



journal of biblical  
perspectives  
in leadership

## The Foundation of Self: A Biblical Context of Leadership Development

Kurt McDonald

---

This article seeks to build a firm foundation for ethical decision-making processes based on self-development. It is modeled with Paul's attempt to raise awareness that occurs in Romans 7:14-25. Examining this pericope from the perspective of inner texture analysis creates a firm foundation from a biblical perspective while also providing a model to follow for the remainder of the article. To accomplish the task of raising self-awareness, this paper explores value structures, ethical decision-making, becoming integral with oneself via self-development, and enhancing one's sense of awareness about him/herself. It is determined that awareness is the first item needed for the process moving from *doing* to *being*; being as an extension of self, aligning thought and action. The leader, being fully integral with his or herself, can make decisions as a natural extension of self rather than the complex, contemplative method that comes from doing. Because the leader is fully integral, he or she may be honest and trustworthy among peers and followers alike.

---

### I. INTRODUCTION

Doing the right thing, at times, is a very difficult choice; especially if a person does not know what the right thing is for a given context. More difficult, still, is the dilemma that is not right versus wrong, but right versus right (Badaracco, 1997). That is, choosing to do the right thing for one person or another person, but not for both. The struggle of right and wrong (or right versus right) is as old as recorded history, beginning with Adam and Eve being tempted in the Garden. Paul records this angst in detail in Romans chapter seven. The goal of this research is to prepare people better today, helping them to make better decisions in ethical decision-making (EDM). To accomplish this task, an inner texture analysis of Romans chapter seven is examined, followed by the results of the analysis, and then relating that information to modern society in the topics of ethics and leadership.

The common theme throughout this work relates to Paul's repeated phrasing in Romans chapter seven verses 14-25, *the things I want to do, I do not do*. While the biblical analysis discusses sin and death, it relates to society today in a manner of right and wrong, or right and right. Paul illuminates the struggle of sin and the anxiety that comes with being separated from God, causing man to commit sin or wrongdoing. This research is designed to help individuals understand the difference between what they *want* to do and what they *ought* to do, aligning them to create a sense of integrity with self. That is, the difference between *doing* and *being* (Fedler, 2006). This change creates a sense of freedom as doing what is right becomes a natural sense rather than a contemplative process.

## II. METHOD

This assessment begins with an examination of biblical literature that will provide the foundation and the theme of this research. The method used for the exegetical section is the inner texture analysis of socio-rhetorical criticism (Robbins, 1996). Within this analysis, there are six categories that benefit the examination. These six categories include repetitive, progressive, narrational, open-middle-closing, argumentative, and sensory-aesthetic analyses. Notice that there is a sense of self-alignment that includes alignment with righteousness. This analysis builds a strong foundation for the model-theory presented in the application section of this research.

### *Repetitive*

Repetitive analysis evaluates the common or repeated words in a pericope. This analysis is important because, at the time, Bibles were not available as they are today. Therefore, people needed to remember the important points, thus, the repetition. Perhaps the most striking word that repeats itself in this text is the word sin. It represents, within the text, as being contrary to God's Law and contrary to the things that Paul wants to do. The Greek word illustrating this sin is *hamartia*, meaning wrongdoing or signifying something contrary to God's Law (Goodrick & Kohlenberger III, 1999, Strong's 281) which perfectly represents the entire theme of the text in question. Sin is not simply contrary to God's Law, it distorts human nature; sin is a brutal misalignment from God (Richards, 1991). To that end, sin separates man from himself, because man was created to be with God (Gen. 1-3). Separation from self creates serious misalignment in the things a person wants to do compared to the things he or she would do.

The next word that holds high repetition is the word *I*. Typically, such a word would not be included in an examination, but for this pericope, there are theories behind the meaning of this word that need investigating. This word, in the ancient Jewish era, did not always refer to self but it included self. It was common, in that time, to refer to self and the entire Jewish people in the word *I* as a historical narrative associated with the prophets (Richards, 1991). When Paul states that he is a wretched man (verse 24), he may be symbolically speaking of the sin that associates historically with the Jews and Adam in the first sin, or perhaps against the prophets at varying points in history.

