The Leadership of Nehemiah
Biblical Leadership through the Lens of Leadership Studies:
Critical Analysis & New Models

A Thesis Submitted by Jeremy H. White

For the Award of Doctor of Philosophy

St. Mary's University Twickenham
School of Theology & Ethics
The Institute of Theology

May 2023

Acknowledgements

An African proverb says, "It takes a village to raise a child." Through the thousands of hours of work that have gone into studying, learning, understanding, and writing this document and fully understanding the disciplines it entails, I am utterly convinced that it takes a village to earn a doctorate. I would like to thank from the bottom of my heart the following for their sacrifice, their support, and their love in helping me obtain a dream that is now a reality:

To my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ for the sacrifice that You have given to bring me life and salvation and to the God of Heaven who created me and gave me the abilities and call to complete this doctorate.

To my wife Amanda for the countless hours of sacrifice, partnership & love that you show.

To my children Griffin, Rowan, & Phoenix for allowing me to be a student alongside you and learn shoulder-to-shoulder with you as we all grow.

To my parents, Don & Marcia for the immense support that they provided.

To my in-laws, Ron & Jane for always being present to support our family.

To Dr. Yvonne Sherwood for starting the process and building my foundation.

To Dr. Chris Keith for taking me under your wing and supporting my doctorate.

To Dr. David Shepherd for planting a thought into my mind that has bloomed into a life's work.

To Dr. Krystin Zigan for never allowing me to stray away from center and keeping me grounded.

To Dr. John Ritzema for helping me finish well and for your insights.

To the faculty and staff at the University of Kent for their dedication to my academics.

To the faculty and staff at St. Mary's Twickenham for their dedication to my academics.

To the faculty and staff at Holy Trinity Montessori for allowing me to work and study at the same time and for your continued inspiration.

To the staff of Narrow Gate Foundation for your support and tutelage along the way.

To the faculty and staff of Christ Presbyterian Academy for your encouragement and provision.

To all my friends, family, and community for supporting me & my family through this process.

I Am Eternally Grateful

- Jeremy H. White

Condensed Table of Contents

Detailed Table of Contents

Tables:

Word Count (Excluding Bibliography & Appendices) – 98, 826

Word Count (Body Only) – 97,374

Abstract
St. Mary's University, London
Jeremy H. White
Doctor of Philosophy
The Leadership of Nehemiah Biblical Leadership through the Lens of Leadership Studies: Critical Analysis & New Models

May 24, 2023

This thesis drives to find connecting points between leadership studies and biblical studies by providing understanding of the two disciplines and where each discipline benefits and complements the other. As an experimental example, the leadership of Nehemiah within the modern biblical text offers a testing ground to witness the use of leadership studies as a lens to analyze biblical leadership. The thesis first provides an overview of leadership studies to create a foundation to analyze the leadership of Nehemiah using leadership theory. Specifically, six different leadership theories are analyzed that will be used to describe the leadership of Nehemiah. This includes path-goal leadership theory, transformational leadership theory, charismatic leadership theory, authentic leadership theory, servant leadership theory, and adaptive leadership theory. Within each theory, three models of that theory are evaluated and used to analyze Nehemiah's leadership.

The focus of this thesis is the creation of a pioneering leadership commentary on the text of Nehemiah. This themed commentary divides the text of Nehemiah into individual contexts of leadership so that each leadership act of Nehemiah can be individually analyzed, and separate styles of leadership can be discerned and discussed. Each context will be evaluated using the models of leadership studies found in the six leadership theories selected.

Finally, it is concluded that Nehemiah adapted his leadership style to each leadership context presented to him. Depending on the situational needs, Nehemiah altered his leadership style to gain success within the context and within his leadership overall. However, the text does not solely express Nehemiah's successes, but also identifies his challenges and his failures. This allows modern readers to evaluate Nehemiah's strengths and failures to apply Nehemiah's leadership to modern leadership situations. Overall, this thesis provides new methods of analyzing the biblical text to begin a deeper conversation between biblical studies and leadership studies and provides a starting point to future projects that incorporate the two disciplines.

Introduction

"All men dream; but not equally. Those who dream by night in the dusty recesses of their minds awake to find that it was vanity; But the dreamers of day are dangerous men, that they may act their dreams with open eyes to make it possible."[1]

— T.E. Lawrence

This thesis utilizes the disciplines of leadership studies and biblical studies to examine biblical leadership and show where the two disciplines can benefit each other. As an experimental example, the leadership of Nehemiah within the biblical text offers a testing ground to witness the connection of leadership and biblical studies. The text of Nehemiah provides both description and first-person narrative allowing for leadership theory to be used to analyze the text of Nehemiah to form scholarly conclusions of Nehemiah's leadership.

Leadership is everywhere and it is invaluable at every level. We find it on the grandest stages of political pomp and quarterly boardroom reviews. We find it in the recesses of life at the family dinner table and in the instructive words of teachers. Leadership finds its beginning at the dawn of civilization as God bestowed leadership responsibility to Adam and Eve by giving them dominion over this earth (Gen 1.26-28). In every aspect of life, we can see leadership playing a central role in the development of culture, society, lifestyle, and the lives of individuals and groups. The realm of leadership studies, while still in its adolescence, continues to develop as it interacts with multiple spheres of society making it applicable to the analysis of Nehemiah and biblical leadership.

The discipline of biblical studies is realm of academia with a rich history of study and research. While the discipline is diverse and investigated, the concept of leadership from a biblical perspective is, once again, in its adolescence of analysis. There is a wealth of leadership principles and examples that the Bible has to offer, presenting a remarkable store of information and application for biblical scholars and leadership scholars alike.

However, there is a problem that requires direct attention. Historically, biblical studies and leadership studies do not interact. There is very little scholarly cross-pollination of the two

---

[1] T.E. Lawrence, *Seven Pillars of Wisdom: A Triumph* (Mount Pleasant, SC: Arcadia Press, 2017), 12.

disciplines preventing each to bring their strengths to help the other's weaknesses. Biblical leadership provides an opportunity for leadership theory to be used to analyze ancient texts. As leadership studies attempts to harmonize the ever growing, multifaceted enterprise of leadership, it would be remiss if it left out the instruction on leadership that the Bible and biblical scholarship has to offer. Likewise, to grasp a full understanding of the Bible as it pertains to leadership, secular leadership studies should be involved to provide robust theory development. Interacting leadership studies and biblical studies together strengthens each discipline and provides support to the other.

The work presented here uses the disciplines of biblical and leadership studies through the example of Nehemiah as a biblical leader to construct an analysis of his leadership. This work is centered on an approach connecting biblical and leadership studies through the creation of a pioneering leadership commentary on the book of Nehemiah. Along with this approach, this thesis will attempt to, in Weber's (1968) terms, "recrystallize" our understanding of Nehemiah's leadership through using leadership studies to analyze biblical leadership.[2] This route will help solidify the argument that the two disciplines benefit one another and will provide affirmation to future explorations between the two disciplines.

