WHEN SERVANT LEADERSHIP FAILS:
THE IMPORTANCE OF ALIGNING VALUES

Nathan Mizzell

Russell L. Huizing

Since Servant Leadership has become a popular leadership theory, consideration of when this style does not seem to attain its anticipated outcomes is important to deliberate. The paper uses intertexture exegetical analysis of Mark 10:17-31 to examine why the rich young ruler failed to respond to Jesus' appeal to sell all of his property, to give to the poor, and to come and follow Him. The research suggests that values must be aligned before servant leadership will be effective. Value alignment and communication are considered as possible next steps in the development of servant leadership.

I. INTRODUCTION

As we begin to approach the 50th anniversary of Greenleaf's introduction of the servant as leader, consideration of its impact is truly remarkable. The theory assisted in developing a more balanced view of both leadership and followership, creating a disruptive innovation in the field of leadership studies. It has been embraced in many cultural contexts around the globe. In many religious circles, it has become one of the champion leadership approaches. Particularly in Christian circles, the theory has been adopted as a model of Jesus' own leadership style. However, irrespective of contextual factors, anyone who has attempted to employ the theory as a primary style of leadership has found that at times, it simply does not accomplish all that it promises. What has happened when servant leadership fails? What might be some of the factors

that cause this failure? To assist with answering these questions, we will turn to the Gospel of Mark, which contains an example of servant leadership displayed by Jesus that did not accomplish its intended outcomes

While the Gospel of Mark is the second book in the New Testament, theologians and scholars herald it as the first written account of Jesus' life (deSilva, 2004). According to de Villiers (2016), historical scholars have documented that Mark's gospel predates Matthew, Luke, and John. It further appears to accurately depict the contextual experiences of that day (de Villiers). While holiness is the dynamic and ever eclipsing theme of the gospel of Mark (de Villiers), the account has also been shown to focus on the humanity of Christ (Duvall & Hays, 2012). Given the emphasis on deity in other New Testament writings, there is an implicit servant theme throughout the book of Mark. It is with this theme in mind that this paper will first exegete the pericope of Mark 10:17-31 using the socio-rhetorical criticism tool of intertextual analysis (Robbins, 1996). The paper will then use the textual analysis to critique and enhance servant leadership as a contemporary leadership theory, based on the leadership characteristics, qualities, and behavior exhibited by Jesus Christ in the story of the rich young ruler.

II. UNDERSTANDING WHAT MARK WAS SAYING

For the contemporary reader to understand the embedded principles within an ancient text, one must discover the meaning of sentences, paragraphs, and discourses. Social-rhetorical criticism (SRC) is one method of ascertaining a proper interpretation and understanding of scripture. SRC is a hermeneutical approach to analyzing and interpreting the world in which the biblical writer lived and the contemporary world by comparing and contrasting values, convictions, and beliefs inside the sentences, paragraphs, and discourses (Robbins, 1996).

Intertexture analysis is one of several exegetical procedures that guide the exegete in analyzing and interpreting the Bible from a socio-rhetorical perspective. According to Robbins (1996), the process of intertextual analysis entails examining the world outside the text to interact with the historical events, customs, values, roles, institutions, and systems to gain contextual perspective. Baron (2011) suggested that by being attentive to not only what is occurring within the text but being sensitive to what has been imported into and echoes from other resources adds intriguing dimensions to analysis. The four components of intertextual analysis are oral-scribal intertexture, cultural intertexture, historical intertexture, and social intertexture (Robbins). Oral-scribal considers the configuration or reconfiguration of language from other texts, cultural intertexture contemplates the text relative to cultural elements surrounding the text, social intertexture cogitates commonly held social norms and practices at the location of the text, and historical intertexture is concerned with events at the location and time of the writing (Robbins). This paper will first summarize Mark 10:17-31, followed by an analysis of the text using the oral-scribal, cultural, and social intertexture components to determine if and how the various intertextures apply to the story of the rich young ruler. Historical intertexture will not be considered, as it specifically relates to events that have taken place at specific times and locations (Robbins). Historical intertexture is commonly fused with social and cultural phenomena in error, making it difficult to distinguish historical events from cultural norms and social knowledge (Gowler, 2010).

Furthermore, no specific historical events occur or are referenced at the time and location in the pericope of the rich young ruler.

