work product that bears their "signature." This can be either an individual or collective recognition. It is akin to joy and pride of an artist who produces a painting that reflects their individual and group creative gifts that communicate beauty and truth.

c. A third important element is task and skill variety. Ideally, a job should require a variety of duties that increase the required knowledge, skills, and abilities to facilitate growth and challenge. The result is a qualitative increase in knowledge, skill, and ability levels.

d. A fourth key element is job autonomy in which employees are engaged in meaningful and sustained input and participation over all aspects of their jobs. This includes their performance goals, standards and metrics, work scheduling, pace and effort levels, and performance appraisal, among other key systems.

e. The fifth element is ample performance feedback. Intrinsically motivated employees desire to gauge their success and impact, hence the need for jobs that provide ample performance feedback that is clear, specific, timely, behavioral, actionable (can make changes), and comes from a credible (trusted) source (Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor 1979). There are two types of performance feedback. The first type is intrinsic performance feedback, in which the employee directly perceives immediate feedback as the job is performed or shortly thereafter. For example, instructors receive feedback from the body language and expression of students on the understanding of concepts taught. The second type is extrinsic performance feedback in which the employee receives performance feedback from a variety of sources (clients, peers, supervisors) in a timely fashion.

    k. *Engage in a comprehensive employee health and wellness program that promotes employee well-being, joy, and eustress (beneficial stress), and not simply the absence of negative outcomes (disease, injury, accidents, illness, stress)*: This entails the following elements:

      a. An integrated workplace hazard monitoring and audit process (Jex, 1998):

        i. Identify the source and cause of accidents, illness, disease, and negative job stress.

        ii. Empower employees to jointly identify, diagnose, and develop solutions for the identified hazards.

        iii. Empower employees to jointly identify, diagnose, and develop means for maintaining and enhancing employee well-being.

The key element is to conduct the stress audit on a yearly basis with integration into mainstream HR and organizational decision-making. (See table 7.1 for an example.) If the data consistently demonstrates that high workloads are contributing to stress, empower employees to develop strategies to increase efficiency and effectiveness and reduce work pressures. In addition, SLHRM organizations commit to adequate staffing levels that do not promote chronic or acute overload. For example, if there are episodic spikes in workload or seasonal elements, proactively increase either temporary or contract hiring. A summary of key SLHRM means to reduce stress is presented in the table 7.2.

Table 7.1 Master list of stress categories

Role Ambiguity (unclear job duties) Examples

- Employee is unsure about whether they are responsible for both quantity of production and maintenance of equipment.
- Unsure about who is responsible for quality control questions when equipment malfunctions.

Role Conflict (clashing job duties and job duties not matched to skills and interests) Examples

- High daily production quota reduces time spent in error inspection.
- Job entails extensive focus on promoting art as a nonprofit organization development director, but the employee has little interest in art.
- Job entails significant degree of mechanical ability that the employee lacks.
- The job places more emphasis on improving presentation skills, which is a minor part of the job more than interpersonal counseling aspects that are most linked to success.
- An employee with a long commute and significant elder care responsibilities must attend meetings in person at the office that could be conducted by phone or computer.

Table 7.1   Continued

Quantitative and Qualitative Role Overload (can't meet work standards) Examples

- A professor who has very high publication requirements in conjunction with a large teaching load.
- A research analyst lacks the technical skill and knowledge of advanced statistics required for a project.
- Social workers with very high case loads.
- A machine operator with no rest breaks for a four-hour period.
- A manager whose team is under such short run performance pressures that they lack the time to invest in long-term planning to adjust to changing customer preferences.
- A social worker with a volume of difficult clients cannot take time for a walk or surf the web.
- A professor with a high teaching load and year-round teaching does not have a block of unstructured time for rest, reflection, and planning.

Role Responsibility Conflicts (managerial and leadership pressures from supervising, meeting work deadlines, and achieving performance standards) Examples

- A supervisor with an underperforming work team in conjunction with high levels of interpersonal conflict.
- Pressure to increase production with a reduction in the overtime budget.
- A college recruitment manager who is under constant pressure to fill a quota with no consideration of external factors that may adversely influence demand for education such as employment prospects for graduates.

Adverse Physical and Social Working Conditions Examples

- Construction workers in high heat.
- Desks that are not ergonomically adjusted for height and weight.
- Warehouse worker with back problems caused by ongoing heavy lifting of boxes.
- Computer data entry operators who receive insufficient rest periods and lack standing work stations resulting in excessive levels of sitting (more than four hours daily).
- Isolated night shift clerk at a convenience store.
- A police officer who works rotating eight-hour shifts every four weeks disrupting sleep patterns.
- A retail store manager's weekly schedule of 6 12-hour days.
- A sales representative who travels 80 percent of the work week.
- Website developer under constant pressure to remain current with changing website design requirements.

Unfair Compensation and Performance Appraisal Measurement Examples

- Police officers in a high crime city that are paid 40 percent below market wages (lack of external equity).
- Supervisor provides higher performance ratings to those in the "in-group" irrespective of their true performance level.
- A machinist who is penalized for higher waste rates due to lower quality metal to reduce production costs (penalized for factors beyond control).
- Supervisor fails to express appreciation to the work team members for extended overtime in meeting a project deadline.

Table 7.1   Continued

Interpersonal Conflict and Office Politics Examples

- Employee fails to receive a promotion over a less-qualified candidate who has a personal friendship with the supervisor.
- Employee receives lower performance appraisal ratings because of his race.
- Employees are excessively busy and lack the time and energy to help new employees learn the job.
- Employment counselors receive an individual bonus for the number of clients placed decreasing cooperation and information sharing among counselors.
- An employee is verbally harassed if he or she rests when fatigued given the performance pressures.

Poor Quality Supervision Examples

- The sales supervisor fails to provide feedback on the employee's presentation delivery weaknesses increasing the employees failure rate.
- The supervisor works 60 hours per week and expects staff to do the same reducing work/family balance.
- The supervisor complains about minor problems on a contract proposal even though the staff developed the proposal with half of the conventional preparation time.
- The supervisor fails to train new employees and provide clear work performance standards.
- A social work supervisor fails to allow the work group to celebrate the successes in the presence of heavy workloads.
- The supervisor provides favorable job assignments to those he likes, and the most undesirable to the "out of favor" employees.

Situational Constraints (lack of key resources)

- Employee lacks complete background information on clients impeding the ability to identify prior preferences.
- Teachers must pay for student supplies from personal funds.
- Supervisor lacks the authority to empower employees to meet client needs that vary with standard procedure.
- Employees must prepare a bid for a road project in 24 hours given the absence of advanced planning.

Perceived Control Challenges Due to the Absence of Autonomy

- A teacher cannot revise the curriculum to adjust to unique student learning needs.
- A computer programmer who cannot influence the number of clients that he or she supports.
- The organization fails to consult over production problems that reduce customer satisfaction.
- A teacher is not involved in selecting the curriculum.

Career Development Challenges Including Inadequate Training and Few Options for Career Growth Examples

- A teacher is not provided with training in distance education techniques for his or her online courses.
- The organization fails to provide additional job training to increase the range of skills used on the job.

Table 7.1 Continued

Lack of Employer Covenant Related to Job Security, Workplace Forgiveness, and Transparency Examples

- Employees experience frequent layoffs with no advance warning.
- The supervisor penalizes employees for every mistake.
- The manager fails to admit weaknesses or apologize for mistakes thereby "chilling" employee motivation to be honest.
- The employer encourages employees to use substandard materials to reduce costs and elevate sales at the expense of repeat business.

Work-Home Pressures Examples

- Employee must drive 30 or more miles to work daily with night meetings.
- The absence of onsite and emergency child care requires employees to remain home with sick children.
- The absence of elder care support increases home demands with no reduction in work load.
- A working mother whose spouse does not share in household duties.

Traumatic Job Stress Produced by Unethical Workplace Behavior Examples

- An employee is attacked or threatened by a coworker or client.
- A supervisor who verbally berates a subordinate in public.
- A supervisor who makes ongoing suggestive remarks related to the employee's sex life.
- A women is denied promotion to management because she is too assertive reinforcing negative gender stereotypes.
- Employees engage in theft of company supplies.
- Management requires or encourages staff to overbill clients.
- Employee discloses contract overpricing to higher management.

Adverse Effects of the Absence of Servant Leader Character Elements Examples

- Prolonged high workloads with ongoing criticism of performance demoralize employees.
- An employee lacks confidence in management's credibility.
- An employee fails to forgive his or her supervisor for being passed over for promotion leading to revenge fantasies.
- An employee is jealous over the success of a coworker who he or she feels has less ability.
- Employee becomes jealous over his or her absence of success in placing clients in comparison to coworkers even though their clientele are more difficult to place.
- Employee is never satisfied with his or her work or that of others.
- A high-performing employee fails to recognize the contribution of other team members to his or her success.
- An employee is unable to "laugh at themselves" for job mistakes.
- An employee takes work on vacation or fails consistently to use all vacation days.
- An employee who fails to discern his or her tendency to judge others and be critical in public settings thereby increasing conflict.
- An employee is angry with him- or herself and others when the bid is rejected even though it was a very competitive and well crafted.
- Peer group of employees justifies the abuse of sick days as recompense for low pay.

Table 7.2 Organizational practices to reduce job stress

Area	Stress Reduction Practice
Employee Responsibility	The SLHRM organization will encourage employees to seek jobs matched to their skills, temperament, and personality. They reinforce a holistic mind, body, and spirit commitment to good mental, physical, and spiritual health through exercise, good nutrition; voluntary religious expression (meditation and prayer) supported by employee assistance and wellness programs and positive program participation incentives. They encourage a commitment to lifelong learning and practicing good organizational citizenship behaviors.
HR System and Job Design	The SLHRM system should provide valid and reliable selection practices, realistic job previews, and create intrinsically motivating jobs aligned with employee job interests and gifts. Short- and long-term employee development is a high priority with generous employee training support. Adequate staffing is provided ensuring that workloads are at manageable levels and that pace of work is sustainable (adequate rest breaks). The organization provides employees with the tools, supplies, and equipment needed to support high performance. There is an unswerving commitment to worker safety and ergonomics. The emphasis is on developing employee strengths, creativity, and providing time for quiet reflection. The organization strives to be a compensation leader with high levels of external and internal pay equity. Performance appraisal systems use multiple sources and methods. The organization embraces the full range of worker friendly benefits including the various forms of dependent care and the flexible workplace. Employees should possess considerable job autonomy and be empowered over key aspects of their work.
Servant Leadership Attributes	Provide employees with a job security reinforcing that layoffs are always a last resort option. Leaders should model a commitment to work/life balance for themselves and their employees by limiting work hours. Managers commit to a moral work environment emphasizing procedural, distributive, and interactional justice and avoid even the appearance of favoritism and "in-group" formation. SLHRM leaders seek to understand the needs and feelings of employees through genuine relationship building. Management drives fear from the workplace by encouraging employees to grow and learn through mistakes and failures and openly discuss their own weaknesses and failings thereby promoting two-way transparency.

Table 7.2   Continued

Area	Stress Reduction Practice
	Management sets a clear mission, vision, value, and set of strategic goals for the organization providing a specific moral and performance directional compass. Managers commit to ongoing employee encouragement, communicate a realistic optimism that provides hope, and generates faith in management. The SLHRM manager facilitates the development of employee social support networks and sponsors and encourages opportunities for social interaction among workers.

Management Reflections

Time can become another idol that enslaves Christians with a yoke of ever-increasing frenetic activity that gradually severs us from the vine, the source of life, joy, and God's presence, the root of our strength, power, and joy. The vast majority of the gospel accounts reflect that learning and discipleship occurs individually or in small groups, some are planned and others reflect the ministry of interruptions. This reflects that discipleship requires close personal interaction, mentoring; in effect, it is a relationship that invests a very precious commodity, time—a major element of Great Commandment, love. As stated previously, time management is an illusion and treats the symptoms rather than the underlying causes. Time management is a rational human attempt to balance the many variables and competing interests that only God can order and balance. Given the complexity of the relationships and the number of variables, it is a futile exercise. Only God can separate out the "best from the good" and the truly essential from the urgent but not important. The solution is to model Jesus' approach.

The only means to accomplish this is by developing a close personal relationship with God by dying to the self, placing God at the center, and the practice of the spiritual disciplines to enter the presence of God through the Holy Spirit. Seek God's guidance for setting priorities. Jesus centered all of His time and attention with laser-like focus on the central mission attributes of saving the lost. Jesus set boundaries and priorities as evidenced by His statement describing His calling to minister to the lost sheep of Israel, not to the Gentiles. Jesus guarded His time and that of His disciples by withdrawing from the crowds and engaging in solitary prayer (Luke 5:16). When we are operating in conformance to the will of God, the Holy Spirit will overcome obstacles, multiply our time

(like the loaves and fishes, Luke 9: 10–17), and enhance our efficiency and effectiveness. In effect, less is more!

The Religious and Spiritual Friendly Workplace

The religious and spiritual friendly workplace is another key element of a holistic commitment to diversity. It is important to recognize that a formal SLHRM mission, vision, and value statement does not ensure the genuine embrace of SLHRM policy and practice. Even many explicitly faith-based organizations employ a very secular and utilitarian approach to their human resource system, with little or no formal faith integration and SLHRM. Let us begin with some of the key elements of the spiritual and religious friendly workplace.

For explicitly Christian faith-based organizations, it is important to clarify whether a formal embrace of the Christian faith is essential for employment. If not, then it is important to develop a spiritual and religious nondiscrimination policy. For employers with 15 or more employees, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act prohibits any mandatory religious activities as a term and condition of employment.

An important self-reflective spiritual discipline is to assess the consistency and integrity between stated policy and practice. Are we officially an SLHRM organization? If so, are we both a hearer and a doer? Regrettably, many churches and other faith-based organizations embrace a form of practical atheism possessing a shell of Christian faith and SLHRM, but operate from an instrumental management perspective. Hence, these organizations frequently become complacent and over confident in the foundational level of employee spiritual vitality and commitment.

From a Christian worldview, spiritual and religious expression and practice should be voluntary and noncoerced. This "free will" orientation ensures that employees will be able to honor their beliefs and expression of conscious. Such an approach encourages genuine spiritual and religious belief and commitment versus coerced activity that promotes hypocrisy. Another major element is a spiritual and religious practice workplace policy that clearly defines permissible activities. For example, what is the policy on explicit evangelism? A related key policy is clearly defining reasonable accommodation strategies for spiritual and religious beliefs and practices including religious holidays, prayer practices, and leave policy. Another key element is training managers and employees to understand religious diversity and how to avoid religious discrimination. It is important that managers understand the boundaries that protect employees from inappropriate pressure, coercion and perceptions of

favoritism. One approach to adopt is that of respectful pluralism, which recognizes the fundamental right of human religious/spiritual expression based on four major principles (Hicks, 2003):

1. *All religious/spiritual expression must observe and honor the dignity of all persons with equal respect.* For example, on an organizational list-serve it would be appropriate to discuss the integration of scriptural servant leadership principles into the workplace, but it would not permit the posting of scriptural passages condemning homosexuality. As an evangelical, my personal beliefs oppose homosexuality, but I could not use the formal organizational platform or media to promote this view.
2. All religious and spiritual expression is voluntary and noncoercive.
3. There can be no formal establishment of a "state" religion or spiritual practice.
4. A forced compartmentalization of religion and spiritualty in the workplace disenfranchises those with genuine religious and spiritual beliefs.

However, for those employees seeking religious and spiritual integration at work, activities such as voluntary prayer/mediation and biblical study time during the workday (breaks, lunch, etc.) and during non-working hours promotes ongoing integration. It is important to cultivate voluntary prayer before each workday and at special events and meetings. Given the primacy of prayer, it is important to form intercessory prayer teams to provide the spiritual covering and guidance for organizational decision-making and protection and favor for employees. Other key elements of the religious-friendly workplace include:

- Promote religious and spiritual events, retreats, seminars, service, and volunteer opportunities
- Develop an employee website or bulletin board to promote religious/spiritual activities (not available to the public)
- Draft a policy that permits the display of religious objects in the office and in employee dress
- The adoption of a workplace chaplain program either through the creation of a formal full- or part-time position, contracting with a chaplain consulting firm, or securing volunteers from churches
- Develop religious mental health counseling programs
- Develop religious-based wellness and employee-assistance program
- Permit employees to transmit religious information on company email or intranet system

These policies and practices will contribute to a more favorable climate for religious and spiritual expression thereby enriching the workplace.

Conclusion

As Christ modeled the good Shepherd to his disciples, we must embrace a high standard of love-based care and due diligence in protecting the spiritual, mental, and physical well-being of our employees. When the organization supports employee work and life balance, it embraces a powerful form of faith. First, it demonstrates trust and confidence that God will protect and provide for the organization's needs, in effect, God is responsible for the outcome. It is a powerful form of humility as well to resist the temptation to be self-sufficient. Second, it demonstrates faith, trust, and confidence in employees regarding their motivation, character, creativity, innovation, ability, efficiency, and effectiveness to complete the work with reduced work hours supervision and face time. Third, it reinforces a faith and trust in God's economy to be an investor and cultivator of the soil, to delay gratification in receiving higher short-term returns in lieu of long-term benefits of a more effective labor force. It also demonstrates a form of altruism and agape love in that it is willing to accept lower returns for a higher level of well-being for employees, which in turn improves the quality of life for their families, enhances civic capital, and improves the community through the time needed to invest in other life domains. This orientation and belief system requires great courage, trust, and faith in our Lord. It is not the broad path, but a straight and narrow path that few embrace.

CHAPTER 8

SLHRM: PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

Performance management and performance appraisal is the single most important "window on the soul" SLHRM practice. An appropriate performance appraisal analogy is the tending of a garden. In securing a bountiful harvest, the most difficult work is at the beginning as we toil in clearing the land of rocks, brush, stumps, and trees. Then we must plow, sow, and weed. The harvest comes later. The great daily demand placed on managers through "fire-engine management" reduces the available time for employee development. This creates a vicious cycle as poorly trained and managed employees generating increased "downstream" problems. The answer is patient, long-term investment in employees. A major solution to the time dilemma is promoting a culture of delegation and empowerment. Hence, supervisors devote less time to micromanagement responsibilities and more time to strategic thinking and planning, value-enhancing goal setting, problem solving, and communication augmenting activities that increase quality, efficiency, and effectiveness. When managers possess more time to plan, they can invest more time and effort in "management by walking around" thereby cultivating relationships. It is also important to understand the basic terms used related to performance management and performance appraisal. (See table 8.1 for more detail.)

Performance Appraisal Worldview

Is performance appraisal compatible with Christian values and teachings? Clearly, the concept of accountability is central to the Christian worldview. Table 8.2 provides a systematic summary to support this section's discussion. We all must stand before the Lord and give an account of

Table 8.1   Definition of key performance appraisal terms

Term	Definition
Performance management	An integrated and holistic system for linking the achievement of organizational servanthood and stewardship mission, vision, and values with all structural levels (individual employees, work groups, departments, and the overall organization) utilizing a broad range of methods (surveys, focus groups, archives), sources (employees, supervisors, customers, peers) and measures/metrics (process, outcome, quality, quantity, timeliness, customer service). It entails the complex integration of motivational tools and techniques to produce high-quality organizational performance.
Performance measurement	The process of measuring performance at the individual, group, department, and organizational levels using a balanced set of methods, sources, standards, and metrics.
Performance metric or measure	A clearly defined and measurable indicator linked to mission achievement (percentage of defect free units).
Performance standard	A metric or measure that contains a target level of performance (achieve an 85% customer satisfaction survey rate related to the waiting time for building permits with a standard of three business days for processing).
Performance appraisal/evaluation	The process of assembling, reviewing, and interpreting a broad range of performance information to produce a valid and reliable assessment (judgment) of the efficacy of employee performance.

how we lived our lives, the truly comprehensive, holistic "performance appraisal" of both our natural and spiritual job descriptions (see Matthew 12:36, Luke 16:2, Romans 14:12, and Hebrews 4:13). The parable of the shrewd manager (Luke 16) reinforces the necessity of accountability, and Hebrews 12 the importance of discipline for those that we love.

However, these systems required multiple witnesses (by two or three witnesses, Matthew 18:16) in the decision-making process, which is absent in most traditional performance appraisals. Hence, is it critical from a biblical standpoint to provide a sufficient degree of effort and preparation for an accurate rating. Performance appraisal as presently designed and implemented violates biblical compatibility standards given that most systems do not emphasize the ethical implications and responsibilities of

Table 8.2 Biblical foundations of performance appraisal

Appraisal Issue and Biblical Teaching	Traditional Performance Appraisal	Performance Management
Sources of information (witnesses) Matthew 18:16 But if you are not listened to, take one or two others along with you, so that every word may be confirmed by the evidence of two or three witnesses. 1 Timothy 5:19 Never accept any accusation against an elder except on the evidence of two or three witnesses.	Single Source witness: Relies solely on supervisor interpretation of performance information. A key factor is the balance between process measures and outcome measures. For example, should the organization penalize an excellent salesperson for factors beyond their control, and conversely, should a poor salesperson receive rewards for high level of sales in a boom market in which almost anyone can sell? If not, how can the reward system be adjusted?	Utilizes multiple sources (witnesses): self-evaluation, peers, clients, other supervisors
Reliability of single source information 1 Corinthians 4:2–4 Moreover, it is required of stewards that they be found trustworthy. But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged by you or by any human court. I do not even judge myself. I am not aware of anything against myself, but I am not thereby acquitted. It is the Lord who judges. Jeremiah 17:9–10 The heart is devious above all else; it is perverse—who can understand it? I the LORD test the mind and search the heart, to give to all according to their ways, according to the fruit of their doings. Proverbs 16:2 All one's ways may be pure in one's own eyes, but the LORD weighs the spirit.	Low levels of reliability given the prevalence of criterion deficiency and contamination with single source appraisals.	Higher reliability given multiple sources and method. Bias sources more likely to be exposed as outliers.