This thesis was developed based on the incorporation of three research questions:

1. How can biblical studies and leadership studies be used to analyze Nehemiah's leadership?

2. What models of leadership can be used to analyze Nehemiah's leadership and what new models are needed to better analyze his leadership and the leadership of other biblical leaders?

3. How can biblical and leadership studies spur on future investigations of biblical leaders?

With these three research questions in hand, this thesis will produce a comprehensive analysis of the context of Nehemiah's leadership, an overview of leadership studies, and an investigation of Nehemiah's leadership style throughout his campaign.

---

[2] Max Weber and S.N. Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building: Selected Papers*, ed. S.N. Eisenstadt (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1968), xlv.

Critical Review of Relevant Literature

It is imperative to take a fresh look at the text of Nehemiah, using leadership theory as a basis for analysis, providing a clear and academically based evaluation of Nehemiah's leadership. This allows us to avoid anachronism as we apply modern leadership theory to an ancient text, being mindful of the biblical context.[3] It is important to ascertain through theory and academic analysis if Nehemiah was in fact successful in his leadership endeavors. Some academics, such as Steinmann (2010),[4] Myers (2010),[5] and Levering (2007)[6] see him as a savior of God's people through impeccable leadership strategy actuated with God's blessing. Other researchers, such as Grabbe (2006), immediately invalidate him as a successful leader, commenting on his xenophobic nature, abuse of power, and outright oppression of the very people he was contracted to help.[7] Most scholars, such as Edelman (2014),[8] Fitzpatrick-McKinley (2016),[9] and Eskenazi (2016)[10] follow Grabbe's (2006) line of argument, but are unwilling to cast Nehemiah as an ineffective leader completely.

The realization of the problem at hand began with my literature review on biblical leadership, leadership studies, and the specific leadership of Nehemiah. I began with an initial question, "Does biblical studies present an academic and well-rounded analysis of leadership using appropriate theory and scholarly research?" With Nehemiah as my primary character to

---

[3] Russell L. Huizing, "Bringing Christ to the Table of Leadership: Moving Towards a Theology of Leadership," *JACL* 5, no. 2 (2011): 59.

[4] Andrew E. Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, *Concordia Commentary: A Theological Exposition of Sacred Scripture* (Saint Louis, MO: Concordia Pub. House, 2010), 375-380.

[5] Jacob Martin Myers, *Ezra Nehemiah*, *The Anchor Yale Bible* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010), liii-lvi.

[6] Matthew Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, *Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2007), 161-162.

[7] Lester L. Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*, vol. 1 of *Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah* (New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2006), 294-317.

[8] Diana V. Edelman, *The Origins of the Second Temple: Persian Imperial Policy and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem* (London, UK: Routledge, 2014), 334-340.

[9] Anne Fitzpatrick-McKinley, "Models of Local Political Leadership in the Nehemiah Memoir," in *Leadership, Social Memory, and Judean Discourse in the Fifth-Second Centuries BCE*, eds. Diana V. Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi, 165-200 (Bristol, CT: Equinox Publishing, 2016), 165-199.

[10] Tamara Cohn Eskenazi, "Imaging the Other in the Construction of Judahite Identity in Ezra-Nehemiah," in *Imagining the Other and Constructing Israelite Identity in the Early Second Temple Period*, eds. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana V. Edelman, 230-256. *Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies* (London, UK: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016), 230-236.

focus on, I wanted to ascertain whether biblical leadership was referenced in both popular and scholarly works, and second, if those works reflected leadership theory that allowed for deep and accurate analysis of biblical leaders, with Nehemiah in particular. It was important to me to first understand how leadership theory has been applied to the biblical text so that I might become aware of the differences between the popular and scholarly take on biblical leadership.

It was important to include a review of popular works on the leadership of Nehemiah for several reasons. First, in many instances, readers interested in leadership, leadership training, biblical leadership, or similar topics do not always differentiate between scholarly and popular works. Often, readers access material based on ease and familiarity of source and do not investigate the level of authenticity, validity, or scholarship of a piece of literature. Second, many popular authors writing in the genre of leadership possess certain scholarly credentials or present themselves as experts in the field. Whether the author is qualified to speak on leadership or not, a critical analysis of popular works is necessary to provide a well-rounded critique of the available material. Third, qualified writers often write in the popular arena due to its ability to increase readership, gain popularity, and/or to increase sales. And fourth, popular work warrants a literature review as the discipline of leadership studies interacts deeply with spheres of society outside the purely academic world including business, politics, entertainment industries, and leadership training centers, just to name a few.

Therefore, I will divide my critical review into a popular works section and a scholarly works section. This will allow a well-rounded analysis of literature interacting with leadership and biblical leadership while also keeping the two areas separate to show how each are important for my thesis and analysis of Nehemiah.

Critical Review of Popular Literature

My initial literature review began in the popular world of leadership books that attempted to aid the general population in becoming good leaders or attempted to help train good leaders through using biblical examples. According to Houston (2004), most popular literature assumes Nehemiah as a successful leader due to his inclusion in the Bible, his ability

to directly interact with God, his good intentions towards the people of God, and others writers' opinions that show Nehemiah as a successful leader.[11] However, these assumptions have not been analyzed through leadership theories and can easily become anachronistic and unsubstantiated.[12] Based on this idea, I researched and read a collection of popular books to ascertain whether Houston's statement was correct and to see if popular books included leadership theory or scholarly levels of analysis.

To find popular books about Nehemiah and biblical leadership, I conducted a basic search in the Fall of 2017 on Amazon.com using "Nehemiah leadership" as the search criterion. My intention was to choose the first seven books from the generated list that discussed leadership using Nehemiah as a prime example. However, five out of the first seven books on the list were self-published books on Nehemiah's leadership. Wanting to include published books on Nehemiah's leadership, I chose to select the first three self-published books on Nehemiah's leadership, and then the next four books produced from a publishing company. A list of these seven books can be found in the following footnote and one self-published book and one published book will be analyzed to critique the methodology and information contained within these popular books.[13]

To summarize, I concluded that in all seven books there was almost a complete absence of leadership theory. All had a purpose of helping individuals enhance their leadership capabilities through looking at the biblical character of Nehemiah and gleaning specific leadership characteristics from the biblical text. However, no author cited any research

---

[11] Tom Houston, "Biblical Models of Leadership," *Transformation* 21, no 4 (2004): 227.

[12] Houston, "Biblical Models of Leadership," 227.

[13] <u>Self-Published Books</u>

Gregory Brown, "Nehemiah: Becoming a Godly Leader The Bible Teacher's Guide" (Self-Published: BG Publishing, 2015).

Dave Kraft, "Learning Leadership from Nehemiah" (Self Published: Dave Kraft, 2015).

Loren VanGalder, "Rebuild the Walls: Lessons in Leadership from Nehemiah" (Self-Published: Spiritual Father Publications, 2013).