According to de Villiers (2016), Mark's gospel is a valuable resource for evaluating holiness from the perspective of spirituality in the lives and experiences of New Testament Christians. Mark's gospel draws off the standard of holiness that existed in Israel and presents Jesus as holy while He often went about healing impure people during His earthly ministry (de Villiers). The Gospel of Mark conveys an explicit Christology that presents Jesus as Messiah, Divine Son, and Son of Man revealed on the surface of the text (Geddert, 2015). However, Mark also contains a hidden implicit Christology below the surface of the text only exposed to contemporary readers willing to dig deep and follow the intertextual clues to connect the dots (Geddert). According to Neyrey (1986), Mark's gospel contextually reflects a code of holiness that existed for centuries in Israel. The holiness code provided comprehensive terms and conditions for all activities within Israel's culture and society, including marriage, social contact with others, and membership of the people (de Villiers). To this end, Mark's gospel presents new ways of reflecting upon and understanding the standard of holiness that would come to establish the precedent for Christianity (Donohue, 2006).

Voices from the Past

A writing which references information from a source outside of itself for support constitutes oral-scribal intertexture (Komalesha, 2014). According to Robbins (1996), these sources can include inscription, poetry, non-canonical apocalyptic material, or the Hebrew scriptures. Recitation, recontextualization, reconfiguration, narrative amplification, and thematic elaboration are examples of ways that language within a text can use language from another source (Robbins). Recitation is an exact quote, recontextualization does not identify where the words came from, reconfiguration makes the later occurrence new in relation to the former event, narrative amplification contains elements of recitation, recontextualization, and reconfiguration, and thematic elaboration creates a thesis and progressively supports or argues the thesis (Robbins).

There are several instances of oral-scribal intertexture in the story of the rich young ruler. In v. 17 the man's request for eternal life inheritance suggests that he was aware of the concept of eternity (Blight, 2014). Barker (2001) asserted that writings dating back to the fifth century BCE introduced the subject of time and eternity. Specific references to eternal life appear in Gen 5:24, Ps 49:9, 73:24, Is 26:16, and Dan 12:1-3. Verse 17 is an example of thematic elaboration, as it presents a theme that emerges into a thesis based on an idea at the beginning of a unit that unfolds as a progressive argument that Jesus defended throughout the discourse (Robbins, 1996). The dialogue between Jesus and the rich man, and then Jesus and His disciples touched on the themes of salvation, the role of keeping the law, and the possibility of wealth becoming a false god (Geddert, 2015). Since salvation was expected to be displayed through the blessings of God for those who kept the Law (Dt 28:1-14), all three of these themes were intertwined in the minds of both the young man and the disciples. Hellerman (2000) further indicated that the young man's question hints as well as justification before God, which might have also been a part of the thinking of 1st century salvation through examples like Abraham (Gen 15:6).

Oral-scribal intertexture also occurs in v. 19 when Jesus told the man that he knew the commandments. The first four of the six commandments Jesus listed are the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth commandments from Ex 20:13-16 representing what a person must not do (Blight, 2014). It is worth noting that "do not defraud" is not included in the Ex 20 passage. Blight believed that Jesus substituted the words do not defraud as a restatement of the otherwise lengthy tenth commandment in Ex 20:17. Peppard (2015) proposed the reference is an expansion of the commandments do not steal or lie. Additionally, the inclusion could be seen as a prophetic critique of the rich man's prior activities that led to his wealth (Peppard). Similarly, Witherington (2001) suggested that Jesus included the defrauding reference because He was addressing a wealthy person who might not covet another's goods but would be inclined to defraud as a regular part of his business dealings. However, as pointed out by Peppard, Jesus' seemingly new commandment to the rich young ruler exists elsewhere in the Torah (Dt 24:14-15; Lev 19:13). Thus, while its inclusion within this listing might be up for debate, Jesus was not stepping outside the Law to address the young man. The sixth and final commandment listed by Jesus in the text is the fifth commandment from Ex 20:12 and deals with interpersonal relationships, specifically with parents (Blight).

Recitation is the verbatim transmission of speech or narrative from oral or written tradition (Robbins, 1996). According to Robbins, recitation includes replication of exact or near-exact words of another text. Since the defrauding command deviates from the commandments in Ex 20:12-17, yet is quoted verbatim from Lev 19:13, it constitutes recitation in the form of replication (Robbins). However, the response of the rich young ruler indicated that he knew and understood what Jesus was talking about, as he replied that he had kept all these things since his youth (Witherington, 2001).