Another theory is that he is speaking of all Christianity in this same historical sense, emphasizing how wretched Christians are without Christ's sacrifice (Garlington, 1990). A simple reading makes it appear as if Paul is discussing the sinful nature of humankind and how there is no freedom from sin without Christ. One school of thought contributes this 'I' as a time of Paul's pre-conversion, or even in reference to Adam in the creation story, a time before the Law existed (Napier, 2002). Verse 9 makes it difficult to associate Paul's words as rhetorical rather than personal. If he is speaking rhetorically, it is from a personal sense, a personal experience that he is choosing to share (Hart, 2013). Whether Paul is speaking in imagery and rhetoric, or from personal experience, the purpose of this writing remains the same, understanding that there is a struggle between what a person wants to do and what a person will do. That is the concept that builds the needed foundation of this paper.

### *Progression*

The progression part of inner texture analysis examines how the text progresses (Robbins, 1996). The progression in this pericope displays great contrast between God's Law and sin. The entire unit displays anguish in the struggle of doing good versus living in sin and climaxes at the end with Paul concluding that Christ is the solution to this problem. Studying this pericope reveals a chiasm that exists within the text:

- God gives the Law
  - The Law is good/right
    - Sin distorts the Law
      - The duality of desiring God's Law while being sinful
    - Man is a slave to sin
  - Sin prevents man from doing good (the Law)
- Christ is the solution, the freedom from sin

Paul progressively emphasizes the dualistic nature in man, the contrast between what is good and right versus sin and death. Repeatedly, he states that the things he wants to do are different from the things he does. He loves God's Law, but sin living in him prevents him from keeping the commandments. Paul is not passing the blame to sin to relieve himself from responsibility; rather, he is stressing that only Christ is able to free people from the condemnation that is sin and how terrible sin is, creating death.

### *Narrational*

Narration explores the purpose for which the text was written, exploring aspects of the character of the author and the author's intent for his or her audience (Robbins, 1996). Some of the material discovered here is relative to the former two analyses but allows for further depth. The first item of note lies in the themes for which Paul is portraying to his audience, dualism and contrast. The dualism showing in this pericope in dialogue such as *want and not want*, *Law and sin*, *mind and heart*. The overarching contrast is the disparity between God's Law and sin. Humans are created to be in a

harmonious relationship with God. However, sin disrupts that, so Christ rekindles that relationship (Fedler, 2006). As stated earlier, whether the intention is personal or rhetorical, it highlights this dualistic nature. Paul highlights his awareness of sin so that others may also understand the depravity between sin and God's Law and the futile effort to combat it without Christ. The depravity between sin and God is based in the heart and mind; it is perversity of the heart and mind (Marshall, Millard, Packer, & Wiseman, 1996).

Paul draws attention to the horrible reality that is sin, using negative terms of imagery such as death and bound in chains (24-25). It appears to combine encouragement and punishment into one writing, further distancing the difference between good and sin. The text displays that the flesh will die because of sin, but the spirit will live eternally because of Christ (Carson, France, Motyer, & Wenham, 1998). Freedom from sin is used in context with living eternally, loving God, and doing good. Living in sin is emphasized as death, wrongdoing, and separation from God. Paul sums up in the last verse that only Christ can reconcile man with God, allowing humans to do good work, living eternally with God because Jesus is God's answer to sin and death. Humans are sinful in nature and cannot earn favor with God because of the desire to sin. Only Jesus is able to free human beings from the condemnation that plagues the human spirit – sin.

### *Opening-Middle-Closing*

The opening-middle-closing analysis explores key points in change with the overall narrative (Robbins, 1996). When examining the opening-middle-closing part of the analysis, the reader should include all the text in chapters seven and eight if he or she wishes to understand the pericope in context. The text surrounding the pericope of focus is important for a more complete understanding of the dualistic nature in this text. Because the unit is progressively repetitive, the opening-middle-closing may be summed up as verses 14 (opening), verses 15-24 (middle), and verse 25 (closing). Verse 14 starts with the introduction that God's Law is good, and sin is not. Verses 15-24 highlight the vast difference between God's Law and sin, progressively. Moreover, verse 25 closes with Christ being God's answer to the problem of sin. So, the story progresses from God's Law and sin, to sin and self, back to God's Law and sin, with an added conclusion of Christ being the solution to sin.