<u>Published Books</u>

Cyril J. Barber, *Nehemiah and the Dynamics of Effective Leadership* (Neptune, NJ: Lorizeaux Brothers, 1991).

Mark Bowser, *Nehemiah on Leadership* (Issaquah, WA: Made For Success Publishing, 2014).

Ron Cottle, *Studies in Nehemiah* (Columbus, GA: Christian Life Publications, 1997).

Heather Moffitt, ed., "Ezra and Nehemiah: Leadership Matters*," Today in the Word A Ministry of Moody Bible Institute* (Chicago, IL, March 2011).

methods or theory to back up their claims. Instead, it consisted of personal examples that reinforced their hypothesis of how to improve leadership, coupled with a surface level analysis of the biblical text that lacked any theological depth. While it might seem obvious that popular books would lack scholarship, it is important to recognize that all the books surveyed presented as professional sources that held authority to convey leadership tactics to their readers. Recognizing that these authors presented themselves as experts in leadership or theology from various fields and did not include any form of leadership theory presents a problem that must be addressed. Scholarly analysis and education are imperative to prevent misinformation and misdirection from occurring in the popular arena of biblical leadership. Therefore, my research, while scholarly, can aide the popular world in providing analysis of concrete biblical leadership that is rooted in leadership theory for popular and scholarly authors alike.

The first analysis of a published popular book addressing Nehemiah's leadership is Cyril Barber's (1991) *Nehemiah and the Dynamics of Effective Leadership*.[14] This book aims to show that the model of Nehemiah in the Bible provides correlative instruction of effective modern-day leadership. While the author has no formal theological or leadership training, his approach is to take the text of Nehemiah chapter-by-chapter and directly relate it to how leaders today can gain success by acting like Nehemiah. The book is full of anachronism as it never recognizes, nor is even aware of potential issues or bias that using an ancient text in modern times can have. There are glimpses of leadership theory and scholarship, but overall, the text lacks academic source material that would help substantiate the author's claims and does not provide concrete evidence that his claims will affect leadership performance.

As an example, in Barber's (1991) fourth chapter, "Formula For Success," he provides four principles for success that he says come from God.[15] In his own words, Barber says, "it is well for us to observe that God has illustrated the basic principles of success in Nehemiah 3."[16] The four principles are coordination, cooperation, commendation, and completion.[17] Barber expresses that Nehemiah was a successful leader because he was able to coordinate a large and

---

[14] Barber, *Nehemiah and the Dynamics*.
[15] Barber, *Nehemiah and the Dynamics*, 51-58.
[16] Barber, *Nehemiah and the Dynamics*, 51.
[17] Barber, *Nehemiah and the Dynamics*, 51-58.

diverse group of individuals in a complicated building effort. Barber explains Nehemiah's leadership intellect through his precise positioning of individuals near their own homes.[18] However, Barber does not substantiate as to why this act showed good leadership. Instead, Barber attempts to correlate this story with modern, personal examples of coordination at a friend's local church. Instead of substantiating his claim, he took too big of a step and attempted to immediately attach the biblical text to a tangible act that modern leaders can attempt. It is here where Barber, and many other popular writers, run into trouble. There is a need to quickly associate an act of Nehemiah with modern leadership success. Barber attempts to express the idea that if only a leader would act just like Nehemiah, he would immediately be successful. What is missing is leadership discussion that can confirm that statement, coupled with contextual understanding that avoids anachronism.

Barber (1991) concludes his analysis of Nehemiah 3 by giving his understanding of the leadership structure taking place. He says, "In the final analysis, Nehemiah succeeded because he was employee-centered and followed the important basic principles of effective leadership."[19] But Barber failed to tell the reader where in modern leadership these principles came from. There is no discussion as to how these four principles for success are valid or create success in society. He is correct in saying that an employee-centered leadership structure can find success, but how does that translate to modern leadership and how does a leader actuate Nehemiah's efforts in his or her situation? Additionally, Barber does not even describe Nehemiah's employees and how they interact with Nehemiah's leadership. Barber continues throughout his book to give examples of Nehemiah's actions as positive leadership without substantiating those claims with leadership theory or needed discussion. Therefore, while Barber shows hints of leadership analysis as he brings up good points for discussion, he does not follow through on his discussion with descriptive analysis, discussion of modern leadership theory, or how the context of Nehemiah can transfer to his readers.

Another popular book using Nehemiah as an example for proper leadership in modern times is Gregory Brown's (2015) self-published work "Nehemiah: Becoming a Godly Leader the

---

[18] Barber, *Nehemiah and the Dynamics*, 52.
[19] Barber, *Nehemiah and the Dynamics*, 58.

Bible Teacher's Guide."[20] Brown shows his belief of Nehemiah's leadership in his introduction by saying, "Nehemiah and Ezra were great leaders who God called to work together. Nehemiah handled the practical aspects, while Ezra handled the spiritual."[21] However, at the end of this section, Brown says, "The book [Nehemiah] ends on a sour note. Israel would not be faithful to their covenant God, which was a foreshadowing of the later rejection of the Messiah in the Gospels."[22] Brown exemplifies Nehemiah as a great leader, while at the same time shows that Israel, the people Nehemiah is leading, will turn away from God. How is that successful leadership? Brown never truly answers that question in this book, which is indicative of popular works on Nehemiah's leadership. Again, the author makes a statement of leadership, but fails to substantiate that statement with source material, evidence, or a discussion of leadership ideas or theory.

Brown's (2015) book is a self-help book that desires to train would-be godly leaders. The author makes overarching claims of leadership through repetitious statements of "Godly leaders are ____." Brown substantiates a "godly leader" in that "godly leaders have character, and they commonly tackle God-sized problems."[23] Brown lists fifteen statements that describe characteristics of effective leadership that he finds in the text of Nehemiah and then connects those characteristics to effective modern leadership strategy. To Brown, godly leaders are concerned and responsive to problems, constant in prayer, identify with failures of others, strengthened by the promises of God, assertive, learn to wait on God, respectful towards authorities, practice a lifestyle of prayer, valuable followers, planners, humble, practice intentional solitude, practice critical examination, work hard, motivate others, and expect opposition.[24] Brown lists each of these characteristics and then provides a Bible verse that, to him, shows this characteristic in Nehemiah. For example, Brown describes a godly leader as someone who is respectful towards authorities. Brown gives the example of Nehemiah being sad in front of Artaxerxes (Neh 2.1-3) as an example of Nehemiah showing respect to the king.[25]

---

[20] Brown, "Nehemiah: Becoming a Godly."
[21] Brown, "Nehemiah: Becoming a Godly," 16.
[22] Brown, "Nehemiah: Becoming a Godly," 17.
[23] Brown, "Nehemiah: Becoming a Godly," 22.
[24] Brown, "Nehemiah: Becoming a Godly," 36, 59.
[25] Brown, "Nehemiah: Becoming a Godly," 38.