According to Draper (1992), Old Testament law established a covenant where promised land owned by God was entrusted to the head of each family. Draper further asserted that the Davidic monarchy began a process of land accumulation by the rich and powerful ruling classes (I Kg 21:1-29). As the nation of Israel lost the land through numerous conquests throughout the years, the Greeks and Romans eventually ended up owning much of the land (Draper). Herod the Great built up vast royal estates which the Romans sold off to the Jewish aristocracy living in Jerusalem (Draper). The peasant class became subject to a crushing tax burden inclusive of religious tithes paid to the priestly aristocracy and a Roman tax which amounted to approximately twelve and a half percent (Draper). It is within this context that Jesus challenged the rich man to sell his possessions (Draper).

What is Known

Cultural intertexture looks at the interactive relations or cultural knowledge revealed in the text (Robbins, 1996). Cultural awareness is insider information known only to those within the culture or individuals who have learned about the culture in an educational setting or contextually through direct interaction with members of the culture (Robbins). Cultural intertexture exists in word and concept patterns such as values, scripts, codes, or systems, and appears through reference or allusion and echoes in the text (Robbins). According to Robbins, references point to a personage, concept, or tradition, while allusions interact with them. It is imperative to refrain from allowing the

contemporary contexts to creep into the interpretation of the ancient but remain sensitive to the realities of the Mediterranean culture at play and to the narrative context of the passage itself (Hellerman, 2000).

The first indication of cultural intertexture appears in Mark 10:17-18 when the rich young ruler ran up to Jesus, knelt before Him and addressed Jesus as the good teacher (Blight, 2014). Although the word teacher frequently appears in Mark's gospel, the use of the word good alongside teacher was unusual (Blight). The formal address from a kneeling position suggests the young man had a deep respect for Jesus and recognized the moral goodness of Jesus as a human teacher (Blight). According to Blight, the concept of inheritance supports the cultural belief that Israel represented God's chosen people who would receive eternal life as a gift or inheritance from God. The fact that the man wanted to know what work of righteousness he needed to do to merit eternal life supports the religious tenants under the Old Testament system of laws for the nation of Israel and further suggests that he thought there were conditions beyond those established under Jewish law he could fulfill (Blight). According to Hellerman, the rich man was trying to synthesize the cultural belief that eternal life was funneled through the Jewish Law with Jesus' disruptive innovation that eternal life was a gift to be received of God (Hellerman, 2000).

The second instance of cultural intertexture appears in the dialogue between Jesus and the rich young ruler as the discourse transitions to v. 19- 22. Apparently, based on the religious culture and customs under the Mosaic law, the young man believed Jewish adherence to a morally good life and obeying the commandments qualified the people for eternal life often displayed in the blessing of wealth (Witherington, 2001). However, the response that Jesus gave the man constituted a complete rejection of conventional Jewish piety that said it was all right to be wealthy so long as the individual was also generous (Witherington). In fact, Jewish literature and the teachings of the rabbi's forbade reducing one's self to poverty and dependency on others by selling all possessions (Witherington). Therefore, there was a contextual conflict between what Jesus told the young man to do and the traditional cultural beliefs amongst the Jewish people of that day (Blight, 2014). It is important to note that nowhere in the text does Jesus indicate a problem with the young man's desire to do something to inherit eternal life, because even though eternal life was a gift of God, the man would have still had to accept and receive it as such (Hellerman, 2000).

The third instance of cultural intertexture occurs in v. 23- 25 after the young man walked away saddened (Barr, 1992). In this passage, Jesus turned to His disciples and drew on the hyperbole of a camel passing through the eye of a needle to emphasize how hard it would be for those who are wealthy to enter the kingdom of God (Hellerman, 2000). Barr noted that for centuries some scholars and commentators have attempted to make Jesus' statement about getting a camel through the eye of a needle acceptable by changing one Greek letter to transform camel into a rope or by the hypothesis of a small door called the needle's eye in the Jerusalem city gate. Myers (1988) asserted that these misinterpretations rob the metaphor of its value and power. Myers contended that the analogy is meant to establish the fact that it is impossible for any human being, even the wealthy who are considered by others to be blessed by God (Hellerman), to obtain salvation apart from God's grace.