159

Continued

Table 8.2 Continued

Appraisal Issue and Biblical Teaching	Traditional Performance Appraisal	Performance Management
Purpose of assessment and the assigning of responsibility for performance problems 1 Samuel 16:7 But the LORD said to Samuel, "Do not look on his appearance or on the height of his stature, because I have rejected him; for the LORD does not see as mortals see; they look on the outward appearance, but the LORD looks on the heart." Jeremiah 17:10 The LORD tests the mind and searches the heart, to give to all according to their ways, according to the fruit of their doings. Matthew 7:5 You hypocrite, first take the log out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take the speck out of your neighbor's eye. Romans 2:1–3 Therefore you have no excuse, whoever you are, when you judge others; for in passing judgment on another you condemn yourself, because you, the judge, are doing the very same things. You say, "We know that God's judgment on those who do such things is in accordance with truth." Do you imagine, whoever you are, that when you judge those who do such things and yet do them yourself, you will escape the judgment of God?	Judgment and legalism: Traditional performance appraisal attempts to assign the proper degree of employee responsibility for his or her level of performance. Judgment requires a degree of knowledge and character integrity that exceeds the intellectual and moral capacity of most managers. We judge on the surface, focusing on the superficial aspects and possess a tendency to overestimate individual employee responsibility and underestimate system factors beyond employee control. Most managers fail to first assume personal accountability for their contributions (remove the log in their eye) to employee performance problems and fail to recognize the many external factors that influence performance.	Learning and development: Focus is to improve organizational performance by recognizing the collective, systems based accountability for performance, a balance of individual, group, and organizational accountability. The focus is on long-term growth and development. The focal point is not assigning responsibility and "blaming," but to solve problems and enhance growth at all levels. Performance management is more effective because it requires management and employees jointly assume responsibility for performance problems, and second, to seek the contextual factors that are beyond employee or organizational control that adversely influence performance.

160

2 Corinthians 3:6 ...who has made us competent to be ministers of a new covenant, not of letter but of spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life. Sources of error Proverbs 15:22 Without counsel, plans go wrong, but with many advisers they succeed. Proverbs 11:1 The Lord detests the use of dishonest scales, but he delights in accurate weights. Matthew 15:18–20 But what comes out of the mouth proceeds from the heart, and this is what defiles. For out of the heart come evil intentions, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander. These are what defile a person, but to eat with unwashed hands does not defile. Proverbs 3:27 Do not withhold good from those to whom it is due, when it is in your power to do it. Proverbs 29:21 ...a slave pampered from childhood will come to a bad end. Hebrews 12:6 ...for the Lord disciplines those whom he loves, and chastises every child whom he accepts.	More error sources given the reliance on a single decision maker. Tempts managers to act upon self-serving interests and impulses (reward friends, punish enemies, take credit for the contributions of others) contributing to inaccurate evaluations (dishonest scales) reducing employee trust and confidence. The end result is a form of employee theft given the withholding of valid praise and correction the withholding of valid praise and correction contributing to self and organizational deception/hypocrisy inhibiting character and competency growth and development. If we love our employees, we will provide the proper level of praise and correction.	Fewer error sources given the multiple sources of information and higher quality control standards associated with the performance measurement process. Information and sources are audited and verified with a consensual, group-based decision model that reduces both the opportunity and temptation to act upon selfish motives given the higher degree of transparency.

161

Table 8.2 Continued

Appraisal Issue and Biblical Teaching	Traditional Performance Appraisal	Performance Management
Feedback frequency Ephesians 4:26 Be angry but do not sin; do not let the sun go down on your anger. Matthew 5: 22–24 But I say to you that if you are angry with a brother or sister, you will be liable to judgment; and if you insult a brother or sister, you will be liable to the council; and if you say, "You fool," you will be liable to the hell of fire. So when you are offering your gift at the altar, if you remember that your brother or sister has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother or sister, and then come and offer your gift. Hebrews 3:13 But exhort one another every day, as long as it is called "today," so that none of you may be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin. 1 Thessalonians 5:11 Therefore encourage one another and build up each other, as indeed you are doing. 1 Thessalonians 5:14 And we urge you, beloved, to admonish the idlers, encourage the fainthearted, help the weak, be patient with all of them.	Traditional performance appraisal provides perverse incentives to avoid providing daily corrective feedback and praise. It provides a false sense of security that once or twice a year appraisals can provide the needed correction or reinforcement. The research literature clearly demonstrates a consistent discrepancy between employees and managers over the quality and frequency of performance feedback.	Performance management encourages ongoing communication and learning that facilitates timely discussion of problems by reducing status differences.

162

Competition and Comparison

2 Corinthians 10:12–13

We do not dare to classify or compare ourselves with some of those who commend themselves. But when they measure themselves by one another, and compare themselves with one another, they do not show good sense. We, however, will not boast beyond limits, but will keep within the field that God has assigned to us, to reach out even as far as you.

Romans 12:3–8

For by the grace given to me I say to everyone among you not to think of yourself more highly than you ought to think, but to think with sober judgment, each according to the measure of faith that God has assigned. For as in one body we have many members, and not all the members have the same function, so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and individually we are members one of another. We have gifts that differ according to the grace given to us: prophecy, in proportion to faith; ministry, in ministering; the teacher, in teaching; the exhorter, in exhortation; the giver, in generosity; the leader, in diligence; the compassionate, in cheerfulness.

Traditional performance appraisal systems that employ a comparative perspective (a forced distribution or grading on a curve) reduces teamwork and increases dysfunctional competition, creates a prideful orientation in the winners, and creates envy and jealousy in the "losers." Scripture specifically says we should not compare ourselves to others on faith issues, but only to Jesus using His performance standard which generates automatic humility given the gap between our sinless Lord and our "performance." These principles can be generalized to the workplace in which our quality standard is to fully develop our God-given talents and abilities, not a relative standard that generates complacency, pride, and fear. The goal is to cooperate and learn from each other.

Performance management systems are more likely to employ objective standards of performance that place no quota on outstanding performers. This enhances cooperation, teamwork and altruism as employees are rewarded for helping others.

163

raters and ratees. Evaluators exercise power over subordinates influencing employee self-esteem, job and career success, work motivation, job satisfaction, and job stress levels, among other key attributes. Most organizations fail to provide the ethical foundation for effective performance appraisal due to an absence of training, quality control, and evaluating the rater on how well he or she administers the performance appraisal process, among others.

It is important to explore the utilitarian and servanthood implications of the various performance management/appraisal approaches. Secular leadership studies confirm the efficacy of two of the important elements of Christian servant leadership as it relates to performance management and appraisal, encouragement, and accountability. Early management research (the famous Ohio State and University of Michigan studies) identified two global sets of leadership behaviors: consideration (employee support), and initiating structure (setting goals, providing direction, promoting accountability) (Likert, 1961; Stogdill, 1974, Northouse, 2013). These behaviors are akin to the Christian virtues of encouragement/exhortation in which we encourage the discouraged and challenge others and ourselves through behavioral accountability to scriptural moral standards. A major challenge in all management situations is to maintain the "harmonic mean" balance between support, mercy, and responsibility. What is the proper balance in your own managerial decision making? There are no formulas given the complex nature of human motivation and the multiplicity of contextual variables. Only the leading of the Holy Spirit provides the lifelong roadmap.

Performance Management/Appraisal Motivational Philosophy

Performance management systems employ a variety of intrinsic and extrinsic motivational tools. However, the terms "extrinsic" and "intrinsic" are a semantic rather than a substantive definition. All motivators entail an intrinsic assignment of worth or value linked to the attainment of a desired end state. Intrinsic rewards necessitate the internalization of values that are self-administered and therefore motivate and guide behavior across a variety of employment contexts. Hence, by definition, they are more reliable and efficient. Motivation is a complex construct amenable solely to indirect measurement given that it is an internal psychological process. Our behaviors are the product of multiple motives operating at different levels of conscious and unconscious awareness.

From a Christian worldview standpoint, sin enters the equation when self-serving elements influence motives, means, and ends thereby

becoming self-serving idols. The locus of motivation (internal or external) does not determine its ethical orientation; rather it is the nature of the underlying motive. In a workplace setting, an intrinsic motivational approach is more likely to satisfy individual employee and organizational servanthood and stewardship values. The most powerful workplace motivators are employee desires to love their fellow man and promote the great Commandment with a second powerful motivator the desire to fulfill our purpose and calling through autonomy and growth in order to promote mastery of their trade or profession (which is associated with extrinsic motivators such as salary, job security, and recognition). The previously introduced Job Characteristics Model of Hackman and Oldham (1976) summarizes the factors that contribute to intrinsic motivational potential (IMP). These include skill variety, task significance (perceived importance of the job and its link to the mission), task identity (producing a whole piece of work), autonomy and performance feedback or knowledge of results.

SLHRM organizations develop a culture emphasizing that meeting employee needs for transcendence (the Great Commandment and fulfilling our calling/purpose) entails a holistic integration of performance at the individual, group, and organizational level. This can only be accomplished by the development of strong and cohesive work teams in which employees are rewarded (monetary and non-monetary) both for their individual job efficacy and for general citizenship behaviors that support team cohesion and effectiveness. There is an inherent recognition that success is a collective team effort through the operation of the "body of Christ" in which humility governs work efforts. When we are humble, we recognize that we cannot achieve anything of eternal value outside of our relationship with God and our connection to others. There are no self-made men and women, and we all stand on the shoulders of others. This entails development of a performance management system that utilizes a harmonic mean of metrics that measure and reward individual, group, and organizational success, but does not penalize employees for factors beyond their control.

Appraisal Ethics

Jesus reserved his harshest criticism for the hypocritical Pharisees, for good reason. When managerial practice diverges from stated policy, the visible contradiction generates disappointment, distrust, and cynicism toward those in authority. It reduces the employee motivation and organizational citizenship behaviors associated with vibrant, productive, and healthy work environments. Employees will not exert the necessary extra

effort and creativity to solve problems and make necessary changes when they lack trust in integrity of management. When managers promote the use of the proverbial "tell and sell" approach to performance appraisal, employees rightly perceive manipulation and hierarchical command and control values (Maier, 1958). Another deadly performance appraisal sin is rater bias. The presence of nonperformance factors contaminates appraisal ratings producing a fruit of perceived and genuine unfairness in the rating process and its outcomes, which in turn is linked to tangible outcomes such a lower job satisfaction and turnover (Poon, 2004). The various forms of appraisal bias serve as a major fertile source of EEO complaints and court cases involving contested personnel practices linked to performance appraisal. Prime examples include person characteristic bias (race, gender, and age), personal relationship contamination (liking or disliking), and failing to gather a representative sample of performance (Wilson & Jones, 2008). Recent research documents other well-known sources of bias including the corrosive effect of employee and rater impression management and ingratiating measures (Rao, Schmidt, & Murray, 1995; Bolino et al., 2008; Kacmar, Wayne, & Wright, 2009). Employee pandering creates resentment among co-workers disadvantaged by the political strategies. Another finding confirmed by research is the influence of rater affect (liking) of the subordinate (Lefkowitz, 2000). There are a variety of biases produced in the appraisal process, which are generated by rater affect, but interestingly recent research indicates that managers can differentiate and separate personal feelings and emotions from formal ratings providing high performance ratings when warranted (Varma, Pichler, & Srinivas, 2005). This is clearly consistent with SLHRM practices to treat all employees with respect irrespective of personal attitudes.

A detailed overview of the most common rating errors appears in table 8.3. Factors that enhance ethical problems include the absence of 360-degree feedback providing a comprehensive view of the employee's performance along with failing to train and hold managers accountable for the presence of rater errors, such as halo, recency, contrast, and the external bias errors. Training raters and holding managers accountable for the quality of performance ratings reduces the presence of these biases.

Another key source of discord is the political use of appraisal to punish opponents and reward enemies irrespective of true performance, thereby eroding trust. Leniency, central tendency, and severity errors can demoralize and demotivate employees given the absence of useful and honest feedback. There is a tendency for both raters and ratees to protect the ego and promote personal and selfish interests over the mission. There are sources of bias on both the employee and rater (the external bias, for

Table 8.3 Sources of performance appraisal error

Error Source	Examples
Flawed measures	Contamination: Performance appraisal information process and decision making is influenced by nonperformance related factors: *Group-based characteristic bias*: race, gender, age, nationality, religion, etc. *Personal characteristics bias*: influence of affect (liking), physical attractiveness, weight and height. *External factors bias*: Measures do not account for the influence of factors beyond employees control (effect of weather on demand for products). *Deficiency*: Measures fail to include key aspects of the construct being measured (production metrics that fail to include quality aspects).
Information processing errors	*External bias*: Outside observers (supervisors, peers, or other raters) assign a higher degree of personal responsibility (lack of effort or ability) for performance problems while discounting external factors. The reverse effect occurs when we assess ourselves with a tendency to externalize responsibility (outside factors, supervisor ineffectiveness, or lack of support. *Assignment of responsibility bias*: When others exhibit problems we are prone to seek accountability and justice (assign the letter of the law), while when we are responsible, we seek mercy and forgiveness. *Premature conclusion bias*: Reach a firm decision based upon a limited and unrepresentative sample of employee performance and information. *Fixed decision bias*: An ego-protecting mechanism in which we seek to validate a decision by selective information search and processing. We discount information that conflicts with our views and seek information that confirms our decision. It requires a higher threshold of contradictory information to change our views. *Negative outcome bias*: We assign a higher rate of influence and importance to negative information and feedback than positive. It requires a higher ratio of positive feedback to override negative outcomes.
Rating errors	*Halo*: Failure to differentiate between various aspects of job performance. Overall global perceptions override specific assessment of specific job duties. *Leniency*: Consistently assigns higher ratings regardless of true performance level. *Severity*: Consistently assigns lower ratings regardless of true performance level. *Central Tendency*: Consistently assigns average ratings regardless of true performance level. Beginning and recency effect: Excessive weighting of early and recent performance information.

Table 8.3 Continued

Error Source	Examples
Political (Instrumental) Use of Appraisal	Use performance appraisal as an instrument to influence, persuade, control or intimidate employees to promote nonmission enhancing or personal interests.
Lack of Rater Training	The absence of rater training and uniform performance standards contributes to appraisal system unreliability as managers employ a different set of metrics for rating employee performance.
Overreliance on Pay and Other Extrinsic Measures	An absence of a balanced reward portfolio undervalues intrinsic motivational approaches thereby contributing to the "mercenary" syndrome of answering to the call of the highest bidder and increasing turnover to unacceptable levels.
An Overconfidence in the System Design versus Process	An overemphasis on the mechanics of appraisal versus the quality of the rater and ratee relationship.

Source: Tversky & Kahneman, 1974; Feldman, 1981; Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995; Hodgkinson, 2003; Lakshman, 2008.

example), that make the process very difficult. Without the presence of servant leadership characteristics, it is very challenging to near impossible to overcome the ethical and process–related challenges.

When managers fail to provide accurate ratings, it creates a climate of deception with wide–ranging negative consequences. Leniency and/ or ambiguous feedback inhibit the identification and correction of performance deficiencies and problems. This rewards incompetence and penalizes good faith employees by eroding recognition for performance excellence. Leniency denies employees a truthful assessment thereby promoting a form of self–deception. For those employees who are performing at or above standards, it dilutes the power of their recognition and imposes costs, creating higher workloads and job stress. This reduces organizational trust levels, inhibiting employee and organizational learning, growth, and accountability. In contrast, rating harshness or severity demoralizes and denies credit to employees, a form of management theft that creates discouragement.

The underlying values emphasized by many performance appraisal systems are utilitarian in nature, rewarding employees for individual performance. Hence, employees quite naturally engage in self-serving and narcissistic behaviors, thereby reducing organizational citizenship and loyalty. These systems reward mercenary self-serving behavior on the part of supervisors and employees alike instead of the altruistic, mission enhancement values needed to promote organizational loyalty. Another problem is

the absence of employee input from both raters and ratees thereby depreciating the quality and utility of the system thus depressing system acceptance and the motivation to use it effectively. Objective indicators of lack of acceptance include skewed rating distributions such as leniency and central tendency along with perfunctory performance feedback.

Factors that Contribute to Unethical Performance Appraisal

It is vitally important to recognize and address the "root-cause" character barriers to effective performance appraisal. One major temptation is to use the power of performance appraisal as a "command and control" and political influence instrument. A second major temptation is the influence of our character weaknesses of pride, fear, envy, and insecurity that view performance appraisal as a means to repress high-performing employees who threaten fragile management egos as Saul was jealous of David (1 Samuel 18:7). Conversely, the fear of man produces the inability to provide negative feedback and constructively manage the emotions produced by conflict. Finally, there is the sister strongholds of "people pleasing" and the addiction to positive feedback through affirmation anxiety. From a character foundation standpoint, the antidote is a managerial "heart of flesh" in which the motives of the heart emphasize mission achievement and promoting the best interests of employees, truth speaking in love (Ephesians 4:15). The underpinning is cultivating trust in management based on the Christian character traits of love, transparency, humility, forgiveness, encouragement, challenge, and conscientiousness.

Critics of performance appraisal (see Bowman, 1999) present compelling critiques, but it is misleading to promote the belief that all performance appraisals are futile given its complexity and the many sources of bias. Traditional methods of conducting performance appraisals are more likely to manifest the various categories of evaluation error given the absence of multiple sources/methods and quality control.

Given this litany of problems, what are some of the key servanthood solutions? Performance appraisal systems embedded within a larger system of performance management can be effective in spite of the obstacles if managers are dedicated to relationship building and utilizing multiple source of input and involve employees in the appraisal process. The first is the character issue. An effective performance appraisal environment requires a learning organization in which mistakes and poor performance are opportunities for problem solving and learning. Until employees are comfortable discussing and taking responsibility for mistakes, self-protective and self-promotional motivational effects will override all

Table 8.4   Key elements of effective performance appraisal systems

1. Ongoing clear, specific, behavioral, and timely performance feedback from a credible source
2. Employee participation in all aspects of the performance appraisal system (developing goals and standards, self-evaluation, two-way communication and problem solving in the appraisal interview)
3. Clear, specific and detailed performance documentation based upon first-hand information such as a performance diary
4. A holistic and integrated set of individual, group, and organizational performance measures based standards grounded upon a detailed and updated job analysis. Include metrics that assess quantity, quality, timeliness, and customer satisfaction. Another key area is a balance of subjective and objective performance measures as not all components of the job are quantifiable or measurable. For subjective elements (traits such as initiative) provide specific behavioral definitions and require documentation.
5. Clear performance (SMART) goals and standards that measure and reward organizational values, work process/behavior, and performance (outcomes).
6. Rater and ratee system support and training addressing the following subjects:
    1. Rating errors and how to avoid them
    2. Goal-setting process (SMART goals)
    3. Multisource, 360-degree appraisals (clients, peers, subordinates, other managers). Most employees report a deficit of specific, behavioral, and timely performance feedback. A fundamental principle of effective system design is multiple methods and measures. Any single metric contains error (contamination) and does not fully encompass the desired outcomes (deficiency). As such, organizations should employ a variety of quality, quantity, and timeliness measures focusing on work process and outcomes.
    4. Contextual factors outside the employee's direct control are taken into consideration.
7. A systematic assessment of the appraisal systems effectiveness in terms of:
    i. Process compliance: adhering to system procedures, quality of feedback.
    ii. Psychometric assessment: identify rating bias (race, gender, age) and rating errors (halo, leniency, severity).
    iii. Assess employee attitudes toward the system.
    iv. Impact on behaviors (turnover, absenteeism, retention, etc.) and productivity.
8. Hold managers accountable on how well they manage the appraisal process, "rate the rater" on their own performance appraisal.
9. A fair appeals process. The key is to develop a balance between individual and organizational performance. Organizations should not punish employees for factors beyond their control, but it is important to instill a sense of corporate responsibility to reduce the "free-rider" effect.
10. A major challenge is linking individual performance to overall organizational performance in a valid fashion. Performance appraisal systems must address issues related to the nature of teamwork. As occurs in many situations, there are short- and long-term aspects for both the performance and interpersonal dimension, some of which work at cross-purposes with each other. Again, the foundational values determine the organization's direction. Another issue is selecting team members for interpersonal skills and teamwork "fit" and the means available to assess the ongoing interpersonal dynamics.

others. In order to implement this learning organization, management must be transparent, forgiving, encouraging, empowering, and challenging (setting and maintaining standards). The mission and truth promotion goals of performance appraisal must take precedence. Sadly, these attributes are lacking in many organizations. The second solution is combining the past, present, and future into an ongoing process. Performance appraisal must promote learning from past performance, but not be controlled by past failures or successes. An emphasis on the future inspires employees and motivates them with a compelling vision providing hope and fulfillment. Ideally, employees believe management respects and value their past and present performance, but are not satisfied like a proud parent given their confidence in the employee's future growth potential. The "present" focus of an appraisal system is important to ensure that that managers and employees are communicating on a daily basis on a coaching and mentoring basis. Effective performance appraisal is a process of ongoing employee–manager communication founded upon trust. The key process factor is employee voice, or the presence of employee participation in all aspects of the appraisal system (goals, standards, evaluation, and the performance appraisal interview), clear, specific, and challenging goals and standards, and ongoing specific, behavioral, and timely performance feedback (Roberts & Pavlak, 1996). These essential management servanthood and stewardship competencies are essential elements of managerial style, and explain why there is such variance within and between performance appraisal raters and systems. A manager practicing these voice attributes will be successful irrespective of the technical soundness of the system. Table 8.4 presents a more complete list of important factors. SLHRM managers are wise to honor and practice these principles.