But Brown never discusses how Nehemiah was being respectful, nor how this is a trait of leadership. This statement is full of anachronism because Nehemiah, as a servant, would understand that it was ill-advised to show negative emotions in front of a Persian king,[26] and as the text shows, was so distraught that he could not help but show his emotions (Neh 1.4, 2.2-3). Brown brings in contextual evidence of the position of a cupbearer and mentions that "Persian kings had a reputation of being extremely harsh and oppressive."[27] However, that statement is mostly true of any ancient king and is not portrayed of Artaxerxes in the biblical text (Neh 2.2-4, 8). Brown also never discusses other examples in the text where Nehemiah is not respectful to authority, especially as it pertains to his enemies.

Overall, there is no assessment of whether Brown's (2015) characteristics are in fact characteristics of leadership. There is no connection to leadership studies to validate the author's claim and therefore, the author falls into a classic syllogism where Nehemiah shows a certain characteristic, and therefore, if one has the same characteristic then he or she will be successful at leadership. Another example of a characteristic of successful leadership that Brown portrays is that effective leaders pray.[28] The syllogism goes that Nehemiah prays, Nehemiah is a successful leader, thus if you pray, you will be a successful leader. There is a lack of support to this claim, no recognition of the potential that Nehemiah might have been unsuccessful in aspects of his leadership, nor is there even proof that Nehemiah's prayer showed success.

My critique of popular works on Nehemiah's leadership found a consistent problem where the author lacks depth in describing how the attributes and characteristics of Nehemiah's leadership translate into modern leadership and leadership strategy. Additionally, there is a lack of contextual description and does not provide the reader with adequate context to transfer the leadership qualities of Nehemiah to their own leadership. My review of popular works on Nehemiah shows that there is a need for popular authors to recognize the need for context and my thesis can aid popular writers by providing depth and context as source

---

[26] David J. Shepherd and Christopher J.H. Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* The Two Horizon Old Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2018), 52.
[27] Brown, "Nehemiah: Becoming a Godly," 38.
[28] Brown, "Nehemiah: Becoming a Godly," 25.

material to their writing. As these popular works are seen as authentic and scholarly by their readers, it is imperative that these popular works have substantial information to meet those claims.

Critical Review of Scholarly Literature

After analyzing popular works, I switched my focus to scholarly works of biblical leadership. While aiding popular authors through my research is a viable outcome, the primary focus of this thesis is concentrating on the scholarly use of leadership theory in works concerning biblical leadership. Additionally, it was important for me to ascertain whether there was any biblical inclusion in the field of leadership studies. In the fall of 2018, 111 databases[29] were used with the search phrase "biblical leadership." Upon completing the search, only twenty-seven articles directly connecting with some aspect of biblical leadership were found. Of those twenty-seven articles, only nine were found to have any information with regards to biblical leadership and leadership studies used in my work. Similar results were found in searches on leadership with specific characters in the Bible such as Moses, David, and Nehemiah with few search results where the leadership of a biblical character was analyzed.

I then moved into my full scholarly literature review in the Spring of 2019 where I read extensively on a variety of subjects of leadership. Only twenty-seven articles and no scholarly books interacted with the subject of biblical leadership as it pertains to leadership studies. Therefore, it was concluded that the interaction between biblical studies and leadership studies was absent. Other scholars produced similar studies and found similar results. Dent, Higgins, and Wharf (2005) found that there is "limited scholarship linking religion with leadership."[30] Huizing (2011) performed an online search using ATLA and ProQuest including the terms "leadership theology," "church leadership," and other equivalent terms and yielded twenty-three relevant articles.[31] Dinh et al. (2014) performed a leadership literature review and yielded

---

[29] A full list of databases used is available upon request.
[30] E.B. Dent, M.E. Higgins, & D.M. Wharff, "Spirituality and Leadership: An Empirical Review of Definitions, Distinctions, and Embedded Assumptions," *Leadersh Q* 16, no. 5 (2005): 642.
[31] Huizing, "Bringing Christ," 59.

no sources interacting with religion.[32] Repeating my search on the EBSCO Host database in the Summer of 2020 using the phrase "biblical leadership" as a criterion I found only ten articles on the subject.

As my literature review shows, there is a significant lack of interaction between biblical and leadership studies. However, through my literature review, I came upon several significant articles and books that helped inspire the premise for my thesis and aided in developing my methodology. Several works interacting with leadership, Nehemiah, or both will be discussed to provide understanding for the foundation of my thesis and the process that was developed.

Eisenstadt's *Max Weber: On Charisma and Institution Building*

My interest in biblical leadership began with an introduction to the works of Max Weber on the topic of charisma. My initial intrigue in the connection between leadership studies and biblical leadership originated with a collection of Weber's papers arranged by Eisenstadt (1968) entitled *Max Weber: On Charisma and Institution Building*.[33] Eisenstadt notes, to which I agree, that "the concept of charisma as developed by Weber and its possible further extensions are of crucial importance for understanding of the processes of institution building."[34] Weber proposes that society works within a balance of freedom, creative change, and personal responsibility working within an arena of interpersonal relations, organizations, institutional structures, and "macrosocietal" settings.[35] However, to Weber, the genesis of freedom and change is not possible without an institutional framework that is both freeing, as it allows individuals an environment to explore and grow, but is also limiting at the same time as it imposes rules and structure that allow for the survival of the system, but at a cost to personal freedom and choice.[36]

---

[32] J.E. Dinh, R.G. Lord, W.L. Gardner, J.D. Meuser, R.C. Liden, & J. Hu. "Leadership Theory and Research in the New Millennium: Current Theoretical Trends and Changing Perspectives." *Leadersh Q* 25, no. 1 (2014): 36–62.
[33] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma.*
[34] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* ix.
[35] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* xvi.
[36] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* xvii.

At the forefront of organizations and institutions lies the leader imbued with charisma who has "a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional qualities."[37] Weber (1968) focuses his ideas of charismatic leadership on how the charismatic leader interacts with institutions, organizations, and societies. Eisenstadt interprets Weber by saying:

> The test of any great charismatic leader lies not only in his ability to create a single event or great movement, but also in his ability to leave a continuous impact on an institutional structure – to transform any given institutional setting by infusing into it some of his charismatic vision, by investing the regular, orderly offices, or aspects of social organization, with some of his charismatic qualities and aura.[38]

This is where Weber's work is valuable in analyzing the leadership of Nehemiah. His interaction of charisma with institution, organization, and society allowed me to investigate how leadership might interact with the ancient society of Yehud in the Second Temple period. Eisenstadt's collection of Weber's papers provide the initial questions of how leadership could be used to analyze the biblical leadership of Nehemiah.