Our Belief

The social knowledge that all people within a particular region possess constitutes social intertexture (Robbins, 1996). Social knowledge is readily available to everyone in a region through general interaction (Gowler, 2010). The four broad categories of social knowledge include social roles, social institutions, social codes, and social relationships (Robbins). According to Robbins' definition for social intertexture, three instances of general social knowledge are present in the Markan account of the rich young ruler. First, the man running up to Jesus, kneeling before Him, and addressing Him as good teacher suggests there was general knowledge that Jesus held a position of both authority and honor based on the work He had been doing (Blight, 2014). Second, while it may go without saying, the reference to the ten commandments in v 19 implies that knowledge of the Mosaic law had an impact on social interactions in the region (Witherington, 2001). Finally, the man's reaction to Jesus' instruction to sell all of his possessions suggests that there was a general awareness of the social codes and standards propagated by Jewish literature and the teachings of the rabbis which forbade reducing oneself to poverty and dependency on others (Witherington).

Scholars have ignored or misappropriated the importance of the economic climate that existed during the time of Jesus' earthly ministry (May, 2010). By overlooking and overwriting the economic factors of the day in exchange for only personal spiritual applications devalues their importance and discards them as superficial (May). The collectivist society of Mediterranean antiquity viewed people within the context of the social groups they represented (Hellerman, 2000). Those listening to Jesus' conversation with the young man would have contextually related his comments towards the wealthy elitist in society (Hellerman). Therefore, from a cultural perspective, Jesus was not only addressing individual sin but institutionalized evil as well (Hellerman). This interpretation can be strengthened further through an appeal to the economic conditions at that time (Peppard, 2015). The economic climate for the rural populations in Mediterranean antiquity was reciprocal by mutual economic behavior which resulted in a zero-sum balance that did not consist of making a profit at the expense of a neighbor (Peppard). Under these conditions, the rich were becoming so by defrauding others of inheritances and wages (Peppard). Therefore, by becoming rich in agrarian Palestine, the man had probably already defrauded and thus not kept all of the commandments as he had believed (Peppard). The young man is blind to this as defrauding due to the socially acceptable manner in which he was operating. However, given the uniqueness of the defrauding command amongst the other commandments, Jesus was indirectly highlighting the issue in the man's life. The defrauding command, in other words, should have stood out to the man as the point of failure in his pursuit of eternal life.

Influence almost always shows up in some manner or another in definitions of leadership (Northouse, 2015). In fact, it could be said that every interaction with Jesus seemed to end in a significant display of influence – sometimes with the result of the person turning away from Jesus, as shown in this pericope, and other times with the person turning to and ultimately following Jesus. The characteristics and qualities demonstrated in the interaction of Jesus and the rich young ruler warrant a discussion

on contemporary leadership theory and specifically, the insights available for servant leadership present in the leadership style Jesus exhibited in Mark 10:17-31.

III. THE SERVANT LEADER

The concept of servant leadership is paradoxical as it runs counter to contemporary images of leadership (Northouse, 2015). The topic of servant leadership has received increased focus and the attention of scholars in leadership literature (Washington, Sutton, & Sauser, 2014). The surge in empirical and practical interest in servant leadership theory can be attributed to a movement away from traditional hierarchical and patriarchal leadership (Crippen, 2004). First introduced by Robert K. Greenleaf in 1970, servant leadership places emphasis on followers over the self-interest of leaders (Washington, et al.). According to Chin and Smith (2006), since its inception, servant leadership has been championed by a growing number of scholars as a useful organizational leadership theory.

Northouse (2015) noted that servant leaders empower constituents by putting them first and helping them develop to their fullest potential. Servant leaders are ethical and concerned with serving the greater good of the organization, the community, and the society (Northouse). Greenleaf (1970) defined servant leadership as a natural desire to first serve, followed by a conscious choice to meet the highest priority needs of others in a manner that causes them to grow and become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely to become servant leaders themselves. Northouse pointed out ten characteristics of servant leadership which include: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community.

There are many strengths identified with servant leadership. It is unique in the way it makes altruism the central component of the leadership process, and it provides a counterintuitive and provocative approach to the use of influence or power in leadership (Northouse, 2015). However, there are also limitations associated with servant leadership. For instance, the paradoxical nature of the title servant leadership carries a negative connotation, scholars are at odds on the core dimensions of the process, and a large segment of writings on servant leadership have a prescriptive overtone that implies that good leaders always put others first (Northouse).