### *Argumentative*

The argumentative structure explores the rhetoric itself, the dialogue (Robbins, 1996). Much of this passage is declarative, that is, making statements. The statements include repeated phrases of sin and death, the struggle with sin versus keeping God's Law, and the desire to do good but not doing it. While these declarative statements are important, they have already been heavily explored in this work. To add more to this research, the aspects of interrogative and exclamatory structure need brief analysis.

The interrogative portion occurs in verse 24 when Paul asks who can free him from sin and death. This verse provides premise to the idea that Paul is speaking in rhetoric, including the entirety of Christianity and himself in the dialogue. When Paul

exclaims (exclamatory portion) that Jesus is the solution to sin, he is not speaking only of himself but of all Christians. Paul asks a profound question that shocks the people and then provides God's solution covered in mercy and grace.

### *Sensory-Aesthetic*

The final aspect of inner texture analysis is sensory-aesthetic analysis (Robbins, 1996). This analysis involves the five senses; seeing, hearing, touching, tasting, and smell; although seeing, hearing, and touching are the most commonplace. In this unit, keywords for senses include heart (22), mind (23), and the repeated term of slavery in relation to sin.

Paul states that he loves God's Law with all his heart in verse 22. The heart is the *being* of people; it is who they are as a person. All of him or all of her; it is related to the very lifeblood for which beings exist (Marshall et al., 1996). The mind is presented as the decision-maker and is the centerpiece for the struggle between goodness and sinfulness. In verse 25, Paul expresses that he mindfully wants to obey God's law, but he is a slave to sin, and so he fails to keep the commandments that he so loves.

This imagery would have been speaking to the hearts of the Jewish people, who also gave precedence to God's Law. These words would have been very emotional for the Jewish people that were God's chosen people. Perhaps in speaking from a personal tone, it allows others to invest their emotions and minds into the same struggle, becoming aware of their need for alignment with God through Christ.

## III. RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

The analysis displays several noteworthy items related to alignment. God is in alignment with himself, humankind needs alignment with God, and God provided a solution to the misalignment that existed between humanity and God. The alignment concept is important for leadership not just on a spiritual plane, but in all matters because alignment creates a sense of trustworthiness stemmed from authentic, integral behavior.

### *God and Sin Cannot Coexist*

As Paul relates sin to death, emphasizing the punishment and reward system, it becomes clear that God is a righteous and just God. To do what is just means to punish wrongdoing. God must punish sin because, if He did not, He would not be righteous; passing over sin would be counted as unrighteous (Grudem, 2000). Whether Paul spoke as a singular or corporate *I*, Paul displays self-awareness of the sin that exists within him and possibly all of humanity. Perhaps, Paul becomes more sensitive to sin as he becomes closer to God. Either way, the revealing struggle with sin displays the awareness that exists within Paul and, probably, within the culture to whom he is writing.

### *The Struggle of Sin*

The disparity and struggle emphasized in Romans chapter seven is one of agony. For Paul, this is a personal expression of the struggle between the mind and the flesh, not resigning to sin, but constantly battling against it (Chang, 2007). He does the things he does not want to do (flesh) and does not do the things he wants to do (heart and mind). The idea is to become self-aware, recognizing the sinful nature that takes place in the thoughts of humans. In doing so, a person may also recognize that he or she needs to align him/herself with God, constantly battling the temptation to do what is wrong; living in a way that works toward doing what is right. However, this battle is futile as sin exists within the nature of man. There is only one solution from the death that comes with sin...

### *Christ is the Answer*

Paul exclaims in verse 25 that Christ is God's the answer to sin and death. Paul first creates a sense of disparity between what is and what needs to be (14), then analyses that disparity in a revealing nature of developing awareness (15-24), and then provides the solution to the problem, being Christ.

## IV. ETHICS: THE THINGS I WANT TO DO

As Paul developed his alignment with Christ, his love for Christ compelled him to flee from sin. In the context of this work, wrongdoing is what is modeled from the concept of sin; wrongdoing being related to a violation of ethics and the decisions that work for or against one's ethics. Ethical decision-making is much more complex than individuals might imagine. The move from doing to being requires more than understanding oneself, it requires the leader to understand the cultural context of ethics (Caligiuri, 2013), how individual perceptions play a role in ethics and ethical interpretation (Herman, 2016), and internally-built ethics that exist as a standard among humanity.