Weber's theories and their interaction will be discussed in more detail later in the thesis. Eisenstadt's (1968) *Max Weber: On Charisma and Institution Building* provided a resource where Weber's ideas on charisma were joined together in a single work. A difficulty of Weber's works is that he was never too concerned with organizing his thoughts into a concise theory, nor was he interested in using his ideas specifically for academics. Therefore, what we have in Weber is a large library of papers, thoughts, and discussions that Weber produced for specific projects or conversations. Eisenstadt provides a collection of these thoughts and discussions that bring together individual ideas into a more collective analysis of charisma that Weber had over his career. The work of Weber can easily become convoluted and complex as he tends to string his thoughts along multiple contexts, spheres of society, and discussion

---

[37] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* xviii.
[38] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* xxi.

points that do not have an end goal of coming to conclusions, but instead, he is satisfied in continuing the journey of thought. This makes understanding Weber's remarks difficult.

However, Eisenstadt (1968) does a very good job at providing an extensive introduction that helps to bring Weber's thoughts into a singular path allowing the reader to better understand Weber himself and the concepts that he presents. After Eisenstadt's introduction, he provides selected excerpts from Weber's writings that provide an organized path to understanding Weber's concept of charisma in leadership and in organizations. Eisenstadt begins with a general discussion of charisma and its interaction with social action, relations, and organization. He then provides specific excerpts of Weber that discuss the role of charisma in politics, legal and economic settings, social stratification and organizations, and religion and culture. This is an excellent way to read and understand Weber and his ideas on charisma and leadership. Eisenstadt allowed me to grasp an overview of Weber's ideas so that I could begin an investigation of leadership. This book allowed me to recognize how I could potentially use leadership styles to analyze descriptions of societies in an ancient text like Nehemiah.

Northouse's *Leadership: Theory and Practice*

Most articles or books on leadership written after 2016 will include Northouse's (2016) *Leadership: Theory and Practice* as it is an excellent reference book that gives the scope of leadership study's history, its creation, and the different areas and approaches to leadership that exist in the field at that time.[39] Northouse begins by discussing the various definitions and ways of conceptualizing leadership and notes the complexity of defining leadership.[40] He then moves into an analysis of the various ways in which leadership can be described and used.[41] Northouse then systematically breaks up leadership studies into different approaches that scholars have used to investigate and apply leadership. Specifically, Northouse shows that leadership theory can be approached as an analysis of traits, skills, behaviors, situations, or a

---

[39] Peter Guy Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 2016).
[40] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice,* 1-6.
[41] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice,* 7-17.

combination of these approaches.[42] This was an excellent introduction to leadership as it provided me with the appropriate scaffolding to understand that leadership can be viewed from different perspectives and that scholars who generated theories of leadership also held a specific perspective of how leadership was viewed. Northouse then spends the rest of the book discussing the various leadership theories that are prevalent in modern leadership studies. In each chapter, he takes an individual theory of leadership and provides a basic description of the theory, an analysis of how the theory is structured, an account of the theory's strengths and weaknesses, commentary on how the theory is implemented in real-world situations, gives real-world case studies of how the theory interacts with society, and then provides leadership instruments created specifically for that theory's use.

The structure and organization of Northouse's (2016) book allowed me to grasp most of the field of leadership studies from one source. I recognized the overall scope of leadership studies and was able to use the book as a starting point when describing various theories on leadership and how they interacted with Nehemiah. Northouse also provided a rich bibliography that allowed me to move into other source material when discussing a particular leadership theory. While this book was an integral introduction to the field of leadership, it is important to note that the book also lacked depth in describing each theory. This is understandable, as its purpose is to provide a general overview of leadership studies. However, Northouse describes several "new leadership" theories that are still in their infancy of development. His description of these "new" leadership theories at times was confusing and was not as concrete and understandable as some of his other chapters. Northouse's analysis of adaptive leadership needs further analysis as he only shows a single model of the theory that places adaptive leadership as a sub-set of complexity leadership theory.[43] Northouse does not spend time describing complexity leadership theory which leaves the reader confused. It is understandable that Northouse would not have extensive discussion on emerging leadership theories, however, this should have been something that he explained to the reader.

---

[42] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice,* 19-113.
[43] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice,* 260.

As leadership studies is evolving and growing rapidly, Northouse's (2016) seventh edition of *Leadership: Theory and Practice* needs an eighth edition to include a more robust understanding of emerging leadership theories. Overall, this book was an excellent introduction to the field of leadership studies and provided the means for an initial overview and list of theories to analyze for my thesis. I relied heavily on Northouse's overview, and his work provided a starting point in many descriptions of Nehemiah's leadership.

Wyk & Breytenbach's "The Nature of the Conflict in Ezra-Nehemiah"

As my literature review continued and I began reading articles discussing the text of Nehemiah and Nehemiah's leadership, my mindset changed when I read Wouter van Wyk and A.P.B Breytenbach's (2001) article entitled "The Nature of the Conflict in Ezra-Nehemiah."[44] Wyk and Breytenbach overview the different conflicts that are present in the text of Ezra-Nehemiah and relate them to the context surrounding Yehud in the Second Temple period. This was a necessary article as it bridged the leadership of Nehemiah with the physical, social, political, and religious contexts that surrounded Nehemiah in his campaign. They concluded that much of the external conflict dealing mostly with Nehemiah's portrayed enemies has roots in the internal structure and organization of leadership that existed in Yehud and within the community itself.[45] To the authors, the center of conflict is housed within the interaction of the returnees and those who remained during the captivity. However, as Wyk and Breytenbach say, "the narrative purposefully intends to highlight external conflicts and hid the extent of internal strife within the Judean community."[46]

Wyk and Breytenbach (2001) focused on the writer's specific agenda in the way he wrote and in what information he provided. This exposed the possibility that I could analyze both the leadership of Nehemiah portrayed in the text and leadership attributes that could be analyzed based on Nehemiah as an author and the organization and structure of what he

---

[44] Wouter C. van Wyk Jr. and A.P.B Breytenbach, "The Nature of the Conflict in Ezra-Nehemiah," *HvTSt* 57, no. 3&4 (2001).
[45] Wyk Jr. and Breytenbach, "The Nature of the Conflict," 1255.
[46] Wyk Jr. and Breytenbach, "The Nature of the Conflict," 1262.

wrote. Additionally, this article presented a concept that revolutionized my reading of the text of Nehemiah and brought into focus how modern readers need to read this text. Wyk and Breytenbach (2001) say:

> Within the narrative [of Nehemiah], different socio-historic situations are thus presupposed, yet in some way or another these have all been integrated into one literary presentation. The result is that the reader often gets the impression that the text, in essence, relates one continuous conflict. And this conflict in Ezra-Nehemiah, on the surface at least, seems to be external, reflecting conflict between the Judeans and various outside parties. On closer examination, however, a number of issues in the text render this first impression problematic.[47]

As a modern reader of the text of Nehemiah, I can quickly read the story as a series of continuous events that occur in succession within the same situation, timeframe, or context. This article opened my mind to other possibilities that reminded me that this narrative occurs over decades of time with multiple situations occurring at various times and in different contexts. This would prove integral to my thesis and Wyk and Breytenbach's (2001) article showed a potential path that my thesis could take.