Jesus' Unique Servant Leadership

Christians have often looked at Jesus as a prolific leadership figure who models the expression of leadership from God's perspective (Engstrom, 1976). Even for those who would see Jesus in a different light, it is hard to argue the profound impact that Jesus has had on a global scale. To the extent that his model of leadership represented servant leadership, his influence becomes foundational for many on the meaningful development of leadership (Engstrom). Servant leadership cannot exist void of effective communication and collaboration with followers, and because relationships involving people are dynamic, positive outcomes and results are never guaranteed (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). The story of the rich young ruler represents one example where Jesus – leader par excellence to many; God, to some – followed a servant leadership style with

results that were seemingly less than desirable. The following table indicates the location within the pericope where each of the ten characteristics of servant leadership were either explicitly or implicitly fulfilled by Jesus during His encounter with the rich young ruler:

Table 1

Comparison of Jesus' Servant Leadership Characteristics with Mark 10:17-31

Description	Pericope	Example
Listening	Receptiveness to others	Answers RYR question (v. 19)
Empathy	Seeing others' perspective	Loves RYR (v. 21)
Healing	Making others whole	Provides way for RYR to gain treasure in heaven (v. 21)
Awareness	Attuned to environments	Mindful of social implications of titles/honoring (v. 18)
Persuasion	Convincing others	Unconvincing to RYR (v. 22) Impact on disciples uncertain
Conceptualization	Big-picture thinking	Ascertained root problem of RYR (v. 21)
Foresight	Reasonable anticipation	Anticipated difficulties for the rich (v.23-25) Blessings for sacrifice (v. 29-30)
Stewardship	Leadership responsibility	Explained situation to followers (v. 23)
Growth Commitment	Fulfilled calling through empowerment	Indicated how RYR (v. 21) and disciples (v. 29-30) could reach fulfillment
Building Community	Creating safe place	Allowed questions and provided answers

While the account of the rich young ruler was an unsuccessful call to discipleship, it contrasts the successful call to discipleship represented by Jesus' disciples who had left everything to follow Him (Draper, 1992). It is important to note that while Mark presented the young man as running up to Jesus, falling on his knees and respectfully asking Jesus what he needed to do to obtain eternal life, Matthew and Luke present the man differently. Matthew's gospel turns the rich man into a presumptuous young man who came up and spoke directly at Jesus, and Luke showed

him as a ruler who was exceedingly wealthy (Draper). Both Matthew and Luke omitted that Jesus showed compassion by looking at the man and loving him (Draper).

After reviewing the pericope of Mark's account of the rich young ruler, Jesus did not fail as a servant leader; however, the young man failed to respond in a manner conducive to receiving what he was seeking from Jesus (Washington, et al., 2014). In fact, the take away for the disciples, who were the actual subjects of the servant leadership development, was that they learned more about what they had gained by leaving all to follow Jesus (Draper, 1992). In contrast, the rich young ruler lost everything, because he not only failed to become a disciple of Jesus, but he failed in obtaining the gift of eternal life received only through the grace of God (Geddert, 2015).

IV. VALUING VALUES

So, what went wrong? Is the leader at fault when the servant leadership approach fails, does the responsibility lie with the would-be follower, or is it simply a fact of life that not all people are going to respond when presented with servant leadership qualities? Perhaps the answer to this, as well as insight to the rich young ruler's response in contrast to the other disciples, can be understood in the study of values.

While abstract, values are critical to belief systems, actions, and choices (de Sousa & Barreiros Porto, 2016). Schwartz's (1992) Theory of Values provided significant insights into values defined as "concepts or beliefs about desirable states or behaviors [that] transcend specific situations, guide selection or evaluation of behavior and events, and are ordered by relative importance" (p. 4). The identification of these values has resulted in two dimensions of measurement: Openness to Change versus Conservation and Self-Enhancement versus Self-Transcendence (de Sousa & Barreiros Porto). While the first dimension measures an individual's willingness to see adoption of values, the second dimension measures an individual's ability to focus on self or others. De Sousa and Barreiros Porto showed that an individual's values are predictors of the groups that they will align themselves with. Chuang, Lin, and Chen (2015) indicated three behavioral dimensions that emerge from an individual's values: knowledge-sharing, organizational identification, and altruism. To the extent that values align, Chuang et al. hypothesized that there would be an increase in each of these dimensions affecting the behavior of individuals. All of this suggests that when there is value proximity between a leader and follower, there is a greater likelihood of adoption of the leader's values (Kang, 2013).