While the answer to sin and death is Jesus, much of this pericope focused on building an awareness of the inner struggle between sin and God's Law. This research focuses on the former, developing the awareness needed to align oneself, *being* rather than *doing* (Fedler, 2006). While an argument may be made for an ethical foundation based on God's Law and its contrast to sin, that is not the focus in this work. Rather, the focus is on building awareness, like Paul's intention to his audience in verses 14-24. In this pericope, God is illustrated as righteous, and sin is illustrated as wrongdoing. Similarly, when facing ethical dilemmas, many individuals struggle to choose right versus wrong. The choice of right compared to wrong often stems from an ethical standpoint. The things that people want to do, they often do not.

### *Normative Ethics*

When dealing with normative ethics, Fedler (2006) identifies two types, virtue ethics and decisionist ethics. *Virtue ethics* answers the question of how a person should

*be* or how a person should *live* (Fedler, 2006). *Decisionist ethics* answers what a person should *do* (Fedler, 2006). The difference between these two types of normative ethics is the inside of a person, the *heart*, as Paul would describe it. A person that is fully aligned with his or herself can live out ethics as a part of *being*, so doing comes as a natural extension of being. *Doing*, on the other hand, focuses more on the rational aspect of ethical decision-making. The person may not do what he or she believes is right. The problem with doing instead of being is that most people have an inflated sense of self-ethics (Bazerman & Tenbrunsel, 2011). Bazerman and Tenbrunsel (2011) describe people that consider themselves to be ethical, cheating on a test; counting some problems right that they *should* have gotten right, even if they had marked it wrong. However, when those individuals would see others doing the same thing, they would consider it unethical. Thus, an inflated sense of self-ethics is a matter of perception.

### *Perception*

Today, fields of study are dedicated to intelligence, the intelligence quotient (IQ), and emotional intelligence (EQ). Moreover, another field has been added called *visual intelligence*. In her book, *Visual Intelligence*, Amy Herman discusses the art of perception (Herman, 2016). People will experience the same situation in very different ways based on how they interpret what they perceive. Ethics involves perception as well because it is based on an individual's understanding of right and wrong, and that perception varies between individuals (Fedler, 2006). When it comes to ethical decision-making, what one person may perceive as right, another person may perceive as wrong. At times, this may not simply be a question of right versus wrong, but right versus right (Badaracco, 1997).

Right versus right, as opposed to right versus wrong, is an ethical dilemma involving which right is the best choice. For example, if a mother promises to take her child to a one-night-only event but, suddenly, her father takes ill and is taken to the hospital, which decision is right? On the one hand, the event is a one-night-only event, and the mother desires to do right by her child by fulfilling her promise to her child; yet, it would also be right to visit the sickly father in the hospital. So, which is the correct right? This is a matter of perception. The mother may perceive this chance to be the last chance she might get to tell her father that she loves him. Conversely, the mother may perceive this event with her child to be one that builds a bond that lasts in the way that she holds a bond with her father. Whatever is the stronger perceived ethical decision is the decision that will often be the choice taken.

The reason that perception needs to be developed, and why it is included in this theme of *not doing as I want to do* is because perception may deceive individuals. What one interprets as true, another may interpret as untrue, even with both people seeing a situation with their own eyes. When people focus on something, the focus attends to that one thing, filtering out everything else. What one person perceives and interprets will be different from another (Herman, 2016). The mother may perceive taking her child as the more significant *right*, while her friend, being in the same room and witnessing the same event, may perceive the mother not attending to her father as an injustice.

When seeing a couple heavily kissing in public, one person may perceive it as perverse while another person may perceive the couple as deeply in love.

When focused perception filters out other surroundings, the perceiver receives an incomplete version of their perception. If a person were asked to count how many dogs are in an animal shelter, the individual would focus on the count of the dogs; but what if the person asked to count dogs did so only to, upon completion, be asked how many cats were in the facility? Developing one's ability to perceive aids in developing self; the perception of self is often inflated when compared to the perception of others regarding ethics. This would afford individuals the capacity to perceive what they have not previously perceived, allowing them to do better as they want to do.

### *Universal Ethics?*

Ethical foundations differ per individual based on perception. Yet, there are studies that show a certain consistency in what is expected of ethics across culture. One such study suggests that integrity/character, altruism, collective motivation, and encouragement are universally adopted, although the importance of each will vary in different cultures (Resick, Hanges, Dickson, & Mitchelson, 2006). Integrity involves having a person be whole, that is, the inside and outside are in alignment, it is *being*. This sense of being requires a level of honesty with oneself and with others that is unfluctuating. Honesty is shown to be the number one trait that followers admire in their leaders (Kouzes & Posner, 2017; Alahmad, 2010). This research also reinforces the concepts of encouraging others and engaging in collective motivation.