Thomas Et Al.'s "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts"

I then read Thomas, Hebdon, Novicevic, and Hayek's (2015) study "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of the Biblical Account of Nehemiah."[48] The scholars' goal is to prove through empirical study that best leadership practices encompass a variety of leadership styles based on the leader's context. Therefore, the successful leader is one who can augment his or her leadership style to fit the contextual need for leadership, and then quickly adapt again as the context changes. Their research used the text of Nehemiah as a

---

[47] Wyk Jr. and Breytenbach, "The Nature of the Conflict," 1254.
[48] Christopher H. Thomas, Andrew S. Hebdon, Milorad M. Novicevic, and Mario J. Hayek, "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of the Biblical Account of Nehemiah," *J Manag Hist* 21, no. 1 (2015).

basis to prove their empirical claims using a configurational approach[49] of dividing the biblical text into unique contexts and then analyzing the leadership styles present within each context using narrative analysis.[50] Empirical studies on the text of Nehemiah are seldom found in scholarship and an empirical study researching Nehemiah and leadership is also rare. Thomas et al.'s study, while academically robust in the leadership discipline, lacked depth when it came to biblical scholarship. Their focus was to show a decisive and empirically sound methodology of collecting data on ancient texts. Therefore, Nehemiah was simply their subject and not their prime target of analysis.

For example, the authors only break the text of Nehemiah into three contexts 1) Nehemiah's arrival to Yehud as an outsider, 2) Nehemiah building the wall, and 3) Nehemiah's cultural reform.[51] However, this is a gross generalization as there are obvious sub-contexts that drastically differ in action, situation, and leadership. Additionally, the authors do not look at leadership contexts preceding Nehemiah's arrival in Yehud, nor do they differentiate Nehemiah's leadership upon his second return with the cultural reform that occurs before he departs back to Susa. Moreover, they ascribe three theories of leadership to Nehemiah, consisting of authentic leadership theory, servant leadership theory, and transformational leadership theory. They use these leadership theories because they worked nicely with their model and are prevalent in research, not because these theories best reflect Nehemiah's leadership displayed in the text.[52] There is no discussion on other leadership styles that seemingly relate to Nehemiah and his leadership. Therefore, the authors haphazardly chose leadership theories and divided the text into contexts that helped to prove their model, but they did not spend enough time creating a structure that would analyze Nehemiah's leadership into the appropriate contexts that the text displays, nor analyzed Nehemiah's leadership styles properly.

---

[49] D. Miller and P. Friesen, *Organizations* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984*), 1.* As Miller and Friesen describe, "The configurational approach displaced contingency theory as the dominant perspective in the literature on change in the 1980s. This perspective is characterized by its 'holistic' view of organizations, which are conceived as 'composed of tightly interdependent and mutually supportive elements such that the importance of each element can best be understood by making reference to the whole configuration.'"

[50] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 101-102.

[51] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 103.

[52] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 102.

From a biblical stance, the author's overview of the text of Nehemiah is brief and does not provide enough description to warrant an appropriate analysis of biblical leadership.[53] They spend a small amount of time describing the setting and actions of the text of Nehemiah and provide little understanding of scholarly analysis of Nehemiah. This, again, shows that their motive was to substantiate a method of analysis, rather than form conclusions of Nehemiah's leadership. This model provides an excellent structure for my thesis to create a leadership commentary broken into individual contexts of leadership and use a more diverse array of leadership theories to analyze the leadership of Nehemiah in each context that Nehemiah faced.

Eskenazi's *In an Age of Prose*

Eskenazi's *In an Age of Prose: A Literary Approach to Ezra-Nehemiah* provided me with an introduction to the person of Nehemiah, a scholar's critique of his leadership and personality, and an introduction to how the text of Nehemiah was written.[54] She beautifully described the composition of Ezra-Nehemiah as:

> A book written in and for an age of prose. It is a book where the words of Yahweh from the mouth of the prophet have come to a kind of closure…where poetic utterances are suspect (Neh 6:12-13), where even prayers of the heart flow in prose (Ezra 9). It is a book where God does not speak directly and where life is lived in the dailiness of placing stone upon stone.[55]

Her book argues three themes within Ezra-Nehemiah that "deemphasize the heroic and affirm the prosaic."[56] First, according to Eskenazi, Ezra-Nehemiah shifts the focus from biblical leaders to the everyday community in Yehud and their effect on the outcome of Yehud. Second, Ezra-Nehemiah broadens the scope of the meaning of the "house of God" beyond the Temple and into the surrounding city of Jerusalem. Third, Ezra-Nehemiah emphasizes the written text over

---

[53] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 99-101.

[54] Tamara Cohn Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose: A Literary Approach to Ezra-Nehemiah* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988).

[55] Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose*, 1.

[56] Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose*, 2.

the oral tradition as it pertains to authority. In Eskenazi's words, "Ezra-Nehemiah wrests power from charismatic figures and provides a more publicly accessible, and publicly negotiable, source of authority."[57] It is the last theme of Eskenazi's book that I focus on in my review. She spends a considerable amount of time discussing the debate of unity of sources within Ezra-Nehemiah and discusses the legitimacy of compiling Ezra-Nehemiah into one collection. She also focuses her attention on the literary structure of Ezra-Nehemiah.

Eskenazi calls for a fresh assessment of Ezra-Nehemiah to view the book from a literary perspective.[58] As it pertains to a fresh assessment of Nehemiah's leadership, I agree with Eskenazi's view that Nehemiah attempts to remove the focus of leadership from a single individual and place the authority, contribution, and success upon the people of Yehud. This is shown in Nehemiah consistently naming individuals who aided in accomplishing the goals of Nehemiah (Neh 3; 7; 8.4, 7; 9.4; 10.1-27; 11.1-24; 12.1-43; 13.13). Eskenazi promotes the notion that Ezra-Nehemiah, as a collective text, subverts Nehemiah's self-glorification and while initially, he is show as a great hero, the focus is on the community. She argues that the presence of Ezra acts as a contrast to Nehemiah as Ezra "deflates [Nehemiah's] heroic aspirations."[59] Once again, I agree with Eskenazi stance that the text attempts to move away from Nehemiah as hero, however, I believe that the text of Nehemiah in of itself addresses the heroism of Nehemiah and shows that Nehemiah, himself, desires to "[wrest] power from charismatic figures and provides a more publicly accessible, and publicly negotiable, source of authority."[60] My thesis will contend that Nehemiah uses different leadership styles for different leadership contexts and while his desire is to cast off charismatic leadership and become a servant, there are times when this is not possible. There are times that Nehemiah chooses to be charismatic because the contexts surrounding him requires that style of leadership.