Who Is Responsible for Employee Poor Performance?

As Christian servant leaders, it is very important to possess a balanced view of how to define and respond to performance problems. Hence, one key element is to reflect on the overall dynamics of assigning responsibility for organizational performance problems. The work of Deming (1986) illustrated the tendency to blame individual employees and assign to them an excessive share of the responsibility for performance and ethical problems. Deming believed that the locus of responsibility resides with ineffective management systems, not individual employee contributions. The psychological process surrounding the assignment of responsibility for poor performance is termed attribution theory in psychology and is widely used in organizational research (Taggar & Neubert, 2004). A capsule version of this very powerful descriptor of human behavior is that a

supervisor when reviewing a poorly performing employee is more likely to blame the employee by relating it to the worker's lack of ability, motivation, or character (internalizing the responsibility) rather than external causes such as poor selection, training, support, resources, or supervision. Why is this case? One reason is that supervisors quite naturally desire to protect their own egos and reputations thereby discounting other external explanations including their own contributions through ineffective supervision. The result is a disagreement between manager and employee on the root cause and solution to the performance problem and ongoing conflict and distrust. This same phenomenon occurs at the executive level as well. Deming stated that organizations frequently "scapegoat" employees for organizational performance problems outside of their control and caused by poor management. Hence, employees and managers differ in how they view performance problems. The truth is frequently in between. How can we address these differences? First, learn to seek information that challenges your initial feelings and evaluations by attempting to disprove them. Take the approach that the employee "is innocent until proven guilty." Examine your behavior closely to ensure that you are not creating a climate where your attitudes create self-fulfilling prophecies in your employees. Attempt to increase your understanding of alternative views by "putting yourself in your employee's shoes."

My question for the readers relates to who is responsible for your organization's poor performance? A servant leader approach is to instill a collective level of responsibility for poor performance without scapegoating. This entails a higher level of transparency than most organizations provide. When organizations fail to embrace a balanced approach, it promotes a Darwinian "survival of the fittest" environment with many discarded, broken, and wounded bodies given an instrumental view of employees.

Another frequent research finding on a factor that contributes to poor performance is high levels of employee dissatisfaction with the quality and frequency of performance feedback given the absence of rater time, observational opportunities, and a lack of manager self-awareness regarding their communication styles and orientation (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984). For example, what a manager defines as "detailed and behavioral performance feedback," employees perceive as a general personality attack. Research clearly reflects one of the enduring findings in performance appraisal research, a consistent discrepancy between employees and managers over the specificity, sign (positive or negative), frequency, and utility of performance feedback (Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979). There are constellations of factors that contribute to differential performance appraisal perceptions. One key element is the absence of systematic performance feedback quality control policies that hold managers accountable for

feedback quantity, quality, and integrity. One of the major causal factors underlying performance perception discrepancies between employee and rater is ambiguous feedback, which itself is a contributing factor to incompetence across all life endeavors. Driving ability self-perceptions clearly demonstrate this phenomenon. The average motorist perceives himself to be a safe and skilled driver, while concurrently reporting that a high percentage of other drivers are incompetent. Most motorists receive little direct feedback on their driving behavior and skills, and the slight amount of feedback becomes discounted given the ego-protecting attribution bias that externalizes responsibility (blame the other person or external circumstances). One of our Christian servant leader obligations is to communicate truth to our subordinates. Encouragement, correction, and accountably are three pillars of a servanthood performance management process. Unfortunately, there are many obstacles to loving employees in a fashion promoting their best interests.

One great challenge of SLHRM performance appraisal is when work is of uneven quality given newly hired employees or employees promoted to new positions, and we are under intense performance pressures to improve the bottom line. The challenge relates to the high level of program accountability and a reduced margin for error in allowing employees to learn from their mistakes. We need to exercise patience for employees in the new situation and provide a clean slate to avoid unfair advantage or disadvantage. In these type of scenarios, employees warrant closer supervision. There are valid and invalid reasons for close supervision. Invalid reasons include the desire to maintain coercive control and power over employees to maximize personal advancement and/or gain and insecurity over subordinate's achievement levels (outshine the supervisor). Examples of valid reasons include directing inexperienced employees and supervising consistently poor performers who are not making adequate progress.

Hence, experience demonstrates that most performance problems entail a complex combination of causal factors including management/leadership system weaknesses and deficiencies (e.g., absence of formal SMART performance goals), individual and group employee attitude and behavioral problems (e.g., low levels of commitment and defensiveness), and unique contextual factors (e.g., intense performance pressures). When managers and employees personalize the situation and fail to practice humility and be teachable, they attenuate their ability to solve the problem in a collegial manner.

From a SLHRM perspective, the ideal is to view our relationship with our employees as a covenant—a mutual long-term relationship. A foundational principle in covenantal problem solving is to engage in

critical self-reflection before we start to define the problem and generate solutions. In other words, servant leaders assume ownership and responsibility for the problem. What can I do to solve this situation in a God-honoring fashion? This entails assigning accountability to both parties, but in a nonjudgmental fashion. Irrespective of how accountability for the performance problems would be ideally, apportioned, Christian servant leaders take the Christ-like perspective and remove the beam from their own eye first, before addressing the speck in their employee's eye. Matthew 7: 1–3 provides the foundational guidance: "Do not judge, so that you may not be judged. For with the judgment you make you will be judged, and the measure you give will be the measure you get. Why do you see the speck in your neighbor's eye, but do not notice the log in your own eye?"

Managers require external data to validate self-perceptions regarding their management styles and micromanaging. Subordinate evaluations and ongoing employee communication are two important tools for uncovering employee views. A key factor relates to institutional accountability. When there is no feedback from the important stakeholder groups, it clearly limits the efficacy of the performance measurement system. Organizational members possess opinions on their leaders, but they are frequently reluctant to provide honest feedback given their natural tendency to defer to authority figures given fear of adverse consequences. However, servant leaders desire truth from their employees, and therefore actively solicit feedback of all types. There is scriptural support for the importance of not complaining or rebelling against those in authority. Psalm 105:15 states: "Do not touch my anointed ones; do my prophets no harm." Candid feedback given in respect is not complaining within relationships founded upon trust. Effective performance management systems encourage and educate the raters and ratees on how to provide and receive appropriate feedback. SLHRM organizations adopt a standardized performance counseling formula, which is summarized below.

- *Establish trust based on humility*: Supervisors should express their concern over the problem and the necessity of addressing the issues jointly. They should communicate a sincere willingness to solve the problem and provide the foundation for the employee to prosper. Supervisors need to acknowledge the presence of relationship conflict and accept responsibility as a manager for some aspects of the situation.
- *Discuss problem context*: The supervisor should provide the details of the performance issues including specific and behavioral feedback on the timing, nature, frequency, severity, and consequences of the

deficiencies. A full discussion includes background information on the depth and breadth of the problem's contextual performance issues (factors that are beyond the employee's control) and the organizational pressures that the manager faces.

- *Employee input*: It is important for employees to provide their view on the cause and solution to the problem and what the manager needs to continue to do and stop doing.
- *Empower*: Jointly develop a solution to the problem and empower employees to set goals and craft solutions.
- *Produce an action plan to implement the solution*: Develop a specific action plan with SMART performance goals and standards.
- *Regular communication*: Schedule regular follow-up meetings to discuss progress and any means for assisting the employee.

Performance Management/Appraisal Stress Coping

There are many Christian character, career management, and negotiation learning points associated with employee responses to stressful superior–subordinate relationships in the areas of performance management. As Christian employees and managers, we need to develop a career management toolkit inventory of coping and adaptive strategies. As noted previously, coping strategies provide internal psychological adaptations to the stressful situation. The second dimension relates to what stress researchers term "adaptive responses" that entail changing the external environment through a physical or interpersonal intervention such as engaging in a principled negotiation strategy. For example, reflect on your own experiences regarding the adapting and coping strategies that you used in managing an insecure boss. From a coping standpoint, one strategy is to recognize that God is pleased when we serve unjust masters with excellence. We can trust the Lord to vindicate us. From an adaptation perspective, strive to identify the interests of your supervisor and endeavor to serve him or her more effectively. A third dimension for thought is the development of institutional safeguards such as antibullying policies to reduce the frequency of dysfunctional work relationships. Christian servant leaders proactively reduce employee stress through a variety of organizational practices.

Forced Distribution Systems

One of great debates in performance appraisal relates to the pros and cons of forced distributions systems, or grading on a curve. Critics claim that forced distribution systems elevate rating inaccuracy, reduce managerial

flexibility, and generate employee perceptions of unfairness given conflicts with employee self-evaluations (Stewart, Gruys, & Storm, 2010). Performance appraisal research confirms the presence of the self-esteem bias, as most employees rate their performance well above average (eightieth percentile) and forced distribution systems conflict with employee self-images, thereby generating negative job attitudes including unfairness and lower work motivation levels (Meyre, 1980). The reliance on comparative performance standards accentuates employee insecurity and depreciates teamwork and cooperation. When the focus is comparative, it encourages employees to become prideful and complacent when anointed "superior," insecure and fearful if they fail to "measure-up" and reduces motivation to improve given complacency with high ratings and discouragement with low placements on the rating scale. When the focus is on meeting benchmarked standards of objective quality, there is less "scapegoating" of individual employee performance and more emphasis on management and employee joint responsibility for problem solving. The impetus for performance appraisal distortion accentuates with the adoption of a forced distribution compensation and promotion system, as managers must "game" the ratings to provide key employees with desired rewards. This also contributes to "in-group" and "out-group" rating behavior as managers attempt to reward "star" employees at the expense of their "B" employees given the limitations on the number of workers eligible for merit or bonus awards. This erodes appraisal system trust and acceptance, thereby contributing to perceived and actual management hypocrisy. However, there is widespread dissatisfaction with forced distribution systems but in spite of the weaknesses, it is used quite frequently, given that it reduces the evaluation burden, as it is easier to assess relative performance, especially at the "tails" of the normal curve. In many workplaces, all of the employees are truly exceptional, thereby forcing managers to make inflated and "artificial" distinctions that demoralize and create conflict.

Developmental versus Administrative Uses of Performance Appraisal

Another key debate in performance appraisal is how to balance the foundational performance appraisal purposes of employee development and administrative decision-making (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984). Some researchers argue that appraisals are more accurate and useful for improving performance if they are diagnostic and not linked to pay or other administrative outcomes. Opponents argue that employees will not take the process seriously unless there is a bottom-line outcome.

Where managers make mistakes is linking performance appraisal ratings solely to monetary rewards. This is dysfunctional for several reasons including the classic case of goal displacement in which monetary rewards focus employee attention and effort on the measured behaviors (quantity of output) at the expense of equally important, but unrewarded, job duties (such as maintenance). In addition, it is important to reject embracing the Theory X view that employees are motivated by money alone and not the intrinsic satisfaction that occurs from a job well done, and the failure to recognize the utility of nonmonetary rewards such as recognition and time off. Another de-motivating factor is the "bait and switch" routine in which organizations make mid-year "corrections" on performance pay formulas thereby reneging on promised rewards. Other characteristics that reduce employee trust are the linkage of the appraisal rating and compensation system in the absence of employee input into the performance standards and an absence of clear communication and employee understanding regarding how managers make performance decisions. Performance appraisal information is most accurate and comprehensive when used to developmentally coach and mentor employees. Using performance appraisal ratings for administrative decisions inflates ratings as managers seek to reduce rater–ratee conflict and maintain workplace harmony. It also reduces the breadth, depth, and accuracy of performance feedback given concerns that honest feedback may adversely influence employee job standing. One solution is for the first level supervisor to present an overall summary of employee performance to a panel of senior managers who make the final administrative decisions. This removes the direct responsibility from supervisors, enabling them to assume the role of coach providing performance feedback.

There is an inherent conflict between the administrative and development applications of performance appraisal systems. For example, when managers use appraisal ratings for compensation and promotion decisions, there is an unfortunate natural tendency to reduce the quality and quantity of performance feedback to reduce employee anxiety and manager discomfort. Hence, if an adverse action such as a layoff occurs, the absence of balanced feedback accentuates the "surprise" effect. Over the long run, this cycle erodes the two-way communication needed for effective performance management. Organizations sometimes embrace performance appraisal "religion" right before layoffs. The underlying motive is to protect the company from a legal liability from wrongful discharge and discrimination lawsuits. The unfortunate consequence of the instrumental use of performance appraisal is the erosion of employee trust and the reduction in the motivational value of performance appraisal.

Performance Appraisal and Christian Character

The performance management process reveals Christian character. Performance management is a "window on the heart" personnel practice that greatly influences employee trust. HR servant leadership performance management requires great *agapao* (the verb form of agape) love, or the ability to promote the best interests of employees irrespective of our personal feelings and relationship history. Christian character begins with an understanding that we possess both an earthly and spiritual job description. Our spiritual job description is ultimately the most important. A major SLHRM job element is promoting both job descriptions through character development. Should SLHRM organizations invest the time and effort for character development in the presence of high workloads? The answer is clearly an emphatic "yes" as unless the organization makes character investments, both individual and corporately, the foundation crumbles. Performance management is the desired system for managing employee performance as traditional command and control and "tell and sell" performance appraisal systems are contrary to biblical teachings.

Promoting a character-based foundation for the appraisal process is a joint effort between manager and employee. Each possesses critical duties and obligations to promote servanthood and stewardship interests. An excellent point to contemplate is the nature and influence of "tough love." A key element of our journey as a Christian is the delicate balance between encouragement and accountability. We tend to align ourselves to one approach or the other depending on our personality, gifts, and life experiences. The proper balance requires an unselfish devotion to loving the other person, irrespective of their reaction to our decisions. The only way to get this right is to be led by the Holy Spirit given the difficulty in understanding all the complex variables associated with human motivation (we deceive ourselves and others regarding our motives).

Managers must assume a role of humility recognizing that effective evaluation/assessment requires the guidance of the Holy Spirit given the complexity of variables and potential for deception. This entails an ongoing personal commitment to engaging in the spiritual disciplines (prayer, fasting, scripture reading) to receive God's guidance in making decisions to promote the best interests of others. Pray for your employees! Emphasize the importance of loving employees by delicately balancing encouragement, support, and accountability. Another key element is assuming responsibility for performance problems (remove the log in the eye) by identifying personal contributions to the situation and factors beyond the employee's control that influence the situation. Managers need to assume a teachable and humble spirit.

From the employee perspective, employees must engage in servant followership. As is the case with managers, effective evaluation requires the guidance of the Holy Spirit given the complexity of variables and potential for deception. This entails an ongoing personal commitment to engaging in the spiritual disciplines (prayer, fasting, scripture reading) to receive God's guidance in making decisions to promote the best interests of others. Pray for your coworkers and managers! Emphasize the importance of loving other employees (and the manager) by delicately balancing encouragement, support, and accountability. Assume responsibility for performance problems (remove the log in the eye) by identifying personal contributions to the situation. Identify factors beyond the employee's control that influence the situation. In summary, assume a teachable and humble spirit, provide respect to your employer, and work diligently if working directly for the Lord. Another vital attribute is promoting employees to management positions with careful screening and preparation. A helpful practice is developing separate performance evaluations for management potential, as technical skill excellence does not equate with excellence in management.

In addition to the character elements, employee involvement in all aspects of the appraisal system design, development, and administration is foundational for success including self-appraisal (Roberts & Pavlak, 1996). One of the key elements of gaining employee acceptance of the appraisal process, is that the criteria and decision rules that govern the plan's administration are clear, specific, accepted, and administered in a fair and transparent fashion. Violating these conditions enhances employee resistance behaviors. Other key elements are ongoing clear, specific, timely, and behavioral performance feedback along with clear, specific, challenging performance goals and standards jointly developed by managers and employees (Roberts & Pavlak, 1996). Also, a key is to develop multisource appraisals (peers, clients, other managers). Negative experience with peer appraisal is common, however, as it requires a high degree of trust and low levels of competition for these systems to work. They can be invaluable, however, as peers frequently possess the most complete knowledge of employee job performance.

Comprehensive managerial and employee appraisal training are key factors in promoting appraisal system character. Most managers lack training on the long-term benefits of an effective performance appraisal system. There is a quid pro quo of support, training, and time in return for managerial investment in rating employees. SLHRM organizations provide extensive performance management training to support newly promoted managers and provide ongoing continuing education in performance management skills development. Failing to devote sufficient

resources to management training, development, and accountability produces a pernicious fruit. The organization often promotes employees on technical skill and job performance and frequently commits the cardinal "sin" of assuming management competency. Management should institute a formal management development plan, provide coaching and mentorship, and institute a subordinate appraisal system. If performance management skills do fail to improve, another option is to demote the employee to a team leader and institute a form of a self-directed work team management. Effective performance appraisal training is not performed in isolation, but is embedded in the larger supervisory or management skills training programs of best-practice organizations including Federal Express. Well-crafted administrative procedures and forms are a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for effective performance appraisal systems. The reason is that performance appraisal entails two of the most complex processes, interpersonal relations and information processing.

The communication process is the foundation of effective performance appraisal/management. Effective performance feedback systems are in reality two-way communication systems with mutual responsibilities. As great as the ongoing need for managers to receive training on performance feedback delivery techniques, the impetus for training employees as receivers on how to respond and process performance feedback is even greater (Schawbel, 2014). The goal is to instill an ethos of receiver responsibility for learning, irrespective of how well or poorly the performance feedback is delivered, its level of accuracy and relevancy, and the credibility of the source (Stone & Heen, 2014). Much of the reluctance and fear associated with the performance feedback delivery process on the part of the sender can be mitigated by training receivers to monitor their body language and tone of voice as they receive performance feedback and provide their response in a nondefensive and nonaggressive fashion. When both the sender and receiver are trained, this increases both the quantity and quality of communication strengthening relationships and problem solving.

These skills are not inherited but are learned behaviors shaped by personality and life experiences. They include

1. Character- and value-based appraisal and the sources and consequences of errors.
2. Tools and techniques for involving and empowering employees.
3. Active listening skills.
4. Providing feedback and counseling techniques.
5. Performance documentation tools (diaries).
6. Goal and standard setting techniques.

7. Appraisal quality control measures.
8. Audited performance measures/metrics.
9. Hold managers accountable through their own performance appraisals regarding their effectiveness in developing and evaluating employees.
10. Provide subordinate appraisal of managerial effectiveness.
11. Assess the presence of rater bias (psychometric analysis).
12. Measurement of employee perceptions regarding distributive and procedural justice implications of performance appraisal (surveys, focus groups).
13. Appeals process.
14. Contextual factors are taken into consideration.

The performance management/appraisal process requires the highest levels of managerial and employee integrity. This process is in a continual state of flux given its complexity and the opportunities for self-deception. Let us commit to the high calling and the road less traveled.

Volunteer Management Performance Measurement

In addition to full-time employees, performance management/appraisal systems are critical for the effective management of volunteers. How the organization approaches the volunteer management process is another servant leader truth test. Nonprofit and church organizations possessing the most effective volunteer programs are high commitment in nature, recognizing that the search for transcendence and meaning is a prime motivational factor. Hence, meaningful volunteerism entails a "count the cost" investment of time, energy, and passion. The harvest is great and the laborers are still too few, hence the need to promote sustainable volunteer workloads. This is why effective volunteer performance management programs entail a systematic commitment to succession planning in order to produce the next generation of disciples.

In an ideal performance management system for volunteers, the same principles that apply to full-time employees relate to volunteers as well. Volunteers are provided with clear job descriptions with specific performance standards and metrics, receive a comprehensive orientation to the organization and the position, receive ongoing formal and informal training linked to individual strengths and weaknesses and position requirements, obtain regular and ongoing performance feedback, participate in setting performance goals and standards, receive regular performance appraisals including self-evaluation of performance and evaluating their supervisor, peers and staff, and receive ample recognition with rewards

and advancement linked to performance. Volunteers should receive both formal and informal recognition and awards and other statements of appreciation. Ideally, there is a volunteer management coordinator managing the recruitment and retention of volunteers constructing individual development plans for each volunteer. Another key factor is to ensure that the benefits of volunteers\programs exceed the cost. It is critical to actively consult with line and staff personnel to place volunteers in areas of need that do not impose excessive supervisory costs in terms of time and effort. These principles are very demanding, but SLHRM organizations recognize the tremendous blessings and value produced by motivated, passionate, and well-trained volunteers. There also needs to be systematic evaluation of the volunteer program effectiveness and return on investment.

Conclusion

The performance measurement and appraisal process provides great organizational character tests. In essence, the policies and practices of the organization reflect the organization's worldview and its faith commitment. Are we committed to the Great Commandment and Commission? The formal organizational structure of policies and procedures is a reflection of our collective view of God and human nature. A foundation and structure of servant leader policies and practices is a necessary, but still not a sufficient condition. The next question relates to the integrity of implementation. The worst incarnation of leadership practice is a façade of grace and servanthood that masks the instrumental and self-serving utilitarian and Darwinian heart. This hypocrisy shipwrecks faith and trust.