The adoption of values, of course, is not just by osmosis. Hoelscher, Zanin, and Kramer (2016) indicated that sensemaking, sensebreaking, and sensegiving communication are all required. Sensemaking assigns meaning to experiences (Hoelscher, et al.). This can be done individually but almost always is done within some level of cultural involvement. Thus, while the individual can assign meaning, it is often within the larger meaning-making of the culture that the individual inhabits. Sensebreaking occurs when new realities require individuals or a culture to reexamine its alignment with a set of values (Hoelscher, et al.). The sensebreaking experience naturally seeks sensegiving, which is often comprised of a message that provides new values parameters given new meaning resulting in a paradigm shift (Hoelscher, et al.; Kuhn, 2012). As individuals recognize the sensebreaking experience, they seek

sensegiving messages that, as more individuals embrace the sensegiving message, shifts the sensemaking to a new set of values. This, of course, is a bit more simplistic than what actually happens. In reality, there are various interpretations of the sensebreaking event, a variety of sensegiving messages, and some degree of spectrum to sensemaking values. As such, the movement to new sensemaking can be filled with conflict and opposition.

There are many of the value adoption elements at play in the biblical pericope. The rich young ruler does not seem to be seeking a total sensebreaking experience, suggesting a Conservation set of values. Still, he has experienced enough of a sensebreaking event to bring him to Jesus seeking sensegiving. Jesus' response indicates that He valued both Open to Change and Self-Transcendence in His followers. From the very outset of the biblical encounter, these differences between Jesus and the rich young ruler predict the eventual outcome. The sensegiving provided by Jesus requires more of a change, and at more of a cost to the young man than his values allow him to make. So, he walks away saddened. But what of the disciples? There are more than enough examples to show that the disciples were uncomfortable moving out of their cultural values. However, it appears as though the difference between the young man and the disciples is a willingness to embrace the sensegiving of Jesus and a closer alignment in their values to self-transcendence. In other words, there is greater value proximity between Jesus and the disciples than between Jesus and the rich young ruler. This lack of values proximity, however, does not limit Jesus' sensegiving method. While John's gospel certainly suggests that Jesus would speak in faith terms throughout his ministry, for the rich young ruler, Jesus speaks in terms of activity that the rich young ruler would have culturally understood.

According to contemporary values studies, the response of Jesus should have been seeking to overcome the young man's resistance to change by reducing the conflict between the sensemaking values and the sensegiving values producing internalization of the new values (Essawi & Tilchin, 2012). While simple to recommend, this process can be both lengthy and complex. Of course, this is not path Jesus chooses. He allows the rich young ruler to walk away and yet turns to his disciples, who he does not have conflict with, and presents his sensegiving to them. Perhaps Jesus understood that the difference in values was sufficient enough that no amount of servant leadership would bring about a different outcome.

V. THE IMPACT OF VALUES ON SERVANT LEADERSHIP

Intersecting the biblical pericope of the rich young ruler from Mark with servant leadership studies strongly suggests that Jesus exhibited servant leadership characteristics in this exchange. Yet, it was not influential enough for the rich young ruler to adopt the leadership of Jesus, which suggests that servant leadership theory alone does not explain this exchange. When comparing the values of the rich young ruler, the disciples, and of Jesus, the results imply that the differences in values prior to the exchange have an impact upon the effectiveness of the servant leadership of Jesus. Initial results indicate that in addition to exhibiting servant leadership qualities, in order for a servant leader to be effective in their influence, there must be an alignment in at least the self-transcendent dimension of values. When this exists, the sensegiving

message of the servant leader is more likely to be embraced by followers with variant values resulting in sensebreaking and new sensemaking. Future research should seek to engage instruments from the Theory of Values field and the Servant Leadership field to determine the validity and reliability of these findings.