Therefore, where Eskenazi sees literary criticism as a needed form of critique to show the contrast of leadership between Nehemiah and Ezra, I see an analysis of leadership style as a different way of explaining Nehemiah's actions and authority. Eskenazi does a fantastic job of

---

[57] Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose*, 2.
[58] Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose*, 5.
[59] Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose*, 79.
[60] Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose*, 2.

showing the literary structure of Ezra-Nehemiah and how literary criticism shows meaning and purpose in the text of Ezra-Nehemiah. I choose a different approach in using leadership theory to ascertain the meaning and purpose of Nehemiah and his leadership as represented in the text.

While Eskenazi and I differ in approach to analyzing Nehemiah's leadership, it was her approach that allowed me to think of other possibilities in analyzing Nehemiah's leadership. Specifically, her portrait of Nehemiah provided me with a characterization of Nehemiah that expressed his emotions, his needs, his successes, and his challenges.[61] Eskenazi characterizes Nehemiah by describing him as "always demanding – of God and of men," that he "rarely waits for an invitation," and that his "belligerent posture towards the world is evident in his military escort."[62] Eskenazi's descriptions are powerful and meaningful and gave me insight into the raw nature of Nehemiah and the drive that the text presents. Eskenazi's depiction of Nehemiah was different than most commentaries that I had read on the character of Nehemiah. It was the first time that I read a characterization of Nehemiah that was so bold and presented both positive and negative attributes of his leadership.

However, an area that Eskenazi does not discuss is Nehemiah's failure. I see this as a miss in Eskenazi's portrait of Nehemiah. She mentions that "[Nehemiah's] success is evident: the city wall is rebuilt; he is remembered."[63] While the text does show Nehemiah having success, it also shows Nehemiah failing. Eskenazi chooses to avoid Nehemiah's second stint as governor and does not address the failing points of Nehemiah's leadership both within his leadership in Yehud and in his ability to create a lasting effect of his vision in Yehud's future.

This book is an excellent work of analysis on the text of Ezra-Nehemiah. It provided me with a starting point to gain information and a perspective on Nehemiah's leadership. It also provided avenues for me to further the analysis of Nehemiah's leadership and move into areas that Eskenazi does not.

---

[61] Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose*, 144-152.
[62] Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose*, 145-146.
[63] Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose*, 145.

Shepherd & Wright's *Ezra and Nehemiah*

Shepherd and Wright's (2018) commentary entitled *Ezra and Nehemiah* is the only commentary on Nehemiah I have found that analyzes the text of Ezra and Nehemiah in a chapter-by-chapter account that also discusses the leadership of Nehemiah in depth.[64] Their commentary describes the text of Ezra-Nehemiah's in the ancient Old Testament context, the pre-Christian Judaic context, as well as placing it in "a wider canonical and overtly Christian context."[65] This allows for context surrounding the text to come into play and be discussed that provides the reader an ability to analyze leadership within the text, but then also to apply that understanding to modern situations. Additionally, Shepherd and Wright (2018) include a chapter at the end of their commentary entitled "Leadership and Ezra-Nehemiah" that brings leadership implications to the text of Ezra-Nehemiah. Here, the authors show that Nehemiah is an excellent text to explore leadership implications because it is "concise and focused on a definable task or set of tasks…"[66]

Shepherd and Wright (2018) reference leadership scholars in their work who provide authentic source material discussing leadership studies. This inclusion of leadership scholars is unique to any commentary of a biblical character that I have read. They reference leadership scholars such as Carlyle, Bass, Northouse, Eskenazi, Bryman, and others that bring validity to their claims of Nehemiah's leadership.[67] Additionally, they devote an entire section to discuss Weber's ideas of leadership and authority and how that applies to Nehemiah.

What is also remarkable about Shepherd and Wright's (2018) commentary is that they discuss the failures of Nehemiah's leadership as a posture for growth and success.[68] This is something that I discuss in my thesis and an aspect of leadership and biblical leadership that is seldom, if ever, discussed. This shows a well-understood view of the notion of leadership and provides a path for modern leaders to learn from an ancient leader's mistakes.

---

[64] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah*.
[65] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 9.
[66] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 188.
[67] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 189, 192, 196.
[68] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 209.

While Shepherd and Wright (2018) provide a chapter in their book to discuss the leadership of Ezra and Nehemiah, they choose not to include leadership implications within their actual commentary. Instead, it is an afterthought that concludes their commentary. This is appropriate for their book as the primary focus is on a full commentary on the text of Ezra-Nehemiah. However, what is needed is a commentary that is focused specifically on the leadership of Nehemiah that includes leadership principles and theory within the commentary itself. Shepherd and Wright do not devote enough time or energy into analyzing Nehemiah's leadership, nor do they discuss the different styles of Nehemiah's leadership at length. Also, Shepherd and Wright ascribe Nehemiah almost solely as a charismatic leader. They rely too much on Weber's ideas and focus on Nehemiah's charisma.[69] A broader lens should be used in analyzing Nehemiah's leadership to include multiple leadership styles. This use of one leadership style is most likely due to looking at the text of Nehemiah as having one context. Therefore, my thesis can help scholars recognize that examples of biblical leadership can occur in multiple contexts warranting multiple styles of leadership.

Fitzsimons' "The Leadership Styles of the Persian Kings in Herodotus' Histories"

While scholarly research that incorporates leadership theory to analyze ancient leaders is rare, Fitzsimons produced a dissertation thesis analyzing the leadership styles of different Persian kings as described by Herodotus in his work *Histories*.[70] Fitzsimons takes the four Persian kings Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius, and Xerxes who Herodotus describes and analyzes their leadership styles using leadership theory. Fitzsimons works off Herodotus' comparison of these four kings as individuals and furthers the work of Herodotus by placing these kings within the context of Persian Imperialism, showing three separate behaviors of violence, uncertainty, and fear that each king portrays, discussing how Herodotus analyzes each king's leadership, and then ascribes each king a particular leadership style.

---

[69] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 204-208.
[70] Stephen Fitzsimons, "The Leadership Styles of the Persian Kings in Herodotus' Histories," PhD diss., The University of Manchester, 2017.

There is a connection of format and methodology between this thesis and mine. Both dissertations use an ancient text's account of a leader or leaders and uses leadership theory to discuss their leadership actions and motives within contextual constraints. In reviewing Fitzsimons' use of leadership theory, I found that he primarily uses leadership descriptions made by Herodotus.[71] Fitzsimons does an excellent job of discussing Herodotus' analysis of leadership portrayed by the four kings of Persia.[72] However, I find it difficult to understand Herodotus' and, therefore, Fitzsimons' definition of "leadership style." Perhaps a better term for describing Herodotus' comparison is "leadership posture" or regular "leadership actions." However, I do not believe that Herodotus accurately portrays each king's leadership style as a methodology in which a leader acts that can be shown through specific characteristics, behaviors, or actions within specific contexts that work towards defining and categorizing a particular style of leadership.