CHAPTER 9

SLHRM: STAFFING PRINCIPLES

The nature and quality of the staffing process is another pillar of SLHRM. As Jim Collins (2001) notes in *Good to Great*, the key staffing factor is "getting the right people on the bus." This entails hiring employees who passionately embrace the mission, vision, and values of the organization, possessing the appropriate combination of character and competency for long-term job growth and development. Hence, the goal is to select employees who possess the ability to fill multiple roles over the course of their organizational membership. This does not preclude hiring for specific positions, but recognizing that a flexible, organic approach to selection cultivates both employee growth and organizational effective-ness. It is important to reinforce that from a SLHRM perspective, the employment relationship is a covenant. This entails establishing a set of mutually recognized and observed obligations and benefits that govern and order workplace interactions, terms, and conditions. In essence, the employment relationship is one of the most important life roles expressing the redemptive and sanctifying love of Christ. Managers are shepherd of the flock possessing a humbling and fearful level of accountability while employees must work diligently as if working for the Lord (Colossians 3:23). The staffing process establishes a foundation for the communication and demonstration of the organization's values.

Effective Recruiting Practices

Let us begin with the recruitment process. The foundation is to apply the Golden Rule standard from the applicant perspective treating candidates with the greatest respect. This entails placing yourself in the role of an applicant and asking, "Would I want to work for this organization after experiencing our recruitment process?" The best practice standards begin with providing clear and accurate information on organizational mission,

vision, and values as they infuse and form the organization's culture along with the more specific job requirements, working conditions, advancement opportunities, and job security elements. In essence, a 360-degree realistic job preview that addresses the strengths and weaknesses of the job and the organization. This enables applicants to engage in self-selection in order to determine whether their personality, life goals, skills, and interests are an appropriate match for organizational and job characteristics. A second major element is to provide extensive training for HR and line managers on the relevant recruitment techniques. It is important to involve existing employees in the recruitment process for several reasons. First, the organization's employees should be your most passionate and persuasive advocates. When current employees truly believe in the mission, are fully engaged in their work, and are part of an extended family of colleagues, their enthusiasm and authenticity persuades job applicants on the organization's desirability. Consider employees to be deputized recruiters equipped with formal and informal thirty-second to five-minute elevator speeches that paint beautiful portraits of the organization's mission. Second, your employees will provide essential information on candidate quality and fit. Hence, it is important to train employees on the protocol for formally recruiting employees including their elevator speech. Finally, it is vitally important to provide applicants with an opportunity to meet supervisors and current employees.

In summary, SLHRM organizations view the staffing process as another means for promoting the dignity of all applicants with Golden Rule standards of respect. In order to promote this ethos, a foundational principle is establishing empathy. The goal is to make every applicant and person interviewed feel valued, while providing a genuine view of the organization's servant leader mission, vision, and values, thereby generating good will, even for rejected applicants. In essence, the goal is for all applicants to reflect favorably on their experiences and be an advocate for the organization.

The staffing process is another "window on the soul" test of SLHRM integrity. As an HR professional or manager, take the time to pray for the success of the selection process. Pray that the Lord leads gifted and passionate applicants and that the final candidates selected possesses the requisite character and competency for success, and most importantly, with selection made upon the will of God. Personnel selection is not an exact science for either employee or the organization, hence a combination of trial and error, and experience being an important teacher as we trust Romans 8:28 to rule in these situations.

One major principle is that candidates should generate within the search committee an excitement and confidence in their abilities. If there

is lukewarm support or a general malaise or unease, this often is the discernment of the Holy Spirit. As such, the preferred course of action is to bypass the candidate. Many organizations have rued the day of hiring a candidate that becomes a problem employee. We should only hire an applicant when it is clear that the person exceeds the minimum selection criteria and that there is a degree of excitement about their candidacy.

Another important principle is to use "superstar hiring" with great caution (Groysberg, Nanda, & Nohria, 2004). It is a great temptation to hire the top performers from other organizations. Sports are a good example of the associated pitfalls. When teams hire the "big names," they fail to recognize that success is a team effort with a dedicated infrastructure that supports high performers. Performance often is lower and organizations disappointed but the result is predictable given the inattention to the larger system factors that contribute to effective performance. Success in one setting does not ensure success in another given the complex contextual factors that contribute to effectiveness.

Another important hiring process practice is to communicate the dollar value of benefits to job candidates in the form of a benefits inventory listing individual benefits and their collective values. When employees receive benefits-cost data, they are more appreciative and understanding of the organization's investment in employee well-being and develop a more favorable perception of employers.

An additional key principle in the selection process is to cultivate in word and deed that the organization is an "employer of choice" with a reputation for integrity and a dynamic work environment. As is the case with individual employees, our good name and reputation is invaluable. When our organization possesses a status as a desirable and trustworthy work environment, this produces great advantages in attracting applicants. However, humility is the operative word as it takes many years to develop a good name, but it only requires a few critical incidents of failure to tarnish the years of good work. It is much more difficult to restore a soiled image than it is to maintain an existing stellar reputation. "Word of mouth" recruiting is the organization's best friend or worst nightmare.

Another important lesson is to ensure that the organization treats all contingent labor and volunteers with dignity and respect, with a significant investment professionalizing the contingent and volunteer recruitment, retention and development process. The treatment of contingent and volunteers is another "window on the soul." If poor treatment exists, it is another source of information causing applicants to view the organization skeptically. In today's labor market, "just-in-time" service delivery and production methods mandate greater labor flexibility, but we must ensure that the organization views all volunteer and contingent workers

with respect and not as disposable commodities. One important factor is to recognize that the absence of stability is a stressor for most workers. This entails adequate training and development investment, high levels of supervisor communication, feedback, support and encouragement, and relevant empowerment opportunities.

Another key principle is to not only screen for competency and character, but also examine the applicant's mission fit. It is important that organizations within the selection process communicate clearly their mission, vision, and values and develop valid and reliable assessment methods. This usually entails assessing the candidate's understanding and commitment to the mission during the interview process.

Many SLHRM organizations face a dilemma relative to training and human capital development. Training resources are scarce, but one countervailing element to low salaries is employee training. If the organization provides generous training options, this practice enhances recruitment and retention. This is a tangible means for saying to employees we care for you, you are important, and we will invest in your future. For some organizations, the root motive may be self-interested and utilitarian, but for the God-honoring SLHRM organization the motive is the Golden Rule and loving your employees. However, these employees are still likely to leave the organization after a relatively short period. Hence, should we invest in employees who may exit the organization before recouping the cost of the investment? On a global basis, from both a principal and utilitarian basis, the benefits exceed the costs. When the organization gains an identity as a quality "farm system" that develops talent valued by other employers, employee will sacrifice short-term financial gain for the experience of working in your organization. Hence, it is a God-honoring arrangement that provides a steady stream of qualified applicants.

A key element is to provide extensive training for HR and line managers on best-practice recruitment and staffing techniques. One of the foundational needs is to instruct managers on valid and reliable interviewing techniques. This includes educating managers on the many errors that bias the information search and analysis process. One of the key weaknesses is making premature candidate assessments based upon incomplete information, biases, and stereotypes. It is important to teach assessors that without a conscious effort to evaluate the results of the entire interview, interviewers reach premature closure within the first five minutes. Hence, it is important to instruct managers on how to develop and administer a standardized interview protocol with behaviorally based questions clearly linked to the essential duties and competencies. This requires developing a list of questions with a standardized scoring system with multiple assessors in a panel interview format.

As was mentioned earlier, it is important for applicants to meet a variety of supervisors and current employees. However, it is also important to reject the temptation to increase the length and depth of the interview process to unreasonable levels. Some organizations require five or more interview iterations, which places excessive stress on applicants.

SLHRM organizations recognize that a job is not merely a means for earning money to meet basic life needs, but an extension of our God-given calling to use our talents and gifts for the glory of God. Clearly, not every job is a lifetime commitment and destination, but irrespective of whether the position is full-time, part-time, permanent, or contingent, in or out of the applicant's area of interest, or a long-term or a temporary position, the organization should approach the recruitment and staffing process with honor and respect. It begins with a user-friendly application procedure with a sophisticated HR applicant management information system that provides multiple application avenues and sources from in person to online applications and other Web-based social media avenues such as Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter. SLHRM organizations that are desirable places to work will have little difficulty in filling most positions even without formal recruiting given the power of reputation, "word of mouth" endorsements, and most importantly, the guidance and direction of the Holy Spirit. Research demonstrates that referrals can be one of the most effective recruitment sources (Zottoli & Wanous, 2000; Keeling, McGoldrick, & Sadhu, 2013; Obukhova & Lan, 2013).

Another user-friendly element is the ability to submit a single resume for multiple positions with a convenient Web-based employment application process with reasonable information demands and requirements. It is important to ask the applicant to provide only the essential job-related information to minimize the time and effort required. For larger organizations, one-stop recruiting centers enhance applicant convenience. If the process is Web-based, providing ongoing candidate access to application status is another helpful convenience factor. Another key element is timely and dignified ongoing communication of the applicant's status throughout the process and a personal notification of employment decisions, positive or negative. It is both frustrating and demeaning for candidates not to receive or access information on their status and never to receive a formal notification of the final decision, or a very perfunctory, bureaucratic, or insulting rejection letter or email. At a minimum, the organization should warmly thank applicants for their interest and their investment of time and energy in the application process with a personalized email and all interviewed candidates should receive a timely letter or phone call expressing appreciation for their time and effort.

Assessing Recruitment System Effectiveness

Finally, it is important to implement a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the recruitment process with a balanced set of recruitment metrics. They will include surveying or interviewing job applicants on the quality of the recruitment and selection process, both those that were selected and those that were rejected. In addition, it is important to assess such factors as the yield and quality metrics for various recruitment sources (see table 9.1). For example, it is important to track the cost per applicant and the cost per hire by recruitment source. In this fashion, the organization can track ROI for the various recruitment methods. In addition to costs, best practice organizations track the quality of hires per recruitment source through such metrics as hiring, retention, and promotion rates. The goal is to be a wise steward of the limited recruiting resources.

Spiritual Foundation of the Recruitment Process

SLHRM organizations embrace the Golden Rule standard and view the recruitment and selection process from the applicant perspective. This includes providing accurate information on the details of the screening (resumes, applications, ratings of training, and experience) methods and the steps in selection process, beginning with interviews. The organization should provide a clear overview of the number and length of interviews, the identity and location of the interviewers (HR, supervisors, peer employees, etc.), the general content and type of questions (behavioral, situational, etc.), and the general nature of the scoring process. If tests are used, describe their general purpose, content, and length and provide an overall description of the type of test (IQ, work sampling, assessment centers, aptitude, achievement, personality such as Meyers-Briggs or the DISC), and ethics test. Finally, indicate whether there will be background checks (criminal and/or credit and financial history) and references required.

Applicants and the organization alike should practice transparency and humility in all interactions. From the applicant perspective, seek out positions compatible with God's will and your endowed spiritual gifts and natural abilities. This entails conducting research and asking questions on organizational mission, vision, values, job requirements, working conditions, advancement opportunities, and job security. Transparency and honesty at the applicant stage reduces future employee turnover, internal employee job stress, and externalized dysfunctional stress adversely affecting coworkers.

Table 9.1 Sample evaluation of recruitment program for police officer

Recruitment Strategy	Col A Applicants	Col B Minimally Qualified	Col C B/A Efficiency Hit Rate (%)	Col D Budget ($)	Col E D/B Cost Per Ap ($)
1. Local Newspaper	950	50	5.3	1,000	20
2. Professional Newsletter	75	45	60	500	11.11
3. Walk-ins	600	15	2.5	$0	0.0
4. On-Campus Recruiting	50	30	60	3,000	100
5. Community Groups	45	20	45	500	25
6. Intern Programs	10	10	100	40,000	4,000
7. Social Media	250	35	14	3,000	66.67
8. Referrals	100	30	30	0	0.00

	Col F Hired	Col G F/A % Hired	Col H F/B Hiring Efficiency (%)	Col I 2 Year Retention Rate (%)	Col J 2 Year Prom. Rate (%)
1. Local Newspaper	5	0.5	10	70	10
2. Professional Newsletter	34	45.3	75	85	12
3. Walk-ins	2	0.3	13	65	8
4. On-Campus Recruiting	18	36	60	90	15
5. Community Groups	7	15.5	35	70	9
6. Intern Programs	9	90	90	95	17
7. Social Media	4	1.6	11	70	10
8. Referrals	12	12	40	80	12

The appropriate matching of applicant abilities and interests with job requirements releases the creative energies enhancing performance and serving as a source of support, encouragement, and expertise for other employees. In essence, a higher level of servanthood and stewardship effectiveness! When God places us in a position of godly obedience that utilizes and develops our natural and spiritual gifts, we generate a synergy that produces good fruits. The applicant should provide productive, honest, and constructive feedback on the organization's recruitment and selection process. Clearly, from the applicant perspective, it is important to withdraw job candidacy if contacted by the organization for an interview or other screening steps if you have no intention of pursuing further employment.

A key element in the selection process is the balance between gifts, abilities, and character. Much of the current literature emphasizes fitting jobs to employee abilities and interests to reflect applicant strengths and passion (Digeorgio, 2004). The theory is that employees will prosper and be exponentially more effective if placed in the areas that match their God-given abilities and interests. As such, this entails a much more flexible and organic selection process given the more elastic job design and organizational structure. However, a focus on gifts, skills, and abilities is incomplete.

Assessing Applicant Character

The "house" of excellence in skill and ability must rest upon a foundation of God-honoring character. SLHRM organizations should be assessing Christian character behaviorally. SLHRM organizations cannot explicitly use Christian character assessment as a criterion for evaluating candidates given Title VII religious discrimination law restrictions, but general character attributes are valid areas for assessment. Irrespective of the level of employee ability, weakness of character erodes the foundation and when trials and stressful conditions occur, the character weaknesses lead to inappropriate decisions and behavior.

With regard to character, we reverse the formula and focus more effort on identifying and remedying our character weaknesses. We must approach character issues with fear and trembling for several reasons. The first is that our character strengths can quickly become weaknesses with time and with the influence of factors such as pride. The second is that appearances are deceiving, both for others and in regard to self-understanding as disguised impure motives are frequently the catalyst for righteous actions and conflict.

How should the selection process incorporate character issues? It begins with prayer. Prayer is the spiritual tracks for the train, and we begin by praying for mature, gifted, passionate, ethical, and moral applicants. In addition, pray that the final candidates selected possess the requisite character and competency for success, and most importantly, that the organization makes selections based upon the will of God. A universal spiritual law is that character is a function of the heart. God calls Christians to test the spirits (1 John 4:1) of others. Hence, we should be praying for godly discernment as we interact with job candidates and ask the Holy Spirit to reveal clues regarding their underlying motivations. Our spiritual discernment is the foundation for further probing in interactions with job candidates. We must be judicious and wise in using explicit Christian character assessment as a criterion for evaluating candidates given Title VII religious discrimination law restrictions, but general character attributes are valid areas for assessment.

The six character attributes listed in chapter 1 are foundational elements, but are not exhaustive of the full range of character traits. Unless we hire men and women of character, we will sabotage our efforts for servanthood and stewardship. As a SLHRM professional or manager, take the time to pray for the success of the selection process. Hence, without prayer, we cannot see into the spiritual heart of the candidates.

How should the selection process incorporate the assessment of character issues? One key component of character is that our motives for seeking a position reinforce intentions to serve the broader public and community interests and are of course moral and ethical. Servant leaders should institute formal selection practices that shed light on applicant motives. Second, we should seek discernment as we interact with job candidates to reveal clues regarding their underlying motivations. Our intuition and spiritual discernment is the foundation for further job candidate probing. We must be judicious and wise in using explicit servant leader character assessment as a criterion for evaluating candidates. The key is to define clearly the specific character attributes in job-related and behavioral terms. For example, forgiveness is foundational character trait essential for promoting creativity and innovation in the workplace. If leaders severely punish employees for errors, this creates a climate of fear conditioning employees to think and behave in a self-protective fashion thereby minimizing the risk taking essential for ingenuity and resourcefulness. For example, asking candidates a situational question on how they would manage an employee who placed great efforts into a new project, but failed to meet client expectations, produces good insight on their character in this area. Other means to assess character include

standardized tests related to character and ethics (Dalton & Metzger, 1993; Behling, 1998; Gross–Schaefer et al., 2000). Table 9.2 presents the major servant leader character attributes and their relationship to key job attitudes and outcomes.

The six character attributes mentioned above are foundational elements, but are not exhaustive of the full range of character traits. As mentioned, unless we hire men and women of character, we will sabotage our efforts for servanthood and stewardship. As a SLHRM professional or manager, take the time to reflect on the success of the selection process. Hence, without introspection, we cannot discern the important character attributes of the candidates.

Table 9.2   Selected servant leader character attributes and the work–related attitudinal, behavioral, and performance outcomes

Servant Leader Character Attribute	Selection Measures
Love: Promoting the best interests of others	Situational interview questions that assess the candidate's understanding of the importance and nature of love. For example, have the candidate respond to a scenario of how to resolve conflict with difficult employees in a moral fashion.
Humility: Recognizing our strengths, weaknesses, and limitations	Provide situational interview questions on how the employee honors and recognizes employees for their excellent work. Second, have them provide an example of when they failed in an endeavor and what they learned from the process.
Forgiveness: Forgiving others and ourselves for mistakes, failures, and offenses	Use situational interview question to uncover how applicants view failure in themselves and others and provide a specific employee failure scenario and ask for their response on how the situation should be managed.
Transparency: A commitment to open and honest communication of strengths and weaknesses	Provide situational interview questions that ask the candidate how they learn from mistakes and failure and how they help others learn from their mistakes and failures of themselves and others.
Hope and perseverance: The ability to sustain a course of action irrespective of the obstacles	Ask the candidate to provide specific examples of how they overcame adversity in challenging work situations and how they encourage others during the times of trial.
Compassion: A commitment to understand the emotions, needs, and problems of others	Ask the candidate their approach to performance management and how they maintain long-term productivity. In addition, ask a situational interview question on their strategies for understanding the needs and problems of others.

Southwest Airlines is a "best-practice" example of blending value, character, and competency elements into the selection process. McGee-Cooper and Trammell (2010) summarized the key elements of their success, identifying the following factors:

1. Select based upon favorable attitudes toward teamwork and a commitment to service over self-interests.
2. Emphasize the needs of employees first to demonstrate the authenticity of employee commitment.
3. Promote from within.
4. Employ ongoing methods and options for employee communication and input.
5. Ongoing celebrations of achievements and expression of employee appreciation.
6. Cultivate and embrace diversity.
7. Promote volunteerism.

The integration of character into the process increases the challenge, but SLHRM integrity entails the equal weighting of character and competency.

Ending Employment Discrimination

One of the key moral areas related to the staffing process is ending employment discrimination. Clearly, there is a clear and compelling ethical and moral justification for eliminating biased treatment unrelated to job qualifications or character. A "letter and spirit" understanding of the Christian faith clearly rejects discrimination as a sin of pride. God is no respecter of persons (Romans 2:11, Acts 10:34) and neither should we. Discrimination wounds and scars both parties, as it strips each of human dignity imprisoning in the guise of false identities. It blinds the "superior" group with delusions of superiority while paradoxically haunting their conscience with insecurity and fear regarding the truth of equality, the anxiety about losing their favored status, and fears of eventual rebellion, retribution, and revenge. The "inferior" group is scarred by the identity that they are inherently flawed tempting them to respond with bitterness, despair, anger, discouragement, and fear. This produces individual and collective suffering at the physical, psychological, and spiritual levels. From a utilitarian standpoint, discrimination is a form of social tax producing high costs through the underutilization of human potential and the deforming of the human spirit that produces dysfunctions including, crime, welfare dependency, and negative mental and physical

health, among others. In addition to these direct costs, we incur huge opportunity costs given the lower tax revenue and societal productivity. Embracing diversity is a godly value, and irrespective of the moral justification, the utilitarian rationale alone requires a vigorous endorsement of antidiscrimination policies. The reality is that the demographics of the labor market are changing with a much higher percentage of women and minorities. From a SLHRM standpoint, a diverse labor pool is not only ethical and moral, it makes perfect business sense through more efficient and effective service delivery and higher quality decision making.

SLHRM organizations embrace ethical and moral selection practices. A key element of ethical and moral selection relate to Equal Employment Opportunity considerations. Equal employment case law has codified the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) 1978 Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection. The EEOC deems if the overall impact of the global selection process produces a selection rate of 80 percent or less than the dominant group, the organization must review its component selection methods to identify areas in which protected groups are disadvantaged. Hence, any selection instrument that influences the employment status of an external or internal applicant becomes a "test." Interviews, performance application forms, resumé screening, and educational requirements are all considered "tests" under the law and are subject to findings of adverse impact using the 80 percent rule. Intent is irrelevant in adverse impact cases. The prevailing legal criterion is the presence of disparate impact on protected groups. This legal standard was adapted given the inability of individual level equal employment case law to address the aggregate impact of societal (and more impersonal) forms of discrimination.

As we conclude this chapter and reflect upon the key learning points, it is important to recognize that the staffing process tests the character and motivation of SLHRM organizations. It is critical that the organization promotes the dignity of all applicants through Golden Rule HR processes. Without a concerted focus on employee character, HR systems sow seeds that impede mission achievement and employee well-being.

CHAPTER 10

SLHRM: TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

The Theology of Career Development

Christian SLHRM entails making disciples. Hence, a foundational element of leadership DNA is developing subordinates, promoting the fulfillment of their purpose and calling. Several key character elements are at the center of this approach. The first is humility, in which we voluntarily step back and "decrease" so others can "increase" (excel) (John 3:30), equip our subordinates to exceed our capabilities and do greater things (John 14:12), and endow others with greater degrees of power and influence or a "double portion" of God's spirit (2 Kings 2:9). In essence, we are obeying God's command to promote the interests of others (Philippians 2:4), esteem others greater than ourselves (Philippians 2:3), and bear each other's burdens in love (Galatians 6:2). By following these biblical principles, the leader learns how to love employees from God's perspective. This entails providing discipline and corrective feedback in a fashion that provides hope and encouragement. Hence, the leader needs to communicate clearly his or her appreciation and that they are pleased, but not satisfied, with the employee's performance given their great potential. Servant leaders make themselves dispensable, while empowering others. They help others unbury talents and use them appropriately.