Universally, studies have shown that there are common expectations in ethics. However, there is no universal code of ethics; some ethical codes may even contradict one another (Badaracco, 1997). This is based on an individual's value structure; specifically, his or her set of terminal values and instrumental values (Rokeach, 1979). Terminal values are the ends values for which a person seeks, such as honor or love. Instrumental values are the methods with which one may achieve terminal values; gaining a sense of honor from chivalry or gaining a sense of love from family. These values benefit from a person developing self-awareness and perception mentioned earlier.

Values influence the way in which people do the things they want to do, or not, based on the values in varying given situations. For example, the terminal value *honor* is something that many consider worthy of aspiration, but what is honor and how does one achieve it? The answer to that question rests in values. Honor is a form of recognition respect pertaining to social identity (Kumar & Campbell, 2016, p. 148). Because honor is based on perceived relationships to society, honor may both remain loyal to one's ethics while also betray one's ethics. Kumar and Campbell (2016) give an example of a duel. A person may commit to a duel to protect the honor of a person or an ideal, yet be a devout Christian, believing murder to be wrong (Kumar & Campbell, 2016). This sense of honor, in a social context, would require the individual to take part to protect something. However, in a personal context, a Christian would dishonor his or her faith by taking part in a duel, knowing that the intention when entering a duel is to murder the other person. As with perception, the stronger value of what is right will often



become the result. Which right is right? Moreover, will the leader do as he or she wants to do? How does the individual know what it is that he or she really wants?

## V. ETHICAL LEADERSHIP

As Paul becomes self-aware, becoming more aligned with himself and with God, he is embarking on a journey that brings tighter alignment and authenticity between the inner and outer self. Authenticity is crucial for Paul's ministry just as it is for leaders today because individuals will not believe the message of that the leader provides if the leader is untrustworthy (Denning, 2007). When leaders move from doing to being, they set themselves as an example that inspires and motivates others, displaying something different than what others might expect.

### *Being versus Doing*

When a leader is *doing*, the questions listed above are the types of questions that occur during contemplation. A leader that is *being* is one that has an accurate sense of self-awareness, a well-perceived sense of self and others, and understands his or her value structure. Ethical leadership identifies how leaders *ought* to behave (Ciulla, 2014). A developed leader in these areas will be able to say, "*The things that I want to do, I do.*" Now, this is different from the inner texture analysis earlier as the analysis provided a means of life and hope through the sacrifice of Jesus, the solution to sin and death. This pericope is in the context of being ethical, though the author believes that the best ethical foundation is one based on God's authority. This research, however, is not based on the inner texture analysis listed above but is instead modeled after it.

For an individual to know what the right thing to do is, he or she must be developed in the areas mentioned earlier; self-awareness, heightened perception, and becoming intimately keen with his or her value structure. In other words, one must be fully aware of or integral with oneself (Badaracco, 1997). People will not believe the message of the leader if they cannot believe the leader (Denning, 2007). If leaders do not know who they are and the reason for being in that moment, others cannot be expected to trust them (Baldoni, 2003). This means a lifetime of self-improvement, always improving, always developing, becoming better with time. With over 30 years of research, Kouzes and Posner claim that leadership development is self-development (2017). When leaders are able to be honest, wholly integral with self, leadership effectiveness improves (Brown & Trevino, 2006). When the leader can accomplish honesty and integrity in the manner given in this work, he or she will be in an excellent position to lead by *being* rather than simply making the rational *doing* choices.

### *Be an Example*

Ethical leadership, because it is rooted in honesty and integrity, benefits from the leader leading by example. Ethical leaders exemplify their leadership in their personal lives as well, they communicate and role model their ethical behavior; they are honest and fair, making balanced decisions (Brown & Trevino, 2006). Ethical leadership

framework is found in many leadership styles including authentic, transformational, and spiritual leadership (Brown & Trevino, 2006). Each of these leadership styles involves the leader *being* true to his or herself, leading others with a genuine authenticity that is well-founded in trust.