About the Author

Nathan Mizzell is a Senior Contracting Officer and Team Lead at Federal Student Aid; he serves as the Director of Discipleship at First Church of Christ Holiness in Washington, DC.; and is completing his Doctor of Strategic Leadership degree at Regent University in Virginia Beach, VA. Nathan also began M&M Consulting, Inc. as a leadership training and development firm in 2017 and is committed to assisting clients with identifying best practices and cutting-edge solutions for the leadership challenges and opportunities leaders and organizations face in the 21st Century. M&M Consulting is founded on the notion that leaders are not born but divinely developed, and that leadership is not innate but a divinely inspired strategic discipline that is perpetually learned through practice. For more information, please contact Nathan at nathmiz@mail.regent.org.

Dr. Russell L. Huizing is the Associate Professor of Pastoral Ministry in the Ministry and Leadership Department at Toccoa Falls College. He is also an adjunct instructor with Regent University in the School of Business and Leadership's doctoral programs as well as with undergraduate studies in the Department of Biblical Studies and Christian Ministry. He has diverse leadership experiences in a variety of contexts including ecclesial, corporate, and family business. He has been a featured speaker at seminars and has consulted with ecclesial organizations. Research materials include ecclesial leadership, follower development, mentoring, discipleship, exegetical study, and the development of a theology of leadership. He is currently the Editor of the *Theology of Leadership Journal* and can be contacted at rhuizing@tfc.edu.

VI. REFERENCES

Baron, S. (2011). "Joyce, Genealogy, Intertextuality." *Dublin James Joyce Journal, 4*(1), 51-71.

Barker, M. (2001). "Time and eternity: The world of the Temple." *The Month, 34*(1)*,* 15.

Barr, S. (1992). "The Eye of the Needle--Power and Money in the New Community: A Look at Mark 10:17-31." *Andover Newton Review, 3*(1), 31-44.

Blight, R. C. (2014). *An Exegetical Summary of Mark 9-16*. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Chin, D. T., & Smith, W. A. (2006). *An Inductive Model of Servant Leadership: The Considered Difference to Transformational and Charismatic Leadership*. Clayton, Australia: Monash University Department of Management. 1-19.

Chuang, Huan-Ming, Lin, Chyuan-Yuh, & Chen, You-Shyang (2015). "Exploring the Triple Reciprocity Nature of Organizational Value Cocreation Behavior Using

Multicriteria Decision Making Analysis." *Mathematical Problems in Engineering, 2015*, 1-15.

Crippen, C. (2004). "Servant-leadership as an Effective Model for Educational Leadership and Management: First to Serve, Then to Lead." *Management in Education, 18*(5), 11-16.

de Sousa, J. M. & Barreiros Porto, J. (2016). "Do Work Values Predict Preference for Organizational Values?" *Psico-USF, 21*(1), 135-145.

de Villiers, P. R. (2016). "Mystical Holiness in Mark's Gospel." *Hervormde Teologiese Studies, 72*(4), 1-7. doi:10.4102/hts.v72i4.3697

deSilva, D. A. (2004). *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods & Ministry Formation.* Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic.

Donahue, J. (2006). The Quest for Biblical Spirituality. In Lescher, B. H. & Liebert, E. (Ed.), *Exploring Christian Spirituality: Essays in Honor of Sandra M. Schneiders, IHM* (73-97). New York: Paulist Press.

Draper, J. A. (1992). "'Go Sell All That You Have . . .' (Mark 10:17-30)." *Journal of Theology For Southern Africa, 79*, 63-69.

Duvall, J. S., & Hays, J. D. (2012). *Grasping God's Word: A Hands-On Approach to Reading, Interpreting, and Applying the Bible.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Engstrom, T. W. (1976). *The Making of a Christian Leader: How to Develop Management and Human Relations Skills.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

Essawi, M. & Tilchin, O. (2012). "Structural Approach to Changing Organizational Values." *Culture & Religion Review Journal, 2012*(3), 35-49.

Geddert, T. J. (2015). "The Implied YHWH Christology of Mark's Gospel: Mark's Challenge to the Reader to 'Connect the Dots'." *Bulletin for Biblical Research, 25*(3), 325-340.

Gowler, D. B. (2010). "Socio-rhetorical Interpretation: Textures of a Text and its Reception." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament, 33*(2), 191-206. doi:10.1177/0142064X10385857

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). "The Servant as Leader" Indianapolis, IN: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Hellerman, J. H. (2000). "Wealth and Sacrifice in Early Christianity: Revisiting Mark's Presentation of Jesus' Encounter with the Rich Young Ruler." *Trinity Journal, 21*(2), 143-164.