One of the key objectives of a training and development program is cultivating areas of strength. The movie *Chariots of Fire* illustrates this very well as Olympic runner Eric Liddell states that he experiences God's pleasure when he is training. When we are in our ability, gift, and calling "zone," time stands still and work becomes a form of worship, joy, and play. When we are working in our "sweet spot," we truly enter the eternal realm and the Kingdom presence of God shakes our temporal anchors. When we are in a position utilizing our gifts, the Holy Spirit wind is at our back. Secular HR studies reinforce this spiritual principles

as it is much easier to increase the performance of a strength from good to excellent than an area of weakness from a "D" to a "C" (Digeorgio, 2004). As per the inequality issue, scripture is clear that there is a diversity of gifts, talents, and resources according to God's will (see Matthew 25:14–30). As the body is composed of many parts of different size and purpose, our unique job duties requires a diversity of support resources to accomplish the tasks that God sets before us (see 1 Corinthians 12). The real key is the stewardship issue, that we must obey the Lord in how we use our diverse resources, gifts, and talents to promote the Kingdom of God in word and deed.

One of the great obstacles to Christian character growth in both our personal lives and the job development domain is a pride-based personal rights focus. Our political, social, and economic system glorifies individual rights, thereby inculcating the self-obsessive, atomistic orientation that contributes to elevating the gratification and protection of the ego as the central pursuit of human development (à la Maslow's self-actualization). Christianity in America reflects this self-obsession when Jesus becomes a means to obtain personal blessings and healing divorced from the larger purpose of ongoing repentance, surrender, and serving the Father unconditionally. Hence, SLHRM organizations strive to create a workplace environment in which employees transcend the narcissistic self-reflection and cultivate a high level of spiritual and emotional intelligence to promote employee development and mission accomplishment. One factor is to reinforce that we must commit to working with excellence in all situations. Yes, the Lord does have a sense of humor, and tests and sharpens us through the difficult "sandpaper" people. It is easy to help train those who are pleasant and like us, but unconditional love is cultivated by choosing to act graciously to those who mistreat, dislike, or attack us. As Christians, we must embrace "turning the other cheek" (Matthew 5:39). Enduring unjust criticism does not always lead to a pleasant ending in this world, but God smiles as nothing done for the Lord is in vain (1 Corinthians 15:58). Matthew 23:12 illustrates this principle clearly: "All who exalt themselves will be humbled, and all who humble themselves will be exalted."

As Christians, at one time or another we are bound to question our choice of career. We may believe that God providentially guided us to our current position, but ruminate whether we are to remain. This is a common pattern after the initial euphoria and challenge of the position wears off. This situation is similar to the tests we face as new Christians in which we burn with a great emotional energy but endure a gradual dissipation of the emotions. We must then rise to the challenge of choosing to love God in a deeper and more mature way. I am confident that

God uses all of our experiences to perfect us for further service and character development, separating the wheat with the chaff, the good form the bad, the joyful from the sorrowful. The joy of career development is discovering what we are and what we are not! One of the worst positions in life is to assume the role of an actor filling an unwanted role. We may discover that our passions are in areas such as being a caregiver that may provide little or no income opportunities. However, God will always find unexpected and creative ways for us to realize our passion and receive the income. For example, let us assume that your greatest joy was organic cooking and baking for the family. The Lord may lead you to start a home business in which you sell the organic baked goods from your home. As scripture states, God will not let His children beg for bread (Psalm 37:25)!

Foundational Career and Leadership Management Principles

Effective career development and training programs entail a level of humility and transparency deriving from a clear confidence that our value is defined by our identity and relationship with Christ as we love and obey God and others, not our performance or our gifts, and abilities. This enables us to place our performance and character strengths in perspective recognizing that excellence is our present and future goal, while perfection is an aspirational goal never fully completed in his life. Hence, we grow through transparent repentance and honestly assessing our strengths and weaknesses. I have learned this truth on my own Christian walk. Transparency enables us to demonstrate humility in a tangible fashion. How can we be humble when we fail to be ourselves, weaknesses and all? The practice of transparency is very difficult given our fleshly impulse to hide our weaknesses and appear to be in control to others. The absence of transparency grants the Devil permission to attack us with condemnation and shame. Transparency is the action side of humility and produces great fruit. We soon learn that operating under the mantle of grace and forgiveness stimulates the healthy pursuit of excellence while minimizing perfectionism. These are difficult, but essential, lessons to learn. Below is a list of key points.

1. *Leadership development requires intense effort and sacrifice, and we must first ensure the integrity, spiritual legitimacy, and viability of the mission we serve in order for our request of employee sacrifice (to count the cost in Luke 14:28) to be moral.* Does the ROI of the organization justify the opportunity costs at the spiritual and temporal levels? In other

words, there must be an assessment as to whether the organization promotes viable Kingdom interests (the substance test) related to the Great Commission and the Great Commandment. Second, if so, is the ethos (mission, vision, values, the motives, means, and ends) according to God's will? Many organizations are compatible with Kingdom objectives, but are these organizations the correct match for the employee? It is akin to separating the best from the good. This requires ongoing prayer, fasting, and reflection.

2. *Count the cost*! Once the viability of the organization meets scrutiny, the next question relates to the degree of spiritual and temporal calling and mission fit. Is the candidate willing to invest all he or she has in developing their skills at this crucial stage? Is the candidate willing to devote great time, energy (sweat and tears) into their leadership development? Developing into a servant leader is like becoming a parent, it is a twenty-four-hour job!

3. *Can you make disciples*? Even though intense effort is required at the beginning, we labor in vain unless the mission, vision, and values are "contagious." We will eventually "burn out" and weary in our "well doing" if we fail to reproduce ourselves and empower others. Thus, does our service in this organization pass the passion test? Does working in this organization generate excitement and strong emotions?

4. *Can you humble yourself and collaborate*? The leader's true beliefs emerge in their approach to collaboration. If agape love is the foundation, the servant leader cares little to none from their personal perspective who receives the credit, only that the mission is completed. High conflict levels illustrate a double mindedness and a competitive approach between programs or divisions within organizations. If there is a genuine commitment to collaboration, the leader cooperates and works with laser-like effectiveness. When resistance and conflict is prolonged and impedes mission accomplishment, this is an indicator of potential character deficiencies (the presence of pride and self-interest) in addition to conflicts of legitimate collective interests and needs. The individual capacity question is important. Given the breadth and depth of the knowledge, skills, and competencies required to develop a servant leader, we must approach the task with "fear and trembling" recognizing that we will need God's power and favor and the support of wise and skilled mentors and role models for the discipleship development process.

5. *Leadership and management development must be systematic.* Growth requires the creation of more leadership and management positions.

The job requirements of the founder are very different from the leadership of an established organization. It is important to "test the spirits" behind our motivation through prayer and the advice of godly counselors in addition to conventional career counseling assessments. As the organization grows in size, the chief executive must empower and delegate management responsibilities while increasing emphasis on long-term strategic growth. It is important to cultivate both mentors and sponsors to provide the requisite levels of support and success. A mentor provides the personalized professional and character development advice, while a sponsor is an individual of higher status with power and influence who can become a champion for the employee. These factors are especially important for women managers to break through the glass ceiling (Tolar, 2012; Ibarra, Carter, & Silva, 2010).

6. *Succession planning is key element of leadership development, but organizations lack the expertise, time, and resources to effectively implement the required practices.* Organizations are lost in the wilderness of "fire-engine" management and the tyranny of the urgent to the neglect of what Covey, Merrill, and Merrill (1994) and their time management system indicates are the critical type 2 long-term planning issues for future success. Without investing sufficient resources in the "high upfront cost but great downstream benefit" management techniques such as strategic planning and succession planning, discipleship making occurs erratically.

7. *The principle of promoting employees to management and leadership positions because of their technical competence and success is very common error.* The organizational landscape is strewn with leaders and managers promoted without either the natural aptitude or the appropriate training to the detriment of their own success and wellbeing. Research clearly demonstrates that the leader's emotional intelligence skills, his or her interpersonal, communication, and stress management skills, explain a great deal of the variance in leadership success (Goleman, 1998). Organizations do leaders and those they serve a great disservice by not carefully selecting, developing, and supporting leaders.

8. *The foundation for all SLHRM leaders remains prayer.* The key element is to ask the Holy Spirit to guide our actions as we separate the best from the good at all levels, from individual to the corporate church and nonprofit level.

Leadership development is not for the faint of heart and spirit! To God be the glory!

SLHRM Character Development

In this section, we address the challenge of character development. Let us begin with a larger framework. The key is to approach character development from both a deontological (consistency of principles) and a teleological (a greater good, utilitarian) perspective. The foundation for character growth is a relentless "testing" of the integrity of motives, means, and ends from a biblical perspective. This ongoing analysis will serve as the foundation for the necessary legal, ethical, and moral test. All three levels must meet the standards. From a Christian servant leadership standpoint, it all begins with a foundation of faith in Christ, humility, mission clarity, and importance, serving others first and empowering employees. Decisions and behaviors are immoral from a biblical view if motivated by self-aggrandizement and glorification including satisfying the ego needs for recognition, power, and achievement, enhancing one's personal image, or obtaining favorable treatment to promote personal, versus mission-based outcomes. In addition, they are all unethical if they impede the mission in some fashion and attenuate trust.

The absence of SLHRM traits (love, courage, humility, empathy, compassion, forgiveness, and altruism, among others) reduces the capacity to commit to the mission, understand the true needs of others and the requisite services needed to serve their interests, and to grasp the root causes of problems and their solutions. Research and practice clearly demonstrates that poor leadership impedes organizational effectiveness. The indicators of dysfunctional leadership include:

1. A personal ego gratification orientation resulting in promoting self-interests (recognition, advancement, connections, networking, financial gain) over the mission
2. Increased level of competition, conflict and personal attacks (demonizing opponents)
3. Reduced organizational cohesiveness and problem-solving capacity given the absence of commitment and interest in the mission
4. Excessive levels of conflict inhibit recruiting and retaining high-quality employees
5. Implementing dysfunctional management strategies due to a lack of trust from micromanagement on one extreme and laissez-faire abdication at the other end of the spectrum.

In an ideal world of management and leadership selection, development and evaluation programs would eliminate the toxic manager. Unfortunately, our human resource management practices are imperfect,

and poorly selected, trained, and evaluated managers are plentiful. Part of business savvy "101" is learning how to manage a dysfunctional boss. As Christians, we have an added obligation to love the "extra grace people" placed in our lives. Another attribute of poor management is the generation of "in" and "out" groups as reflected in leader-member exchange theory (Northouse, 2013). Career progress (or lack thereof) is highly correlated with the quality of experience during the first year. It is important to take external action when managerial incompetence threatens employee career progress. Classification as a "poor" employee makes it is very difficult to overcome the negative stereotypes even with improving employee performance. In essence, employees retain an unseen weight that impedes their career progress (Burns & Otte, 1999; Abu Elanain, 2014). Placing the employee in the "out" group generally entails the employment of a differential leadership approach (more traditional and authoritarian) (Northouse, 2013). Hence, it is critical to be aware of the dangers as an employee and seek the Lord's guidance on whether to endure or to exit.

One of the key metrics related to engagement and servant followership is the level of peer support. In many jobs and occupations, the majority of learning occurs through OJT, or on-the-job training. Depending on the job, up to 90 percent of all training occurs on an informal basis (Snell & Bohlander, 2013). Best practice organizations recognize that a major component of servant followership is employees taking the time to help others. SLHRM organizations recognize and reward good citizenship. One of the most serious losses from disengaged, discouraged, overwhelmed, and/or cynical employees is the good Samaritan. Compassion fatigue sets in and the workplace becomes more Darwinian in nature.

Below are reflections on best practice based learning and development programs.

1. *Employee development is a lifelong responsibility for every organizational member*: In order to serve Christ with excellence and meet our God-given potential, we must embrace a lifelong commitment to learning.

2. *Embracing a humble and teachable spirit*: This entails a commitment to identifying our strengths, weaknesses, and recognizing our limits. We must actively seek feedback and guidance from others. It requires great strength and humility to seek out negative performance and character feedback. It entails even greater levels of humility to receive and process it in a non–defensive manner.

3. *Helping others (peers, supervisor, other colleagues) on the job is a critical duty as research demonstrates that much organizational training/learning occurs through informal on-the-job-training:* Servant leaders and followers are

unconditionally committed to supporting and encouraging friend or foe, even if it personally disadvantages or inconveniences. Jesus modeled the ministry of interruptions, as he was never too busy to help those in need. We must provide our assistance and performance feedback in an honest, considerate, loving, and supportive spirit. This entails providing specific, behavioral, timely, and non-judgmental feedback. The cumulative fruit of this Golden Rule commitment is a workplace of joy minimizing employee stress and emphasizing excellence.

4. *Drive out fear in the workplace*: God-honoring employee development and learning *require* making mistakes. Ruthlessly eliminate perfectionism and replace it with a devotion to the healthy pursuit of excellence that recognizes the inevitability of failure, personal trial, struggle, and blunders and their value in learning and character growth.

5. *Training and development programs should be designed and administered according to adult learning theory principles*:
    i. Provide numerous opportunities to apply directly key learning objectives in a nonjudgmental and nonthreatening manner.
    ii. Provide timely and specific performance feedback to improve performance.

6. *Develop a curriculum that is compatible with the learning style preferences of the audience.* This entails a learning style diagnostic assessment to identify the specific types of learners including visual, aural, reading/writing, and kinesthetic (Zapalska & Brozik, 2006). With the identification of learning styles, it is important to develop a curriculum that actively engages student learning according to Bloom's Taxonomy, in which the leader creates, evaluates, analyzes, applies, understands, and remembers (Halawi, Pires, & McCarthy, 2009).

7. *Training and development programs are designed to reinforce key organizational values and should not only increase technical proficiency, but link the subject of learning to the larger mission, vision, and values.*

8. *Management and HR practices should reinforce the application and integration of learning objectives.* Managers and employees should be jointly responsible for training implementation and integration, with accountability reflected in the performance appraisal process.

9. *Organizations should provide adequate financial and logistical support for training*:
    i. The American Society for Training & Development reported in 2012 that the average organization spent 3.1 percent of the payroll budget on training (ASTD, 2012). Regrettably, many organizations invest less than the average amount which is objectively low.

     ii. Employees should be provided with an individual develop-
ment plan (IDP), which provides a comprehensive diagnostic
of strengths and weaknesses along with a short- and long-term
action plan.

     iii. Provide employees with an individual learning account (ILA),
a yearly sum of funds that the employee can invest in training
and development activities

     iv. *Organizations must support employee training and educational efforts
by providing release time from regular job duties to reduce employee
stress levels.*

10. *Personal Career Development Strategies:* Engage in systematic personal
self-assessment (know thyself) by inventorying:

     i. Strengths and weaknesses

     ii. Passions, areas of gifting, likes, and dislikes

     iii. Personality attributes

     iv. Personality attributes (the Big Five: openness, conscientious-
ness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism) and dispo-
sition through diagnostic assessments such as the Myers–Briggs
(MBTI) (Bahreinian, Ahi, & Soltani, 2012).

     v. Predisposition toward dependence on authority figures

11. Establish organizational sponsors and mentors, ideally inside or
outside the organization, network with other managers, and volun-
teer for projects to demonstrate job skills

12. Enhance employee efficacy perceptions regarding the objective of
the training (Luthans & Peterson, 2002). Employee confidence in
their ability to succeed is a major element of efficacy, the psycho-
logical confidence that we can cope with the demands of the new
situation. It is important that employees believe that management
supports them and can be trusted.

13. *Organizations should monitor supervisory behavior to combat what is
termed in-groups and out-groups.* The classification into the out-
group changes the management mode used. Out-group employees
are more likely to be micromanaged using traditional hierarchi-
cal authority and receive less empowerment and developmental
opportunities along with fewer opportunities to develop and
display talents (Northouse, 2013). In-group employees receive
higher levels of encouragement and empowerment. Subordinate
career advancement is adversely influenced when your boss is
in the out-group by reducing supervisor "upward influence."
This situation results in lower levels of resource support (finan-
cial, personnel, and information) and power (Kanter, 1979). The
manager's relationship problems with other organizational stake-
holders frequently "spills over" to employees.

Another best-practice recommendation for leadership development is to implement an online knowledge utilization and sharing system (Widén-Wulff & Suomi, 2007). The key is to record and communicate internal institutional knowledge and external best-practice programs and research. These systems are searchable by subject area and enhance the effectiveness of training and development as well as general management problem solving. It is essential to preserve institutional memory and knowledge from departing members while promoting innovation.

Most organizations have moved to some form of e-learning or virtual learning. These systems can be highly effective and cost efficient. They provide an "on-demand," as needed, asynchronous learning environment. Many of the programs are completely self-directed, provide immediate corrective feedback, and operate at a pace compatible with trainee motivation and ability levels. However, the e-learning domain possesses definite limits. One issue is that there are significant differences in computer literacy levels impeding the effectiveness of e-learning programs. In addition, there are individual learning style differences contributing to preferences for a "high-touch" traditional approach. Ideally, there needs to be an assessment of learning styles.

E-learning is even more important given the growth in virtual organizations and the flexible workplace (Green & Roberts, 2010). With the virtual workplace, this will entail a hybrid approach of webcasts plus residency type experiences. Training programs for the virtual workplace are extremely important given the need to enhance group cohesiveness. As per the elements of virtual workplace teaching, one foundational element is group conflict and processing skills. Given that virtual groups do not have the opportunity to pursue in-person socialization and bonding, it is critical to learn how to interact with team members who are largely unknown from a personal level. The foundational element is to provide opportunities for bonding while inculcating the conflict management skills that enable groups to function cohesively. Another key area is performance management skills given the need to empower and hold others accountable. Virtual teams rely less on "face time" and more on empowerment. Hence, the need for self-directed work team training to address such issues as conflict management, setting performance goals, and motivational approaches.

Training Program Evaluation and Needs Assessment

The final foundational element of a comprehensive training and development program is a needs assessment and training program evaluation. There are different levels, from the individual to the macro. At the macro level, it is important to link training needs with a SWOT (strength, weakness, opportunity, and threat) analysis to ascertain the interface between

macro mission interests and strategic needs. One of the dangers with the training process is to fail to link training to long-term system issues. Another key element is to ensure that the employees receive ongoing support for their training and development activities. In addition, there needs to be in place clear incentives to support training program application of learning subject areas within the human resource system through the performance appraisal system.

A key best-practice recommendation is to engage in systematic evaluation of training and development program effectiveness providing ongoing feedback on the success of the training program from the key stakeholder perspectives including employees, all levels of management (entry level, mid-level, and executives), and clients. It is important to document and communicate training success to instill confidence in the efficacy and relevancy of training. Without early success, discouraged employees and managers lose hope. In terms of a training program assessment framework, the Kirkpatrick evaluation model is well developed and regarded, and provides a good foundation (Roberts, 2010). Let us take the example of supervisor performance appraisal training. The Fitzpatrick's five levels of analysis begin with attitudes. Did the participants perceive value in the performance appraisal training? This is usually assessed by attitude and satisfaction surveys. The second level is learning. Was there a measurable change in knowledge levels as measured by traditional exams and role-playing exercises? The third level relates to behavior. Did the training change behavior in the desired format? For example, did managers hold more frequent performance counseling meetings, and engage employees with higher levels of participation through increased use of self-evaluations? It is important to gather subordinate feedback to measure the effectiveness of training efforts. Hence, the organization conducts subordinate surveys of managerial behavior in the desired change areas such as more frequent informal performance feedback. The fourth level is changes in performance. Did employee productivity increase after the introduction of the performance appraisal training? The final level is ROI. Did the monetary and other resources invested in the training program produce an acceptable rate of return? This is the most difficult and complex assessment given the multiplicity of variables and the associated measurement difficulties.

Conclusion

In conclusion, training and development is a key factor in a SLHRM organization's success. Training and development requires the embracing of a long-term perspective in which employees and leaders work synergistically for the common good. It is another "path less traveled."

CHAPTER 11

SLHRM: COMPENSATION MANAGEMENT

Compensation System Worldview

Compensation is a foundational component of the SLHRM system. As Christian servant leaders, our stewardship of money is a window on our spiritual state and character. The compensation process reveals important worldview elements that manifest profound implications for human resources (HR) practices. One of the most pernicious pathologies of the secular worldview is defining self-worth and identity according to our job accomplishments and the most tangible indicators of "value," our salary. The other element that contributes to our enslavement is rampant materialism, which encourages the belief that happiness is a function of what we own and consume. Second, the goal as Christians is not happiness, which is transitory and influenced by highly variable factors, but deep spiritual joy, generated solely by the presence of the Holy Spirit in our hearts, eternal in nature, an island of peace in the trials and tribulations of our lives. If we embrace the subtle but powerful deception that materialism is the key to happiness, we are at the mercy of a multitude of elements beyond our control. When accomplishments and pay levels determine our value, we worship enslaving idols of the heart that imprison us with pride, fear, and insecurity.