### *Be Different*

Doing the same things that other people do is hardly an example of leadership, it is followership. While followership has its place, and is crucial in the leadership process, leading requires something different than the typical routine to be effective. Social conformity impedes change (Ciulla, 2014). *Being* different means creating new norms rather than following the current norms. To accomplish this task takes time. Social assumptions are proven beliefs that are proven to work with time (Schein & Schein, 2017). In other words, culturally accepted norms were, at one point, a new idea that, with time, has proven to be useful and accepted into society as an assumed identity of said culture. For this reason, change is difficult to implement, making a sense of trust in the change message essential for success.

## VI. THE THINGS I WANT TO DO

The application section is built in two parts. The first part includes some basic tips to become what others perceive as an ethical leader. The second section is a practical section with assessments that will aid the leader in building the various senses of awareness discussed in this article. Because sin is related to wrongdoing, removing the boundaries of self-bias through development and alignment builds a stronger structure for personal integrity within the leader. Building trust is a result of the formed sense of integrity. Leaders may then seek to understand cultural needs, building alignment between the organization, the leader, and the followers.

The first tip is to build trust. As mentioned earlier, trust was important for Paul because he needed to be a trustworthy person for the message receivers to trust the message. That need for trust continues today whether it be a spiritual message or vocational message. One quick way to build trust is to be quick to accept responsibility; people are quicker to forgive and to trust when leaders own their mistakes (Herman, 2016). From a Christian perspective, Christ is the only flawless human being. Mistakes happen, learn from them, do not fall over them (Baldoni, 2003). After people trust the leader, the leader can then share in the experience with others, aligning shared values and vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2017; Ciulla, 2014). Character is derived from habits and actions, and they are capable of being changed with some effort (Fedler, 2006). When leaders change themselves in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the organization, they may then inspire change in others, working toward a goal as one unit (Friedman, 2007).

Questions are a very useful tool for leaders. Asking questions may further improve the alignment process of the group culture and the leader, further building trust (Carbery & Cross, 2015). Whether they are working to reshape self or reshape a team, questions reframe the state of mind (Friedman, 2007). Furthermore, if questions are framed well, as in a positive presupposition, it empowers the leader and the followers to

make changes from an empowered state rather than a disempowered state, improving creative solutions by up to 30% (Achor, 2012). Coming from an empowered position enables the leader and the team to work much more effectively.

### *Some Methods to Start the Process of Development*

Three assessments are a great start to developing oneself, moving from *doing* to *being*. These assessments include the following:

1. Visual Intelligence exercises:
  - a. These exercises are free; based on the book from Amy Herman that trains individuals to enhance their perception (Herman, 2016)
2. Authentic leadership questionnaire (ALQ):
  - a. This assessment measures self-awareness, points of strength and weakness, and offers opportunities for improvement (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, & May, 2004)
3. Multifactor leadership questionnaire:
  - a. This test describes a leader with an ethical orientation and is based on the work of leadership giants in the industry (Bass & Avolio, 2000)

## VII. CONCLUSION

For a leader to be at his or her most effective state, he or she needs to develop self-awareness, develop perception, and become intimately aware of his or her value structure. The model that Paul displayed in Romans chapter seven illuminates the importance of awareness, aligning the inner and outer self, which builds a sense of trustworthiness between leader and follower, allowing the message to be well-received. Although Paul's discussion is deeply spiritual and of crucial import, his model of discussion may be taken into leadership. Developing oneself will improve the leader's ability to live, as in *being* rather than *doing*. As he or she develops this sense of self, the individual may begin to do the things that are wanted simply out of an extension of self rather than a complicated rationale. If individuals apply what is discussed in this work, they will become more effective in ethical decision-making because of the integral alignment of self. To accomplish the purpose of this article, an inner texture analysis of Romans chapter seven is examined, followed by the results of the analysis, and then relating that information to modern society in the topics of ethics and leadership. Although the power struggle of sin will always exist as long as humans live, humanity can learn to become ethical, building foundations of self that are authentic and genuine to one's value structure.

### *Future Research*

Some items of note for future research would include a workshop for Rokeach's value structure, and a discussion of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and how that might change a person's values based on circumstance. Although there are many examples

of self-development included in this article, they are only basic examples; good steps for a person to get started in leadership development. Discussing how leaders may best inspire others would be beneficial, including the art of storytelling as a method with which to inspire. Finally, content that further builds an ethical foundation to a biblical foundation based on the inner texture results would help Christian leaders to further weave the fabric of faith, ethics, and leadership together.