Hoelscher, C. S., Zanin, A. C., & Kramer, M. W. (2016). "Identifying with Values: Examining Organizational Culture in Farmer Markets." *Western Journal of Communication, 80*(4), 481-501.

Kang, M. (2013). "When an Organizational Message Resonates with Personal Values of Publics: Implications for Strategic Communication Management." *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 21*(4), 185-199.

Komalesha, H. S. (2014). "Translation, Tradition and Intertextuality." *Orbis Litterarum, 69*(3), 230-245. doi:10.1111/oli.12031

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The Leadership Challenge: How to Make Extraordinary Things Happen in Organizations* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kuhn, T. S. (2012). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

May, D. M. (2010). "Ancient Economics -- Modern Interpreters: The World of Jesus." *Review & Expositor, 107*(4), 481-498.

Myers, C. (1988). *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Neyrey, J. H. (1986). "The Idea of Purity in Mark's Gospel." *Semeia, 35*, 91-128.

Northouse, P. G. (2015). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Peppard, M. (2015). "Torah for the Man who Has Everything: 'Do Not Defraud' in Mark 10:19." *Journal Of Biblical Literature, 134*(3), 595-604. doi:10.15699/jbl.1343.2015.3006

Robbins, V. K. (1996). *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries." In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 25)* (1-65). San Diego: Academic. doi:10.1016/ S0065-2601(08)60281-6

Washington, R. R., Sutton, C. D., & Sauser, William I., Jr. (2014). "How Distinct is Servant Leadership Theory? Empirical Comparisons with Competing Theories." *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics, 11*(1), 11-25.

Witherington III, B. (2001). *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.

When servant leadership fails: the importance of aligning values. Nathan Mizzell. Russell L. Huizing. Since Servant Leadership has become a popular leadership theory, consideration of when this style does not seem to attain its anticipated outcomes is important to deliberate. As we begin to approach the 50th anniversary of Greenleaf's introduction of the servant as leader, consideration of its impact is truly remarkable. The theory assisted in developing a more balanced view of both leadership and followership, creating a disruptive innovation in the field of leadership studies. It has been embraced in many cultural contexts around the globe. In many religious circles, it has become one of the champion leadership approaches. When servant leadership fails: the importance of aligning values. Article. Full-text available. Since Servant Leadership has become a popular leadership theory, consideration of when this style does not seem to attain its anticipated outcomes is important to deliberate. The paper uses intertexture exegetical analysis of Mark 10:17-31 to examine why the rich young ruler failed to respond to Jesus' appeal to sell all of his property, to give to the poor, and to come and follow Him. The research suggests that values must be aligned before servant leadership will be effective. Value alignment and communication are considered as possible next steps in the development of servant leadership. Vi You are a servant leader when you focus on the needs of others before you consider your own. It's a longer-term approach to leadership, rather than a technique that you can adopt in specific situations. Therefore, you can use it with other leadership styles such as Transformational Leadership. Servant leaders are likely to have more engaged employees and enjoy better relationships with team members and other stakeholders than leaders who don't put the interests of others before their own. Servant leadership is not entirely a new concept or a way to lead, but it hasn't been intentionally applied until in recent decades when the idea took off in force. © Shutterstock.com | cristovao. In this guide, we'll explore what servant leadership is through the context of history and modernity. We'll examine the different elements of the concept and consider the characteristics a good servant leader needs to possess. The importance of values is a core part of leadership philosophy, as it shapes the way the leader behaves and acts. S. Chris Edmonds wrote in his book The Culture Engine, "I define leadership as a person's dedication to helping others be their best selves at home, work, and in their community". Servant leadership flips the typical leadership script by putting people ahead of power. A servant leader prioritizes the team's growth and well-being, letting their own needs and ambition take a backseat. 10 key principles of servant leadership. So what does it take to be a servant leader? It's a simple way to make your team feel valued so they know you care. 2. Empathy. A lot goes into empathy, but when it comes to servant leadership, it basically comes down to getting to know your team. Find out what makes them tick, and learn their strengths and weaknesses. I've already mentioned the importance of understanding your team's strengths and weaknesses. But it's just as important to do a little self-reflection of your own.