Conversely, God embraces money and compensation as a good and necessary element of promoting well-being at all levels, individual, family, and community. The key is recognizing and acknowledging the source (God) of our ability to generate wealth, compensation's purpose in promoting God's will to meet our legitimate and basic needs, and our role as a steward to use compensation wisely to promote Good's plan and purpose. Compensation systems reinforce and support a "body of Christ" differentiation of talents, gifts, and abilities, reflecting God's joy and pleasure in the process of variety in creation. Hence, every organization's compensation system should reflect God's nature and purpose.

Each compensation system embraces an implicit and an explicit view of human nature, a motivational approach that focuses on satisfying selected needs and values. Using the framework of Douglas McGregor, Theory X organizations assume that money is the best motivator, an extrinsic approach; but relying primarily on monetary compensation is a double-edged sword (McGregor, 1960). A reliance on monetary compensation is effective in the short term, but generates many perverse consequences over time. A balanced compensation portfolio consisting of monetary and non-monetary elements is an attribute of management best practice (Jackson & Schuler, 2006). For many jobs, employees are primarily motivated intrinsically and performance enhancement programs using extrinsic approaches such as pay can decrease motivation and performance (Deckop, 1995; Deckop & Cirka, 2000; Markova & Ford, 2011).

A theory that provides excellent guidance on the mixed influence of compensation is equity theory (Pynes, 2013). Equity theory accurately describes our reasoning and value assessment process of how we compare our inputs to a job (effort, performance level, qualifications) with the outcomes or the returns (pay levels, promotion, recognition) received. If these ratios are out of balance, the employee attempts to restore equity by adjusting inputs such as reducing work effort. If employee efforts fail to restore balance, workers experience increasing levels of stress and frustration. When organizations invest little effort in non-monetary forms of compensation to reinforce intrinsic motivation, it creates greater levels of compensation dissatisfaction, especially in government and nonprofit organizations. This decoupling of pay with performance occurs in many settings, especially with professional, highly educated occupations. For example, the intrinsic nature of the work is the primary motivator for social service workers and teachers (Borzaga & Tortia, 2006; Bassi & Fave, 2012). A competitive and reasonable level of compensation is a necessary factor, but should not be the primary motivational approach.

An important element in developing an effective salary policy is integrating employee hearts both spiritually and psychologically into the mission and ethos of the organization. A recruiting strategy based on being a compensation leader may attract high performers, but many of them will possess a mercenary attitude and leave the company for the next high bidder unless they embrace the mission. A critical decision that an organization must make is whether they will deploy a "star" approach predicated on a small number of talented employees or a broader, team-based development of solid "B" players. From a biblical standpoint, cultivating a team orientation is the mandated approach. This embrace of the team perspective receives strong endorsement from the research literature, which demonstrates that star hiring usually fails

Table 11.1 Key SLHRM worldview compensation elements

Element	Christian Worldview	Market View	Humanistic
Main mission-related objective of compensation	To promote human dignity. To enable man to express his innate God-given gifts, abilities and skills in the fulfillment of his or her purpose and calling. Express the love and character of Christ, the Golden Rule, by the example of a fair and just compensation system. To provide employees with a means to meet basic maintenance needs (food, clothing, shelter, health care, etc.). To recognize and reward competency of performance and character.	To fairly compensate employees for the monetary value of their labor as determined by labor supply and demand and worker human capital attributes (experience, skill level, competency, performance). The key goal is to promote a labor supply and demand balance to avoid labor market distortions, to attract the appropriate quality and quantity of labor given market conditions.	To promote human dignity in a foundational social relationship domain. To provide employees with a means for supporting their basic maintenance needs (food, clothing, shelter, health care, etc.). To recognize and reward competency of performance and character.
Main values emphasized	*Agapao* love expression, promote the well-being of others. Internal and individual equity: pay based on qualifications, merit, and contributions (good and faithful servant). Fairness: honest weights and measures.	Market equity and balance. Employees as instrumental units of production, depersonalizes human being made in the image of God.	Supports self-actualization by meeting higher order needs. Provides for individual growth and development.

Continued

Table 11.1 Continued

Element	Christian Worldview	Market View	Humanistic
Employer obligations	A high level of moral and spiritual accountability for employee treatment: we all must give account to Christ. Provide a just wage to support employee growth and development.	Adhere to market principles and legal guidelines. When reduced to a market "machine" decision-making process, disguises moral and personal accountability.	Provide a just wage to support employee growth and development.
Worker attitudes toward compensation unfairness	Work with excellence even for unjust masters. Attempt to influence employers to develop a just compensation system. Realize fruit of the Spirit character development through enduring trials and tribulations.	Quit and seek new employer if dissatisfied with salary levels, terms and condition of employment, or employee treatment. Seek restitution through the court system for egregious violations.	Seek new employment if dissatisfied with salary levels, terms and condition of employment, or employee treatment. Attempt to negotiate a more equitable compensation system.

given that the supporting team infrastructure does not move with the employee, and the new support system is not as effective (Groysberg, Nanda, & Nohria, 2004).

What is the Christian worldview on compensation? Table 11.1 provides a summary of the major elements. SLHRM emphasizes the intrinsic dignity of the individual and views work as a means for expressing godly love, contributing to the spiritual, physical, and emotional wellbeing and growth of the employee. There is an innate dignity in all honest labor.

Wage System Fairness

A key point is an unswerving commitment to wage system fairness. We are autonomous moral agents who cannot claim that we are labor market technicians locked in a machine-like system. Reducing compensation to a market machine process disguises our moral and personal accountability. Clearly, the Bible presents nonpayment or underpayment of wages as a form of theft, as stated in James 5:4, "Listen! The wages of the laborers who mowed your fields, which you kept back by fraud, cry out, and the cries of the harvesters have reached the ears of the Lord of hosts." From a Christian perspective, we must embrace and promote all forms of compensation equity as noted in the points that follow (Pynes, 2013).

   i. Internal equity: A logical internal hierarchy of job classifications linked to a rational and fair ordering of knowledge, skills, abilities, qualifications, and other human capital characteristics (positions requiring higher skills receive higher compensation).
  ii. External equity: Pay is market competitive.
 iii. Individual or merit equity: Pay levels are fair relative to individual performance and skill level (value added to production and service delivery).
 iv. Employee need equity (Living Wage): Pay a wage that supports human dignity and quality family well-being.

As with other aspects of servant leadership, compensation equity requires an ongoing intentional commitment to paying employees according to their contributions.

Debate Over the Living Wage

One of the most heated compensation debates relates to individual need equity, or the living wage. What are the pro and con arguments?

Figart (2001) provides a very cogent summary. The main argument against the living wage is that it distorts the effective and efficient operation of labor markets. A free labor market entails wages linked to productivity rates, the value labor adds to the production process, worker skill levels, and labor demand. Wage payments above the market equilibrium level distort the relation between the marginal value of labor and aggregate wage levels thereby inflating production costs. The result is lower demand for labor and the substitution of capital for labor attenuating overall job creation and economic growth. The end result is an overall decreased societal standard of living, higher taxation levels to support expensive social safety net programs, lower investment in job-creating industries, an increase in governmental dependency, and reduced individual economic and moral self-sufficiency (Figart, 2001).

In contrast to the conservative economic views, the Catholic Church's teachings on social justice provide a strong moral and conceptual foundation for the living wage (Figart 2001). The Catholic Church is the primary Christian institutional advocate as represented in a more than one-hundred-year tradition of encyclicals on living wage policy (Zigarelli, 1993). Capitalist labor market theory atomizes workers and falsely assumes that promoting the self-interests of individual employers and employees cumulatively is in the best interests of society. This view is a distortion of the communal and social interconnections of labor to the larger health and well-being of the community and society as a whole. Hence, capitalist labor market theory dehumanizes workers and impedes the ability of employees to support their needs in a dignified manner. The capitalist labor market increases wage and income inequities between skilled and unskilled labor, which results in outsourcing of labor, substitution of technology for labor, reduction in living wage jobs for minorities, results in decline of cities, and promotes outsourcing of public sector jobs (Figart, 2001).

We cannot have a just and healthy society with a large segment of the population burdened by preventable poverty. In order to fully understand the debate, one must understand the philosophical basis of the living wage movement. The foundational principle underlying the living wage movement is that dignified human labor is essential for body, mind, and spiritual health (Figart, 2001). The biblical rationale for the living wage is compelling as well. The Old and New Testaments call employers to treat fairly both the poor and the laborer (Deuteronomy 24:15, James 5:4). Jesus commands us to help the poor meet their basic life needs (Matthew 25: 34–26). Treating workers fairly glorifies God and enables these workers to serve the Lord effectively in their own personal life ministries and to raise their families in a fashion that promotes healthy spiritual, physical,

and mental development. Hence, we promote a more just, moral, and prosperous civil society. Social justice theory states that the ultimate goal of the economy is to meet the material needs of employees to support a good and moral life. Hence, employers possess a moral obligation to provide wage rates that help employees meet their basic needs given that the right of private property is subordinate to human needs. If employers are unable to pay a living wage, society should supplement the salaries of workers with a variety of means including the negative income tax, childcare, and food subsidies, among others.

Proponents posit that paying workers a living wage glorifies God and enables workers to more effectively serve the Lord and raise a family thereby promoting a just, moral, and prosperous civil society. Employers who pay less than a living wage receive subsidies through societal cost shifting onto families through working longer hours, the need to work two or more jobs, less time for family needs, poorer quality child rearing, and the associated adverse mental and physical health outcomes with the higher levels of stress (Figart, 2001). Another major source of subsidy is the government through food stamps, welfare, Medicaid, and housing assistance, among other programs. Finally, churches and nonprofit organizations, both faith-based and secular, absorb costs and indirectly subsidize low-wage employers through food banks, housing programs, and other forms of assistance. Living wage supporters in the United States cite decreasing social mobility and increasing income inequality due to the increase in one-parent families (in which the parent is usually a woman), the depreciation of the value of the minimum wage, the reduction in unskilled manufacturing jobs, lack of national health insurance, and the globalization of labor markets as key factor justifications. The substitution of capital for labor, lower levels of construction employment, and international competition and the globalization of markets reduces the pool of living wage jobs, forcing more workers into the service economy (Figart, 2001; Economic Policy Institute, 2011). The result is a dramatic increase in jobs that pay below poverty wages with a concurrent erosion of the quality of life for millions of low-wage and skilled workers and their families. The pernicious combination of lower governmental spending in social services given higher deficits in combination with the increased demands and stagnating revenues of the nonprofit and church sector decrease the effectiveness of the social safety net, increasing poverty rates (Figart, 2001). Hence, these sources of church support are unable to meet the needs of the millions of low-wage workers with its present level of resource support, given that less than 5 percent of Christians tithe and the absence of a skilled labor force of paid and volunteer workers (Barna Group, 2013).

The living wage generates much controversy, with a considerable contention over the specific definition of basic needs. How can we differentiate necessities from, needs, wants, and luxuries? The definition does vary somewhat by culture, but social scientists have developed well-validated measures of life quality, including access to basic health care, adequate nutrition, and safe and affordable housing, among other key areas (Malik, 2013; Gross National Happiness, 2014). How would you view your compensation policy if the prevailing wage were inadequate to rent a basic apartment or provide health care for your family as it is in many developing countries?

From a research standpoint, the literature on the living wage issue has demonstrated little negative impact on employment levels and municipal budgets (Chapman & Thompson, 2006). Another follow-up question relates to the efficiency/effectiveness of labor markets. Clearly, we operate in a hybrid system with significant government regulation, much of it directed at what economists term market failure. A labor market may operate efficiently, but impose significant externalities upon society (low-wage employers receive indirect subsidies given that they fail to provide health benefits). In addition, markets often internalize other forms of inefficiency, including forms of gender discrimination in which predominately female dominated occupations such as personal care–giving receive lower wages than comparable male professions (Pynes, 2013). This is a very complex issue requiring a delicate balance to preserve the powerful positive incentives of free markets while reducing the impact of their imperfections.

Finally, should employers voluntarily provide a higher rate of compensation than the market requires? To be a leader in compensation recognizes the value added by employees. A second important question relates to whether family size or the number of dependents should be a factor in wage levels. Compensating employees at differential wages based on family need raises many issues of internal equity. However, there are no legal prohibitions against considering family need in terms of compensation unless there is an intended or unintended discriminatory impact. We (as a society) must address both individual and systematic factors that contribute to a high degree of stress on our lower income workers. We have micro and macro obligations as Christians.

If the labor market human capital elements do not justify a living wage, I posit that SLHRM organizations make every effort to enhance employee human capital skills and performance either to increase employee productivity to justify higher wage or strive to place the employee with a new employer who can utilize his or her talents and meet living wage requirements after a reasonable term of employment. Even though employers

may realize a loss on their investment in the short term, the cumulative and aggregate benefit of such a practice will be to enhance the reputation of the employer increasing the quality and quantity of the applicant pool to replace those who left.

The focus of the living wage movement is to reduce human suffering and promote the dignity of low-wage earners. Numerous public policy interventions can assist low-wage workers and their families including the earned income tax credit (Hamilton, 2010) and tax credits/subsidies for hiring low-income workers (Hamersma, 2003). Another important area relates to governmental regulation including elevating the minimum wage that has eroded in purchasing power significantly over the last 40 years (Addison, Blackburn, & Cotti, 2013). This area is by definition a political question relating to the balancing of key economic, religious, and social values. Our response, both as an individual employers and a society, are important elements of Christian social responsibility.

In conclusion, this discussion addresses very critical compensation and public policy issues. There are several levels of analysis with the most proximate at the level of the individual SLHRM employer and the balance of stewardship and servanthood values. From a stewardship standpoint, employers should provide a compensation system that is internally equitable in relation to job skill requirements and employee merit performance levels, and concurrently labor market competitive. What occurs if the market equitable wage is below a decent standard of living? Does the employer possess any larger servanthood obligations to address unmet employee needs? Our discussion to date has addressed the pros and cons of including employee need as a factor in individual employer compensation decisions. We miss the larger "lay of the land" if we ignore moral and ethical obligations and the larger market and public policy concerns. This issue will be a matter of ongoing debate.

Elements of Servant Leadership Compensation

Compensation is a foundational element of SLHRM management. Commit to a "best-practice" compensation system that develops employee character and trust. This begins with honest weights and measures as noted in Deuteronomy 25:13–15:

> You shall not have in your bag two kinds of weights, large and small. You shall not have in your house two kinds of measures, large and small. You shall have only a full and honest weight; you shall have only a full and honest measure, so that your days may be long in the land that the LORD your God is giving you.

A foundational best practice principal is to develop a valid and reliable performance measurement and appraisal system with ongoing employee involvement. A valid performance measurement system reduces errors from key sources including contamination (the presence of nonperformance factors such as race bias), deficiency (measures lack key elements of performance such as quality of service) and imbalance or the inappropriate weighting of performance factors (quantity is much higher than quality). Another key balance element is that the system should promote an equilibrium between monetary and nonmonetary rewards and motivators developed with ongoing employee input. Servant leaders encourage and recognize others. A final balance factor it to promote an integrated system of performance measures linked to individual, group, and organizational process (behavior) and outcome metrics.

SLHRM systems embrace employee empowerment in all HR systems. To enhance the fairness and effectiveness of the compensation system, employees should play a major role in developing the compensation system policies, procedures, decision rules, and criteria. This demonstrates trust in employees while enhancing employee acceptance, commitment, and motivational effectiveness. However, given that we live in a broken and sinful world, there is need for additional employee safeguards through a viable and independent appeals procedure. Another key element is to promote transparency of compensation system information and the decision-making process, which facilitates trust and the empowerment process. A final element is a "user-friendly" compensation system that is Web-based and accessible by employees.

Another pillar of the SLHRM compensation system is to recognize and reward employees for character growth and development. Explicitly use the system to promote servant followership and leadership. A case that illustrates the antithesis of the SLHRM approach was that embraced by Sears and illustrated in a Harvard Business Review case study (Paine & Santoro, 2003). This case illustrates many of the key temptations that SLHRM organizations face in serving their clients and members. It is very easy to rationalize and embrace a self-serving and expedient orientation. In this case, Sears instituted a new compensation system that replaced a flat compensation rate for various types of car repairs with a commission system that lowered reimbursement rates per repair or maintenance item. Hence, it generated powerful incentives for unnecessary and inflated car repairs, increasing conflict and stress between service advisors and the mechanics who completed the work. It also reduced employee autonomy and compensation. Sears paid a very high price in loss of customer trust in addition to tempting its employees to violate their obligation to protect

the interests of consumers. Key lessons from the case include (Paine & Santoro, 2003):

- The absence of explicit God-honoring values that promote a covenant-based, long-term relationship among the organization, its employees, and its customers (honesty, high service quality, customer safety, employee well-being) is a recipe for temptation. The crisis revealed the chief executive's instrumental leadership philosophy that selected the expedient path of short-term profits over the welfare of his employees and customers. The case also demonstrated the absence of leadership transparency and accountability given his resistance to voluntarily assuming responsibility for the system's deleterious influence on employees and customers. This contributed to organizational inertia (unwillingness to solve the root problem) and the externalization of blame for the associated ethical and performance problems.
- The absence of employee input in designing the compensation system enhanced employee dissatisfaction (reduced employee acceptance and system fairness perceptions). The end result was an erosion of trust based upon the belief that the company's foundational motive was to increase employee workload and sales volume while reducing employee pay, a classic assembly line "speed-up" scenario. This system demonstrated a dearth of trust in employees.
- The absence of balanced performance measures that reward employees for quality, quantity, timeliness and customer satisfaction. When performance metrics are deficient by failing to measure performance in a balanced fashion, it contributes to dysfunctions such as goal displacement (quantity over quality, accuracy, and honesty) contaminating the entire performance management process. This resulted in the adoption of a quota system that encouraged unnecessary work.
- Generating a conflict of interest between service advisors (volume and profit) and mechanics (quality standards). The motivational forces in the Sears system created incentives that impeded teamwork and honest communication between mechanics and service advisors. In effect, they were working at cross-purposes in terms of promoting quality as both possessed incentives to inflate and exaggerate service problems to increase sales.
- An absence of balanced rewards as the compensation system failed to employ nonmonetary forms of incentives including recognition and award programs. The system embraced a Theory X motivational

philosophy assuming that mechanics possessed little or no desire to achieve higher order needs (growth, recognition, accomplishment). In effect, the system reduced the discretion and autonomy of both service advisors and mechanics eroding the intrinsic motivational potential of their jobs.

- An absence of auditing and quality control procedures to guard against unnecessary service work exacerbated the financial incentives to cheat. In an ideal SLHRM system, employees of character will reject unethical compensation systems given the internal moral compass, but clearly external means for ensuring ethical conduct have their place as well.

This system motivated employees to maximize repair work with no regard for quality or honesty resulting in governmental investigation and adverse company publicity (Paine & Santoro, 2003). Relevant remedial suggestions follow:

1. Emphasize a clear and seamless linkage and value congruence between God-honoring organizational mission and vision values and compensation system motivational approaches in which the focus is on serving the customer while providing fair compensation rates.
2. Develop the compensation system in partnership with the employees.
3. Promote transparency of financial and performance information.
4. Hold employees accountable for ethical conduct (honesty, accuracy, customer service, no overage, staying within estimates).
5. Promote pay equity by instituting a base salary at a market-competitive wage level in order to reduce employee status differences and comparison envy/pride.
6. Embrace generous human capital investment (mechanic certification and cross–training) policies and practices that demonstrate faith and trust in employees.
7. Develop a balanced scorecard set of performance standards (quality, quantity, timeliness, and customer satisfaction) and link them to the compensation system.
8. Create a balanced compensation system that rewards employees at different levels (individual, work group, store, and company) to reinforce the relationship between employee performance and organizational performance. Evaluate and reward only those factors under the employee's control and minimize the "free-rider" syndrome.

9. Institute a profit sharing system at the store and the company level to increase the relationship between employee individual and group effort and performance.

These principles are key elements of a SLHRM compensation systems and overcoming the "knowing" and "doing" gap by identifying and overcoming the obstacles to implementing God-honoring policies.

Sears Case Learning Points

The serious ethical and/or performance problems chronicled in this case placed tremendous pressure on employees and customers. Executives and managers possess a Christian deontological (ethical) obligation to protect employee interests and integrity. When the organization violates its fiduciary obligations, employees must make difficult decisions to address the cognitive and affective ethical dissonance that a guilty conscience creates. Organizational dynamics frequently place significant barriers to a righteous organizational response. A major factor that influences an employee's course of action is the degree of employee loyalty to the organization (see the work of Hirschman, 1970). When loyalty is low, employees are more likely to embrace either active or passive exit. Active exit is leaving the organization, while passive exit entails a "checking-out" at work as the employee psychologically disengages thereby reducing job effort and performing at a minimum level. When loyalty is high, the employee is more likely to attempt voice, or an active process of intervention to change the organization. Employee voice is effective when the following three conditions are present (Hirschman, 1970):

1. There exists an effective means to express employee discontent (union, grievance process, suggestion system, employee surveys, town meetings, receptive managers, etc.).
2. The organization possesses the time and resources to change direction.
3. The organization possesses self-interested reasons (loss of sales, customers, or institutional memory) to take seriously employee attempts at voice and exit.

Organizational loyalty is a function of trust, and reflects a cumulative form of psychic capital. This loyalty can work in both directions regarding ethics. For example, employees may overlook or rationalize away misgivings based upon their confidence in the intentions of the organization (psychological trust). In other words, they are excessively liberal in

giving the organization the benefit of the doubt. For voice to be credible there needs to be a legitimate perceived threat of exit (Hirschman, 1970). When employees possess few employment options, or when employees are readily replaced, voice is muted. The same thing occurs at the customer level if new clients readily replace customers who are dissatisfied and no longer patronize the business.