---

### About the Author

Kurt McDonald is a doctoral student at Regent University in the Strategic Leadership (DSL) field of study. His focus rests on the developmental aspect of leadership theory, with an added interest in culture, the development of self, and the study of encouraging development in others. Kurt uses this expertise for teaching and coaching, encouraging and helping others in their developmental process; be it vocationally, spiritually, or otherwise.

Kurt McDonald

Regent University Doctoral Student in Leadership Development

[kurtnmcdonald@gmail.com](mailto:kurtnmcdonald@gmail.com)

---

### VIII. REFERENCES

- Achor, S. (2012). The Happy Secret to Better Work [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.netflix.com/WiPlayer?movieid=70269123&trkid=13633959>
- Alahmad, A. (2010, First Quarter). To be ethical or not to be: An international code of ethics for leadership. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 5(1), 31-35. Retrieved from <http://eres.regent.edu:2048/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.regent.edu/docview/195579458?accountid=13479>
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumba, F. L., & May, D. R. (2004, December). Unlocking the mask: a look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801-823. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.09.003>
- Badaracco, J. L. (1997). *Defining moments: When managers must choose between right and right*. United States of America: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Baldoni, J. (2003). *Great communication secrets of great leaders*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden.
- Bazerman, M. H., & Tenbrunsel, A. E. (2011). *Blind spots: Why we fail to do what's right and what to do about it*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006, December). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595-616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>
- Caligiuri, P. (2013, July-September). Developing culturally agile global business leaders. *Organizational Dynamics*, 42(3), 175-182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2013.06.002>
- Carbery, R., & Cross, C. (2015). *Human resource development: A concise introduction*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carson, D. A., France, R. T., Motyer, J. A., & Wenham, G. J. (1998). *New Bible Commentary* (4th ed.). Downer's Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Chang, H. (2007). The Christian life in a dialectical tension?: Romans 7:7-25 reconsidered. *Novum testamentum*, 49(3), 257-280. Retrieved from <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com.ezproxy.regent.edu:2048/content/journals/15685365>
- Ciulla, J. B. (2014). *Ethics, the heart of leadership* (3rd ed.). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Denning, S. (2007). *The secret language of leadership: How leaders inspire action through narrative*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fedler, K. D. (2006). *Exploring Christian ethics: Biblical foundations for morality* (1st ed.). Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Friedman, E. H. (2007). *A failure of nerve: leadership in the age of the quick fix*. New York, NY: Church Publishing.
- Garlington, D. B. (1990, Fall). Romans 7:14-25 and the creation theology of Paul. *Trinity Journal*, 11(2), 197-235. Retrieved from <http://trinj.com/>
- Goodrick, E. W., & Kohlenberger III, J. R. (1999). *The Strongest NIV Exhaustive Concordance*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Grudem, W. (2000). *Systematic theology: An introduction to biblical doctrine*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Hart, J. F. (2013, September). Paul as weak in faith in Romans 7:7-25. *Bibliotheca sacra*, 170(679), 317-343. Retrieved from <http://www.dts.edu/>
- Herman, A. E. (2016). *Visual intelligence: Sharpen your perception, change your life*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2017). *The Leadership Challenge* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kumar, V., & Campbell, R. (2016, February). Honor and moral revolution. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 19(1), 147-159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-015-9593-5>
- Marshall, I. H., Millard, A. R., Packer, J. I., & Wiseman, D. J. (1996). *New Bible Dictionary* (3rd ed.). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Napier, D. (2002). Paul's analysis of sin and Torah in Romans 7:7-25. *Restoration Quarterly*, 44(1), 15-32. Retrieved from <http://www.acu.edu/>
- Resick, C. J., Hanges, P. J., Dickson, M. W., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2006). A cross-cultural examination of the endorsement of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63, 345-359. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-005-3242-1>

- Richards, L. O. (1991). *New International Encyclopedia of Bible Words*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *Exploring the texture of texts: A guide to socio-rhetorical interpretation*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Rokeach, M. (1979). *Understanding human values: Individual and societal*. [Kindle]. Retrieved from <https://www.amazon.com>
- Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. (2017). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.