As Christian SLHRM leaders, it is our God-honoring duty to actively seek employee voice and hold ourselves accountable irrespective of the bargaining power held by employees. The best-practice Christian and secular companies possess many formal and informal policies and practices (360-degree feedback systems, employee empowerment, suggestion systems, among others) to increase employee input in order to promote the organization's long-term well-being and interests. When companies embrace employee voice, a bountiful crop of good will is harvested, thereby enhancing organizational problem solving and learning. Many organizations, unfortunately, are not sincere in their desire to increase employee input. These organizations recognize the utilitarian benefits of embracing employee voice (the letter), but are unwilling to share power when it adversely affects their short-term selfish interests (power, profits, reputation, etc.). These organizations institute what organizational theorists deem pseudo participation, or the conscious intent to manipulate employees by superficially soliciting employee input with no intention of utilizing the information for management decision making. This takes various guises from gathering information through surveys, interview and focus groups, and not providing and acting upon the results to disingenuously commissioning problem-solving teams and never seriously considering the recommendations. The end result is a bitter fruit of employee disillusionment and cynicism that erodes employee trust.

The Sears case reinforced the importance of managerial upward influence. As Christian servant leaders, we are entrusted with our "flock" of employees. Leadership is a great responsibility, and we should not aspire to management positions unless we are willing to make the ultimate sacrifice to protect the health, safety, and well-being of those under our authority. When faced with an unethical management policy that adversely effects the welfare of our employees, we must exercise due diligence by exercising upward voice, implement the necessary management adjustments within our scope of authority to protect our employees, or consider resigning from our position if the organization persists in the egregious management policy despite our protestations.

The Sears case illustrates many of the conundrums of management. How does a company that was a leader in developing management systems to maximize customer satisfaction in its retail division develop a

compensation system that was antithetical to its foundational cultural values and practices? How does an organization diverge from the straight and narrow path and "morph" into a consumer predator? Was Sears' leadership consciously aware of the unethical elements of the plan? What can we learn from the Sears case in terms of how to safeguard the organization's integrity? These issues are clearly critical given the SLHRM leader's obligation to protect the organization's employees from unnecessary temptation and conflicts of interest. Money leads people astray in three major avenues. The first is in traditional materialism. We strive to build the "American Dream" through honest hard work, but end up worshiping wealth. A second path is to use unethical or even criminal means to reduce the pain and avoid the deferred gratification associated with long-term career growth. Another dysfunctional reaction is the entitlement mentality trapping the working poor with an identity of victimization, dependency, and entitlement but immersed within a cognitive dissonance of resentment. All three lead to the idolization of material goods.

There are situations necessitating the encouragement and rewarding of employees for honoring their commitments. The danger occurs when that recognition/award becomes ingrained as an entitlement mentality. Basing obedience on the effects of operant conditioning reduces intrinsic motivation and the associated behavior when the awards cease. For example, rewarding employees for no unscheduled absences is valuable, but only when coupled with a high level of performance. Management must address the cumulative effects of the incentive system and its impact on employee motives. A short-term focus on rewards will provide the appropriate incentives, but management must then engage in the longer term and more challenging task of instilling a servant followership mind set in which employees are committed to excellence as a basic value orientation. Persuading employees to believe that management can be trusted and is concerned for the well-being of employees is a central focus. As Christian servant leaders, we are to protect the less mature Christians and the unbelievers by reducing or eliminating the temptation trigger points to the maximum extent feasible. Using a biblical analogy, a mature Christian knows that meat sacrificed to idols is not cursed, but Paul instructed more mature believers from avoiding eating idol-dedicated food if it would cause others to violate their conscience (see 1 Corinthians 8). Many absence reduction programs include unintended incentives for employees to game the system and misrepresent the reason for missing work to collect the bonus. As such, we are encouraging the less mature and ethical employees to violate their conscience (assuming it is activated in this case). As Christians we grow by both facing and

avoiding temptation, but keep in mind that we were never meant to endure ongoing temptation without respite and relief as our resistance margin is gradually eroded.

In summary, the principles of SLHRM compensation exceed traditional minimum standards of legal compliance and extend to the moral imperatives of a just wage system. We need to be both hearers and doers providing employees with fair and attractive wages that provide for employee needs and ensure high levels of retention and performance.

CHAPTER 12

FINAL REFLECTIONS

The SLHRM organization and leader can never lose sight that the collective policies and practices of human resource management are the product of individual and group decision making. The SLHRM culture rests upon a worldview and the associated attitudes and behaviors that construct the edifice of HR policies and practices. Hence, there is always ethical, moral, and spiritual accountability for our HR systems. No matter how formalized, routinized, and bureaucratized, human free-will decision making is at the heart of ethical and moral accountability. Hence, a SLHRM organization begins and ends with leaders who embrace character growth and integrity through self-knowledge. Growth in SLHRM is a lifelong and intermittently painful, individual and collective growth process. We can all relate to the central role of trial and tribulation in the shaping and restoration of the heart. A mountaintop experience inspires given the breadth and depth of vision, but the close-quarter spiritual warfare combat involved in the Christian maturation process is waged on a daily basis in the dense undergrowth of the spiritual jungle with limited lines of sight. We must rely on the Holy Spirit for direction, strength, and wisdom to resist the hidden dangers of ambush by the idols of this world that seek to rule our hearts. We must resist the root cause of our great enemies of discouragement and despair, as there are specific actions we must undertake while relying on God to do the rest. The development of such a balance is a major challenge of our walk with Christ. When we assume an excessive degree of responsibility for the outcomes related to the HR system, it is a yoke of legalism and works producing an ultimate fruit of bondage and despair. When we fail to pursue the harmonic balance, we shirk our free-will responsibilities and fail to grow in faith. Achieving the harmonic mean is an ongoing life challenge.

Commitment to SLHRM excellence, the need for achievement, and the desire for recognition are all desirable attributes if they are under

the dominion of the Holy Spirit, but cruel taskmasters when the focus is the egocentric promotion of selfish ends. As Christ stated, where our heart is determines what we value, what we serve, and what we treasure (Matthew 6:21). We must ask the painful and profound question, what is our treasure and who are we really serving? The reality is that Christians are no different than others in the sense that we are frequently yoked and chained to secular notions of success that distort our God-given shape, mission, and purpose. For some of us, our work and ministries become idols as we labor for an iconic, self-made, image of God in lieu of the life-giving vine. The result is a form of godliness, the sterile, ritualistic, and legalistic works of the law. No matter how many lists we form, no matter how many figurative sin sacrifices we perform through "checklist Christianity," it will not relieve the ache of the Holy Spirit conviction in our heart. God will foster similar circumstances to repeat this cycle of stress and pain for the rest of our lives in order to foster unconditional surrender. Our life will have that "Groundhog Day" surrealism until we surrender our idols. We serve an infinitely patient loving and forgiving God! Below is a personal reflection on the nature of the struggle.

The SLHRM Prodigal

"After he had washed their feet, had put on his robe, and had returned to the table, he said to them, 'Do you know what I have done to you? You call me Teacher and Lord—and you are right, for that is what I am. So if I, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have set you an example, that you also should do as I have done to you. Very truly, I tell you, servants are not greater than their master, nor are messengers greater than the one who sent them. If you know these things, you are blessed if you do them'" (John 13:12–17).

One of the great paradoxes of the Christian faith is that the foundational principles of SLHRM are simple to grasp and communicate, but extremely challenging to practice. Salvation is freely given to all those who confess Jesus as Lord, but confession is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for achieving the fruit of the Holy Spirit and working out our salvation with fear and trembling. It is relatively easy to become a Christian, but immensely challenging to live as one. We must struggle against three powerful enemies: the inherently self-centered motives of the flesh, the temptations produced by the worldly idols of success and affirmation, and the presence of spiritual evil.

This profound truth reinforces the challenges of SLHRM in the workplace, the path less traveled. SLHRM organizations have the high

privilege and daunting responsibility of instructing employees and other key stakeholders in the character and competency elements of servant leadership. We stress that competence without godly character is a silent colony of termites undermining the pillars of our witness, leading to an inevitable structural collapse. We instruct employees on the twin towers of accountability and encouragement that define Golden Rule love in the workplace. As it states in scripture (Hosea 4:6), "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge." But knowledge alone does not protect us from a gradual erosion of fervor and dedication to serving others.

A SLHRM prodigal is a manager who knows the truth, but has abandoned his or her first love for four major reasons: the path of expediency in realizing the temptations of obtaining worldly riches (power, fame, promotion, recognition, etc.); succumbing to burnout and fatigue from the bone weariness inherent in "well doing" without adequate rest and boundaries; the "fear of man" in which we place the approval of others over God and principle; and the blinding influence of pride that extinguishes the light of humility and transparency. The SLHRM prodigal is in dangerous waters as indicated in John 13:17, as God pours out blessings if we know the truth and embrace it, and conversely, there are higher degrees of punishment if we understand our obligations and choose not to honor them.

How do you know if you are a SLHRM prodigal? One indicator is the disquiet in our souls as our conscience convicts us. Success born of impure motives or means will always leave a sour taste after the initial sweetness of success subsides. Another indicator is the attitudinal, behavioral, and performance feedback received from peer employees and subordinates. When there is a significant discrepancy between words and actions, policy and practice, and a hearing and doing gap, employee engagement, passion, and commitment suffers as trust erodes.

What is the solution when one is lost in the wilderness of the SLHRM prodigal? The first strategy is prevention entailing a ruthless and ongoing commitment to identifying and testing the integrity of our motives and actions. We must identify the root cause of our actions. A journal is an effective means for identifying long-term patterns and changes in our behavior. Second, embrace an ongoing commitment to 360-degree appraisal through an accountability partner and mentor who will speak truth into your life. Finally, embrace subordinate and peer appraisals that provide candid feedback on how others perceive our actions. As was the case with the prodigal son, we all stray from the straight and narrow, but we possess the blessed assurance that if we take one step toward God, He will come running to us!

The goal of this book is to provide reflections and a starting point for ongoing growth in servant leadership in the area of human resources. If we commit to loving our employees as ourselves, we begin with a strong foundation for long-term success. It is my hope that the readers will commit to the paths less traveled and shine brightly in an increasingly dark organizational environment.

REFERENCES

Abu Elanain, H. M. (2014). Leader-member exchange and intent to turnover. *Management Research Review, 37*(2), 110–129.

Addison, J. T., Blackburn, M. L., & Cotti, C. D. (2013). Minimum wage increases in a recessionary environment. *Labour Economics, 23*, 30–39.

Argyris, C. & Schön, D. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Arthur, J. B., & Huntley, C. L. (2005). Ramping up the organizational learning curve: Assessing the impact of deliberate learning on organizational performance under gainsharing. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(6), 1159–1170.

ASTD. (2012, December 6). $156 billion spent on training and development [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.astd.org/Publications/Blogs/ASTD-Blog/2012/12/156-Billion-Spent-on-Training-and-Development.

Ayers, M. (2006). Towards a theology of leadership. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, *1*(1), 3–27.

Babakus, E., Yavas, U., & Ashill, N. J. (2011). Service worker burnout and turnover intentions: Roles of person-job fit, servant leadership, and customer orientation. *Services Marketing Quarterly, 32*(1), 17–31.

Bahreinian, M., Ahi, M., & Soltani, F. (2012). The relationship between personality type and leadership style of managers: A case study. *Mustang Journal of Business and Ethics, 3*, 94–111. Retrieved from http://mustangjournals.com/MJBE/v3_MJBE_2012.pdf

Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management, 31*, 300–326. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1050&context=aglecfacpub

Barna Group (2013, April 12). *American Donor Trends*. Retrieved from https://www.barna.org/barna-update/culture/606-american-donor-trends#.UuggZRBOnIU.

Barsade, S. G., & O'Neill, O. A. (2014). What's love got to do with it? A longitudinal study of the culture of companionate love and employee and client outcomes in the long-term care setting. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*. Retrieved from http://asq.sagepub.com/content/59/4/551.full.pdf+html

Bassi, M., & Fave, A. D. (2012). Optimal experience among teachers: New insights into the work paradox. *The Journal of Psychology, 146*(5), 533–557.

Behling, O. (1998). Employee selection: Will intelligence and conscientiousness do the job? *The Academy of Management Executive, 12*(1), 77–86.

Bekker, C. J. (2006). The Philippians hymn (2:5–11) as an early mimetic Christological model of Christian leadership in Roman Philippi. Servant Leadership Roundtable, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Bekker, C. (2010). A modest history of the concept of service as leadership in four religious traditions. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 55–66). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bernardin, H. J., & Beatty, R. W. (1984). *Performance appraisal: Assessing human behavior at work*. Boston, MA: Kent Publishing Company.

Beugre, C. D., & Baron, R. A. (2001). Perceptions of systemic justice: The effects of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31*(2), 324–339.

Black, G. L. (2010). Correlational analysis of servant leadership and school climate. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry & Practice, 13*(4), 437–466.

Blanchard, K., & Hodges, P. (2005). *Lead like Jesus*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

Bolino, M. C., Kacmar, K. M., Turnley, W. H., & Glistrap, J. B. (2008). A multi-level review of impression management motives and behaviors. *Journal of Management, 34*(6), 1080–1109.

Bolles, R. N. (2013). *What color is your parachute? A practical manual for job-hunters and career-changers*. Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bonacum, L., & Allen, N. (2007, October 10). CCH survey finds most employees call in "sick" for reasons other than illness. [Press release]. *Commerce Clearing House*. Retrieved from http://www.cch.com/press/news/2007/20071010h.asp.

Boone, L. W., & Makhani, S. (2012). Five necessary attitudes of a servant leader. *Review of Business, 33*(1), 83–96.

Borzaga, C., & Tortia, E. (2006). Worker motivations, job satisfaction, and loyalty in public and nonprofit social services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 35*(2), 225–248.

Bowman, J. S. (1999). Performance appraisal: Verisimilitude trumps veracity. *Public Personnel Management*, *28*(4), 557–576.

Boyce, A. S., Ryan, A. M., Imus, A. L., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). "Temporary worker, permanent loser?" A model of the stigmatization of temporary workers, *Journal of Management, 33*(1), 5–29.

Brandes, P., Castro, S. L., James, M. S. L., Martinez, A. D., Matherly, T. A., Ferris, G. R., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2008). The interactive effects of job insecurity and organizational cynicism on work effort following a layoff. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 14*(3), 233–247.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2013, December). *Labor force projections to 2022: The labor force participation rate continues to fall*. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2013/article/labor-force-projections-to-2022-the-labor-force-participation-rate-continues-to-fall.htm.

———. (2014, January 17). *Job openings and labor turnover survey: Highlights*. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/web/jolts/jlt_labstatgraphs.pdf.

———. (2014, January 24). *Union members survey*. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/news.release/union2.nr0.htm.

Burns, J. Z., & Otte, F. L. (1999). Implications of leader-member exchange theory and research for human resource development research. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 10*(3), 225–248.

Cerit, Y. (2009). The effects of servant leadership behaviors of school principals on teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 37*(5), 600–623.

Cha, S. E., & Edmondson, A. C. (2006). When values backfire: Leadership, attribution, and disenchantment in a values-driven organization. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 57–78. Retrieved from http://people.mcgill.ca/files/sandra.cha/When_Values_Backfire.pdf

Chapman, J., & Thompson, J. (2006, February 15). *The economic impact of local minimum wages*. Retrieved from http://www.epi.org/publications/entry/bp170.

Chatbury, A. A., Beaty, D. D., & Kriek, H. S. (2011). Servant leadership, trust and implications for the "Base-of-the-Pyramid" segment in South Africa. *South African Journal of Business Management, 42*(4), 57–61.

Chan, S. H., & Mak, W. (2014). The impact of servant leadership and subordinates' organizational tenure on trust in leader and attitudes. *Personnel Review, 43*(2), 272–287.

Chief Human Resource Office. (2014, January 24). *Performance management. Just cause standards for represented employees*. Retrieved from http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/CHRO/pages/manual/perf/disciplinary_standards.aspx.

Choudhary, A., Akhtar, S., & Zaheer, A. (2013). Impact of transformational and servant leadership on organizational performance: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics, 116*(2), 433–440.

Chung, J. Y., Jung, C. S., Kyle, G. T., & Petrick, J. F. (2010). Servant leadership and procedural justice in the U.S. national park service: The antecedents of job satisfaction. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration, 28*(3), 1–15.

Cocker, F., M., A., & Sanderson, K. (2012). Managerial understanding of presenteeism and its economic impact. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management, 5*(2), 76–87.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great*. New York: Harper Collins.

Cordeiro, W. (2009). *Leading on empty*. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House.

Covey, S., Merrill, A. R., Merrill, R. R. (1994). *First things first: To live, to love, to learn, to leave a legacy*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Cropanzano, R., Byrne, S., Bobocel, D. R., & Rupp, D. E. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*(2), 164–209.

Dalton, D. R., & Metzger, M. B. (1993). "Integrity testing" for personnel selection: An unsparing perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 12*(2), 147–156.

D'Arcy, J. (2012, February 1). A homemaker's real salary. *Washington Post* [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs /on-parenting/post/a-homemakers-real-salary/2012/02/01/gIQAh7czhQ_blog .html#pagebreak.

De Cremer, D., Brockner, J., Fishman, A., van Dijke, M., van Olffen, W., & Mayer, D. M. (2010). When do procedural fairness and outcome fairness interact to influence employees' work attitudes and behaviors? The moderating effect of uncertainty. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(2), 291–304.

De Meuse, K. P., Bergmann, T. J., Vanderheiden, P. A., & Roraff, C. E. (2004). New evidence regarding organizational downsizing and a firm's financial performance: A long-term analysis. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 16*(2), 155–177.

de Waal, A., & Sivro, M. (2012). The relation between servant leadership, organizational performance, and the high-performance organization framework. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 19*(2), 173–190.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.* New York: Plenum Press.

Deckop, J. R. (1995). Pay system effects on altruism motivation. *Academy of Management Proceedings August 1995,* 359–363. Retrieved from http:// proceedings.aom.org/content/1995/1/359.full.pdf+html

Deckop, J. R., & Cirka, C. C. (2000). The risk and reward of a double-edged sword: Effects of a merit pay program on intrinsic motivation. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 29*(3), 400–418.

De Clercq, D., Bouckenooghe, D., Raja, U., & Matsyborska, G. (2014). Servant leadership and work engagement: The contingency effects of leader-follower social capital. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *25*(2), 183–212.

Deming, W. Edwards (1986). *Out of the Crisis.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 26*(8), 600–615.

Digeorgio, R. (2004). Winning with your strengths: An interview with Ken Tucker of the Gallop Organization. *Journal of Change Management*, *4*(1), 75–81.

Ding, D., Lu, H., Song, Y., & Lu, Q. (2012). Relationship of servant leadership and employee loyalty: The mediating role of employee satisfaction. *I-Business, 4*(3), 208–215.

Drucker, P. F. (2006). *Managing the nonprofit organization.* New York: Harper Collins.

Ebener, D. R., & O'Connell, D. J. (2010). How might servant leadership work? *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 20*(3), 315–335.

Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 57*(1), 61–94.

Elise, J. C., & Kolenikov, S. (2014). Flexible work options and mothers' perception of career harm. *Sociological Quarterly, 55*(1), 168–195.

Engstrom, T. (1976). *The making of a Christian leader: How to develop management and human relations skills.* Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan.

Farling, M. L., Stone, A. J., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 6*(1/2), 49–72.

FedEx. (2013, January 23). *FedEx attributes success to people-first philosophy.* Retrieved from http://www.fedex.com/ma/about/overview/philosophy.html.

Feldman, J. M. (1981). Beyond attribution theory: Cognitive processes in performance appraisal. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 66*(2), 127–148.

Ferch, S. R. (2010). Consciousness, forgiveness and gratitude. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 77–89). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Figart, D. M. (2001). Ethical foundations of the contemporary living wage movement. *International Journal of Social Economics, 28*(10–12), 800–814.

Fiscal Policy Institute (2011, May 5). *Top ten reasons a living wage makes sense in New York City.* Retrieved from http://fiscalpolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/TopTenReasonsALivingWageMakesSenseForNYC_20110505.pdf.

Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (1991). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in.* New York: Penguin Books.

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Fried, Y. & Ferris, G. (1987). The validity of the job characteristics model: A review and meta- analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 40*(2), 287–322.

Gallup (2013, October 8). *Worldwide 13% of employees are engaged at work.* Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/165269/worldwide-employees-engaged-work.aspx.

Garber, J. S., Madigan, E. A., Click, E. R., & Fitzpatrick, J. J. (2009). Attitudes towards collaboration and servant leadership among nurses, physicians and residents. *Journal of Interprofessional Care, 23*(4), 331–340.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantam.

Golonka, S., & Matus-Grossman (2001, May). *Opening doors: expanding educational opportunities for low-income workers.* MDRC. Retrieved from http://www.mdrc.org/publication/opening-doors-expanding-educational-opportunities-low-income-workers.

Graham, J. W. (1991). Servant leadership in organizations: Inspirational and moral. *Leadership Quarterly, 2*(2), 105–119.

Green, D. & Roberts, G. (2010). Personnel implications of public sector virtual organizations. *Public Personnel Management, 39(1)*, 47–57.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness.* New York: Paulist Press.

Gray, B., & Kriger, M. P. (2005). Leadership lessons and indications from the Buddhist tradition for creating adaptive organizations. Symposium Paper presented at the 2005 Annual Meetings of the National Academy of Management, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly, 13*(4), 423–452.

Gross National Happiness (2014, January 28). *Gross national happiness.* Retrieved from http://www.grossnationalhappiness.com/.

Gross-Schaefer, A., Trigilio, J., Negus, J., & Ro, C. (2000). Ethics education in the workplace: An effective tool to combat employee theft. *Journal of Business Ethics, 26*(2), 89–100.

Groysberg, B., Nanda, A., & Nohria, N. (2004). *The risky business of hiring stars. Harvard Business Review, 82*(5), 92–100.

Güçel, C., & Begec, S. (2012). The effect of the servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior: Case study of a university. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*, *4*(1), 107–116.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*(2), 250–279.

Halawi, L. A., Pires, S., & McCarthy, R. V. (2009). An evaluation of E-learning on the basis of bloom's taxonomy: An exploratory study. *Journal of Education for Business, 84*(6), 374–380.

Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership, 3*(4), 397–417.

Hamersma, S. (2003). The work opportunity and welfare-to-work tax credits: Participation rates among eligible workers. *National Tax Journal, 56*(4), 725–738.

Hamilton, F., & Bean, C. J. (2005). The importance of context, beliefs and values in leadership development. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 14*(4), 336–347.

Hamilton, J. H. (2010). Optimal tax theory: The journey from the negative income tax to the earned income tax credit. *Southern Economic Journal, 76*(4), 860–877.

Han, Y., Kakabadse, N. K., & Kakabadse, A. (2010). Servant leadership in the People's Republic of China: A case study of the public sector. *Journal of Management Development, 29*(3), 265–281.

Handlin, H. C. (1992). The company built upon the golden rule: Lincoln electric. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 12*(1), 151–163.

Hellgren, J., Sverke, M. & Isaksson, K. (1999). A two-dimensional approach to job insecurity: Consequences for employee attitudes and wellbeing. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*(2), 179–195.

Herbst, M. (2007, September 14). The Elite Circle of $1 CEOs. *Bloomberg Businessweek.* Retrieved from http://www.businessweek.com/stories/2007 –09–14/the-elite-circle-of-1-ceosbusinessweek-business-news-stock-market -and-financial-advice.

Herman, R. (2008). Servant leadership: A model for organizations desiring a workplace spirituality culture (Doctoral dissertation). Capella University. Retrieved from ProQuest. (3329873), http://gradworks.umi.com/33/29 /3329873.html

Hicks, D. A. (2003). *Religion and the workplace: Pluralism, spirituality, leadership.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hillman, O. (2000, July 6). Our work versus our value [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.intheworkplace.com/apps/articles/default.asp? articleid=72527&columnid=65 25.

Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice and loyalty.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hodgkinson, G. P. (2003). The interface of cognitive and industrial, work and organizational psychology. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76*(1), 1–26.

Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2011). Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: An examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(4), 851–862.

Hu, W. (2010, May 19). Teachers facing weakest market in years. *New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/20/nyregion/20teachers.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.

Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Perry, S. J., Witt, L. A., Penney, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013). Servant leaders inspire servant followers: Antecedents and outcomes for employees and the organization. *Leadership Quarterly, 24*(2), 316–331.

Ibarra, H., Carter, N. M., Silva, C. (2010, September). *Why men still get more promotions than women.* Retrieved from http://hbr.org/2010/09/why-men-still-get-more-promotions-than- women/ar/1.

Ilgen, D. R., Fisher, C. D., & Taylor, M. S. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64*(4), 349–371.

Irving, J. A. (2010). Cross-cultural perspectives on servant leadership. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership. Developments in theory and research* (pp. 118–129). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Irving, J. A., & Longbotham, G. J. (2007). Team effectiveness and six essential servant leadership themes: A regression model based on items in the organizational leadership assessment. *International Journal of Leadership Studies, 2*(2), 98–113.

Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (2006). *Managing human resources through strategic partnerships* (9th ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.

Jain, S., & Nair, S. (2013). Research on work–family balance: A review. *Business Perspectives & Research, 2*(1), 43–58.

Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009a). Examining the impact of servant leadership on sales force performance. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 29(*3), 257–275.

———. (2009b). Examining the impact of servant leadership on salesperson's turnover intention. *The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 29*(4), 351–365.

Jenkins, M., & Stewart, A. C. (2010). The importance of a servant leader orientation. *Health Care Management Review, 35*(1), 46–54.

Jex, S. M. (1998). *Stress and job performance: Theory, research and implications for managerial practices.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Jones, D. (2012a). Does servant leadership lead to greater customer focus and employee satisfaction? *Business Studies Journal, 4*(2), 21–35.

———. (2012b). Servant leadership's impact on profit, employee satisfaction, and empowerment within the framework of a participative culture in business. *Business Studies Journal, 4*(1), 35–49.

Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2005). A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust, and organizational trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 26*(1), 6–22.

Jungins, K., & Wiggins, M. E. (2011). Family-friendly human resource policy: Is it still working in the public sector? *Public Administration Review, 71*(5), 728–739.

Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, S. J., & Wright, P. M. (2009). Subordinate reactions to the use of impression management tactics and feedback by the supervisor. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 8*(1), 35–53.

Kanter, R. M. (1979). Power failure in management circuits. *Harvard Business Review, 57*(4), 65–75.

Kanungo, R. N., & Mendonca, M. (1994). What leaders cannot do without: The spiritual dimensions of leadership. In J. A. Conger (Ed.), *In spirit at work: Discovering the spirituality in leadership* (pp. 162–198). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Keeling, K. A., McGoldrick, P. J., & Sadhu, H. (2013). Staff word-of-mouth (SWOM) and retail employee recruitment. *Journal of Retailing, 89*(1), 88–104.

Kool, M., & van Dierendonck, D. (2012). Servant leadership and commitment to change, the mediating role of justice and optimism. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 25*(3), 422–433.

Kriger, M., & Seng, Y. (2005). Leadership with inner meaning: A contingency theory of leadership based on the worldview of five religions. *Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 771–806.

Lakshman, C. (2008). Attributional theory of leadership: A model of functional attributions and behaviors. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 29*(4), 317–339.

Laub, J. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the Servant Organizational Leadership (SOLA) instrument. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60*(2), 308 (UMI No. 9921922).

———. (2005). From paternalism to the servant organization: Expanding the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) model. *International Journal of Servant Leadership, 1*(1), 155–186.

———. (2010). The servant organization. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 105–117). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lefkowitz, J. (2000). The role of interpersonal affective regard in supervisory performance ratings: A literature review and proposed causal model. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73(1)*, 67–85.

Leung, R. (2003, July 3). The Mensch of Malden Mills. CEO Aaron Feuerstein puts employees first. *60 Minutes*. Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/news/the- mensch–of–malden–mills/.

Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Hu, J., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership: Antecedents, consequences and contextual moderators. In D. V. Day (Ed.) *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations* (pp. 357–379). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly, 19*(2), 161–177.

Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Long-Zeng, W., Eliza Ching-Yick, T., Pingping, F., Ho Kwong, K., & and Jun, L. (2013). The impact of servant leadership on hotel employees' "servant behavior." *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 54*(4), 383–395.

Luthans, F., & Peterson, S. J. (2002). Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy: Implications for managerial effectiveness and development. *The Journal of Management Development, 21*(5), 376–387.

Lydon, R., & Walker, I. (2005). Welfare to work, wages and wage growth. *Fiscal Studies, 26*(3), 335–370.

Macdonald, J, & Beck-Dudley, C. (1994). Are deontology and teleology mutually exclusive? *Journal of Business Ethics, 13*(8), 615–623.

Maier, N. R. F. (1958). *The appraisal interview: Objective methods and skills*. London: Wiley.

Malik, K. (2013). *Human development report 2013*. United Nations Development Programme. Retrieved from http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/14/hdr2013_en_complete.pdf.

Marchand, A., & Blanc, M. (2011). Occupation, work organisation conditions and the development of chronic psychological distress. *Work, 40*(4), 425–435.

Markova, G., & Ford, C. (2011). Is money the panacea? Rewards for knowledge workers. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 60*(8), 813–823.

Mayer, D. M. (2010). Servant leadership and follower need satisfaction. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 147–154). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mayer, D. M., Bardes, M., & Piccolo, R. F. (2008). Do servant-leaders help satisfy follower needs? An organizational justice perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 17*(2), 180–197.

McCuddy, M. K., & Cavin, M. C. (2008). Fundamental moral orientations, servant leadership, and leadership effectiveness: An empirical test. *Review of Business Research, 8*(4), 107–117.

McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Research notes: Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*(3), 626–637.

McGee-Cooper, A., & Trammell, D. (2010). Servant leadership learning communities: Incubators for great places to work. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 130–144). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGrawHill.

Meade, A. (2014, March). How to study a Bible passage. Sermon presented at Vineyard Community Church, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Melchar, D. E., & Bosco, S. M. (2010). Achieving high organization performance through servant leadership. *Journal of Business Inquiry: Research, Education & Application, 9*(1), 74–88.

Mehta, S., & Pillay, R. (2011). Revisiting servant leadership: An empirical study in Indian context. *Journal of Contemporary Management Research, 5*(2), 24–41.

Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Henderson, D. (2008). Is servant leadership always a good thing? The moderating influence of servant leadership prototype [Presentation]. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management. San Antonio, TX.

Meyer, H. H. (1980). Self-appraisal of job performance. *Personnel Psychology, 33*(2), 291–295.

Mittal, R., & Dorfman, P. W. (2012). Servant leadership across cultures. *Journal of World Business, 47*(4), 555–570.

Morgan, T. (2006, August 10). Leadership summit: Andy Stanley. Message posted to http://tonymorganlive.com/2006/08/10/leadership-summit-andy -stanley/.

Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. (1995). *Performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2008). Regulatory focus as a mediator of the influence of initiating structure and servant leadership on employee behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(6), 1220–1233.

Ng, K. Y., & Koh, C., S.-K (2010). Motivation to serve: Understanding the heart of the servant-leader and servant leadership behaviors. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 90–104). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Nutt, P. C, & Backoff, R. W. (1995). *Strategic management of public and third sector organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

O'Boyle, E. H., Jr., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver, T. H., & Story, P. A. (2011). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*(5), 788–818.

Obukhova, E., & Lan, G. (2013). Do job seekers benefit from contacts? A direct test with contemporaneous searches. *Management Science, 59*(10), 2204–2216.

O'Halloran, P. L. (2012). Performance pay and employee turnover. *Journal of Economic Studies, 39*(6), 653–674.

O'Reilly, C. A. III., & Pfeffer, J. (2000). *Hidden value: How great companies achieve extraordinary results with ordinary people*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Ortberg, J. (2002). *The life you've always wanted*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Paine, L. S., & Santoro, M. (2003). Sears auto centers. *Harvard Business School Case. 394–009* Boston, MA: Harvard Busines Publishing.

Parris, D. L, & Peachy, J. W. (2012). Building a legacy of volunteers through servant leadership: A cause-related sporting event. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 23*(2), 259–276.

———. (2013). A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics, 113*(3), 377–393.

Patterson, K. (2003). Servant leadership: A theoretical model. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(2), 570 (UMI No. 3082719).

———. (2010). Servant leadership and love. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 67–76). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pekerti, A. A., & Sendjaya, S. S. (2010). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: Comparative study in Australia and Indonesia. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21*(5), 754–780.

Peterson, D. C. (2001). Muhammad. In D. N. Freedman and M. J. McClymond (Eds.), *The Rivers of Paradise: Moses, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus and Muhammad as Religious Founders* (pp. 457–612). Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans.

Peterson, S. J., Galvin, B. M., & Lange, D. (2012). CEO servant leadership: Exploring executive characteristics and firm performance. *Personnel Psychology, 65*(3), 565–596.

Poon, J. M. L. (2004). Effects of performance appraisal politics on job satisfaction and turnover I ntention. *Personnel Review*, 33(3), 322–324.

Prosser, S. (2010). Opportunities and tensions of servant leadership. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 25–38). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Prottas, D. J. (2013). Relationships among employee perception of their manager's behavioral integrity, moral distress, and employee attitudes and well-being. *Journal of Business Ethics, 113*(1), 5–60.

Pynes, J. E. (2013). *Human resource management for public and nonprofit organizations* (6th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Raines, R. (2012, March 29). Companies that invest in employee education reap multiple benefits. *ajc.com*. Retrieved from http://www.ajc.com /news/business/companies-that-invest-in-employee-education-reap-m /nQSd4/.

Rao, A., Schmidt, S. M., & Murray, L. H. (1995). Upward impression management: Goals, influence, strategies, and consequences. *Human Relations, 48*(2), 147–167.

Reed, L. L., Vidaver-Cohen, D., & Colwell, S. R. (2011). A new scale to measure executive servant leadership: Development, analysis and implications for research. *Journal of Business Ethics, 101*, 415–434.

Regent University Center for Entrepreneurship (2014). Retrieved from http:// www.regententrepreneur.org/.

Reichers, A. E., Wanous, J. P., & Austin, J. T. (1997). Understanding and managing cynicism about organizational change. *The Academy of Management Executive, 11*(1), 48–59.

Reinke, S. J. (2004). Service before self: Towards a theory of servant-leadership. *Global Virtue Ethics Review, 5*(3), 30–57.

Rezaei, M., Salehi, S., Shafiei, M., & Sabet, S. (2011). Servant leadership and organizational trust: The mediating effect of the leader trust and organizational communication. *EMAJ: Emerging Markets Journal, 1*(1), 70–78.

Rivkin, W., Diestel, S., & Schmidt, K. (2014). The positive relationship between servant leadership and employees' psychological health: A multi-method approach. *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung* [*German Journal of Research in Human Resource Management*], *28*(1/2), 52–72.

Roberts, G. E. (2010). A guide to practical human resource management research. In S. Condrey (Ed.), *Handbook of Practical Human Resources Management* (3rd ed.), (pp. 735–768). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Roberts, G. & Hess-Hernandez, D. (2012/2013). Religious commitment and servant leadership The development of an exploratory conceptual framework. *International Journal of Servant Leadership, 8/9*(1), 299–330.

Roberts, G. E. & Pavlak, T. P. (1996). Municipal government personnel professionals and performance appraisal: Is there a consensus on the characteristics of an effective appraisal system? *Public Personnel Management, 25*(3), 379–408.

Rubin, B., & Rubin, R. (2006). Labor-management relations: Conditions for collaboration. *Public Personnel Management, 35*(4), 283–298.

———. (2007). Service contracting and labor-management partnerships: Transforming the public sector. *Public Administration Quarterly, 31*(2), 192–217.

Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K., & Peng, A. C. (2011). Cognition-based and affect-based trust as mediators of leader behavior influences on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(4), 863.

Schawbel, D. (2014, March 5). Douglas Stone: The importance of feedback in business communications [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/sites/danschawbel/2014/03/05/douglas-stone-the-importance-of-feedback-in-business-communications/.

Schneider, S. K., & George, W. M. (2011). Servant leadership versus transformational leadership in voluntary service organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 32*(1), 60–77.

Searle, T. P., & Barbuto, John, E. (2011). Servant leadership, hope, and organizational virtuouness: A framework exploring positive micro and macro behaviors and performance impact. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 18*(1), 107–117.

Sendjaya, S. (2010). Demystifying servant leadership. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 39–51). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sendjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010). Servant leadership as antecedent of trust in organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 31*(7), 643–663.

Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies, 45*(2), 402–424.

Sherman, D., & Hendricks, W. (1987). *Your work matters to God*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.

Showkeir, J. D. (2002). The business case for servant leadership. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership* (pp. 153–156). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(3), 434–443.

Snell, S., & Bohlander, G. (2013). *Managing human resources* (16th ed.). Mason, OH: Southwestern.

Spears, L. (1998). *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant leadership.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Stewart, S. M., Gruys, M. L., & Storm, M. (2010). Forced distribution performance evaluation systems: Advantages, disadvantages and keys to implementation. *Journal of Management and Organization, 16*(1), 168–179.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and practice.* New York: Free Press.

Stone, D., & Heen, S. (2014). *Thanks for the feedback: The science and art of receiving feedback well.* New York: Viking.

Sturm, B. A. (2009). Principles of servant-leadership in community health nursing: Management issues and behaviors discovered in ethnographic research. *Home Health Care Management & Practice, 21*(2), 82–89.

Sun, P. T. (2013). The servant identity: Influences on the cognition and behavior of servant leaders. *Leadership Quarterly, 24*(4), 544–557.

Swenson, R. (2004). *Margin: Restoring emotional, physical, financial, and time reserves to overloaded lives.* Colorado Springs, CO: Navpress Publishing Group.

Taggar, S., & Neubert, M. (2004). The impact of poor performers on team outcomes: An empirical examination of attribution theory. *Personnel Psychology, 57*(4), 935–968. Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.library.regent.edu/docview/220141766?accountid=13479

Takamine, K. S. (2002). *Servant-leadership role in the real world: Re-discovering our humanity* in the workplace. Frederick, MD: PublishAmerica.

Tan, K., & Newman, E. (2013). The evaluation of sales force training in retail organizations: A test of Kirkpatrick's four-level model. *International Journal of Management, 30*(2), 692–703.

Taylor, T., Martin, B. N., Hutchinson, S., & Jinks, M. (2007). Examination of leadership practices of principals identified as servant leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 10*(4), 401–419.

Tolar, M. H. (2012). Mentoring experiences of high-achieving women. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 14*(2), 172–187.

Tsui, A. S., Pearce, J. L., Porter, L. W., & Tripoli, A. M. (1997). Alternative approaches to the employee-organization relationship: Does investment in employees pay off? *Academy of Management Journal, 40*(5), 1089–1121.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science, 198*, 1124–1131.

Uru Sani, F. O., Caliskan, S. C., Atan, O, & Yozgat, U. (2013). A comprehensive research about academician's servant leadership style and its consequences. *Ege Academic Review, 13*(1), 63–82.

van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management, 37*(4), 1288–1261.

van Dierendonck, D., & Jacobs, G. (2012). Survivors and victims: A meta-analytical review of fairness and organizational commitment after downsizing. *British Journal of Management, 23*(1), 96–109.

van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business & Psychology, 26*(3), 249–267.

van Dierendonck, D., & Rook. L. (2010). Enhancing innovation and creativity through servant leadership. In D. van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 155–165). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

van Dierendonck, D., Stam, D., Boersma, P., de Windt, N., & Alkema, J. (2014). Same difference? Exploring the differential mechanisms linking servant leadership and transformational leadership to follower outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(3), 544–562.

Varma, A., Pichler, S., & Srinivas, E. S. (2005). The role of interpersonal affect in performance appraisal: Evidence from two samples—the US and India. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*(11), 2029–2044.

Vondey, M. (2010). The relationships among servant leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, person-organization fit, and organizational identification. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *6*(1), 3–27.

Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(3), 517–529.

Washington, R., Sutton, C., & Feild, H. (2006). Individual differences in servant leadership: The roles of values and personality. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 27*(8), 700–716.

Wells, B. (2002). *Which way to clergy health?* Retrieved from http://www.faithand leadership.com/programs/spe/resources/dukediv–clergyhealth.html

Widén-Wulff, G., & Suomi, R. (2007). Utilization of information resources for business success: The knowledge sharing model. *Information Resources Management Journal, 20*(1), 46–67.

Wilkes, C. G. (2008). *Jesus on leadership: The man with the miracle touch*. Nashville, TN: Lifeway Press.

Wilson, K. Y., & Jones, R. G. (2008). Reducing job–irrelevant bias in performance appraisals: Compliance and beyond. *Journal of General Management, 34*(2), 57.

Winston, B. (2002). *Be a leader for God's sake*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University-School of Leadership Studies.

Wong, P. T. P., & Davey, D. (2007). Best practices in servant leadership [Presentation]. Paper presented at the Servant Leadership Roundtable, Regent University. Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Wong, P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003). An opponent-process model and the revised servant leadership profile [Presentation]. Paper presented at the Servant Leader Research Roundtable, Regent University. Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Wu, L., Tse, E. C., Fu, P., Kwan, H. K., & Liu, J. (2013). The impact of servant leadership on hotel employees' "servant behavior." *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, *54*(4), 383–395.

Yoshida, D. T., Sendjaya, S., Hirst, G., & Cooper, B. (2014). Does servant leadership foster creativity and innovation? A multi-level mediation study of identification and prototypicality. *Journal of Business Research*, *67*(7), 1395–1404.

Zainaldin, J. S. (2004, July 27). Eastern air lines. *New Georgia Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/business-economy/eastern-air-lines.

Zapalska, A., & Brozik, D. (2006). Learning styles and online education. *Campus-Wide Information Systems, 23*(5), 325–335.

Zhang, H., Kwan, H. K., Everett, A. M., & Jian, Z. (2012). Servant leadership, organizational identification, and work-to-family enrichment: The moderating role of work climate for sharing family concerns. *Human Resource Management, 51*(5), 747–767.

Zehiri, C., Akyuz, B., Erin, M. S., Turhan, G. (2013). The indirect effects of servant leadership behavior on organizational citizenship behavior and job performance: Organizational justice as a mediator. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, *2*(3), 2147–4478.

Zenger, Z., & Folkman, J. (2013, March 15). *The ideal praise-to-criticism ratio* [Web log Post]. Retrieved from: http://blogs.hbr.org/2013/03/the-ideal-praise-to-criticism/

Zigarelli, M. (2003). A Christian approach to firing people. *Regent Business Review*, Issue *8(November/December)*, 4–9.

———. (1993). Catholic social teaching and the employment relationship: A model for managing human resources in accordance with Vatican doctrine. *Journal of Business Ethics, 12*(1), 75–82.

Zottoli, M. A., & Wanous, J. P. (2000). Recruitment source research: Current status and future directions. *Human Resource Management Review, 10*(4), 353–382.

INDEX