Fitzsimons identifies Herodotus' "style" of leadership for Cyrus as "the benchmark of what a leadership should be."[73] For Cambyses, his style of leadership is described as extreme and obsessive that leads him into a state of madness.[74] Darius is identified as a leader who is without emotion and finds success through keen calculations that are void of empathy for those under his rule.[75] And finally, Xerxes is portrayed as one who is overcome with fear and compensates due to that fear with violence and inappropriate behavior unfit for leadership.[76] These descriptions are not styles of leadership, but are actions and postures that can describe reasons as to why a particular king led in a certain way.

Modern leadership theory is not addressed at all in the thesis until the concluding chapter. Therefore, while it is shown in the introduction as a prominent theme of the thesis, modern leadership style is relegated to end as an afterthought for Fitzsimons' readers to quickly ponder. He offers three modern leadership styles that possibly connect with the four

---

[71] Fitzsimons, "The Leadership Styles," 117-131.
[72] Fitzsimons, "The Leadership Styles," 117-131.
[73] Fitzsimons, "The Leadership Styles," 133.
[74] Fitzsimons, "The Leadership Styles," 133.
[75] Fitzsimons, "The Leadership Styles," 133.
[76] Fitzsimons, "The Leadership Styles," 133.

kings. Fitzsimons discuses Hook's "event-making man,"[77] charismatic leadership, and transformational leadership and interacts each theory's level of involvement with each of the four kings. To Fitzsimons, only Cyrus possesses Hook's "event making man," and ascribes the other three leaders as non-leaders due to their failures.[78] Fitzsimons breaks Weber's thoughts on charismatic leadership into a discussion of a person with extraordinary gifts, crisis, radical solutions, committed followers, and continued success. Once again, only Cyrus shows any charismatic attributes, and the other three kings are once again cancelled as charismatic leaders. And finally, Fitzsimons' analysis of transformational leadership in relation to the four Persian kings is mostly absent. He shows transformation potential based on the level of relationships the different kings make. The more developed the relationship, the higher the transformational potential. However, none of the kings make deep relationships and therefore the analysis is mostly moot.[79]

Overall, Fitzsimons does a very good job at analyzing Herodotus and his description of leadership in the four Persian kings. His thesis provides a contribution to history and analyzing ancient writers. However, from a leadership studies perspective, his analysis of modern leadership theory is basic, unsubstantial, and works more as an afterthought to his thesis. There is very little to glean from his use of contexts to describe leadership styles and his ability to analyze ancient leaders through a lens of modern leadership studies.

Methodology of Thesis

Parameters of the Thesis

To focus my attention on the analysis of leadership in the biblical text of Nehemiah, I intentionally avoided discussion of authorship, correct dating of the text, textual variants, debates on translation, or any other criticisms or debates on the construction of the text of Nehemiah. While these discussions are important, they can become a distraction to the focus

---

[77] Sidney Hook, *The Hero in History: A Study in Limitation & Possibility* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2019).
[78] Fitzsimons, "The Leadership Styles," 138.
[79] Fitzsimons, "The Leadership Styles," 142.

of this thesis. Therefore, this thesis will focus on leadership and will not enter or contend with other worthy debates included in biblical studies.

I am choosing to use the final form of the text of Nehemiah, and the final form of the entire biblical text, as it is presented in modern print. Also, I choose to use the Masoretic Text as a reference, however, my discussion will use the English NRSV translation of the Bible as my primary source of biblical text. I choose to use the final form of the biblical text and a modern English translation as the primary biblical source material for several reasons. First, as a dual-disciplined thesis, I am unable to spend the necessary time becoming an expert on the Hebrew language or be able to read from the original texts. While I have experience with the Hebrew language and the text, I am not an expert and therefore choose a modern text that I can work with in a scholarly manner. Second, as this thesis interacts with modern leadership principles and has a purpose of being used for modern leadership training, the final form is chosen so that it can interact with modern readers in and out of academic environments. And third, the modern text separates the text of Ezra and Nehemiah into two documents. This allows me to focus on the text of Nehemiah alone. As the text of Ezra only mentiones Nehemiah once (Ezra 2.2), it is important to me to solely focus on the text of Nehemiah with the purpose of analyzing his leadership and the context surrounding his leadership as presented in the final form of the text. Instead of analyzing both the texts of Ezra and Nehemiah, I can focus only on the text of Nehemiah that produces a deeper analysis of his leadership.

Additionally, I recognize that the final form of Nehemiah presents the story of Nehemiah from different perspectives. I note the difficulty in unifying a text that alternates from the first-person account of Nehemiah (Neh 1.1-7.5; 12.27-43; 13.4-31) to the narration of the text with Nehemiah as a character in the story (Neh 7.6-12.26; 12.44-13.3). The change of perspective also changes how Nehemiah's leadership is portrayed. In his first-person account we are presented with a more forceful description of Nehemiah's charisma and emotions as he tries not only to persuade his followers but also tries to persuade his readers of his vision and reasons behind his actions. The narration of Nehemiah's leadership provides more detail surrounding events where Nehemiah is less involved and shows the product of Nehemiah's leadership. This makes it difficult to analyze Nehemiah's leadership using leadership theory

when Nehemiah is not telling the story, when he is in the background of the narrative, or when he is not present at all. However, I will attempt to analyze Nehemiah's leadership through the transition of the first and third person accounts of Nehemiah's leadership. I will also analyze Nehemiah's leadership, the effects of Nehemiah's leadership, and analyze the installation of leadership principles by Nehemiah within his followers in sections of the text where Nehemiah is not directly leading or is not present in the text.

Methods of Analysis

As I began to analyze the biblical text of Nehemiah and attempted to dissect the specific leadership style that Nehemiah presented, I found myself in constant agitation, attempting to relegate his leadership to a single style of leadership. His actions were blatantly charismatic in one situation, whole-heartedly servile in the next, transformative at certain times, and portraying a myriad of other styles blended throughout. I found his leadership style, as portrayed in the text, successful in some endeavors, while in others his goal unobtained. Nehemiah acted compassionately and sacrificially to one populace (Neh 1.1-4, 5.1-5, 14-19, 8.9-12, 12.1-46), attempted to manipulate and coerce another to reach his vision (Neh 5.6-13, 9.1-5, 10.28-39, 11.1-2), was seemingly xenophobic to members of his own people and foreigners (Neh 7.61-65, 9.1-2, 13.1-9,15-30), and combative, as a good general should be, towards his opposition who threatened to annihilate him and his followers (Neh 4.1-5, 15-23, 6.1-19). What I found in the text of Nehemiah was the antithesis of a singular stream of leadership due to a multifaceted contextual environment present during Nehemiah's leadership. My thought process altered after reading Wyk and Breytenbach's (2001) words:

> Within the narrative [of Nehemiah], different socio-historic situations are thus presupposed, yet in some way or another these have all been integrated into one literary presentation. The result is that the reader often gets the impression that the text, in essence, relates one continuous conflict.[80]

---

[80] Wyk Jr. and Breytenbach, "The Nature of the Conflict," 1254.

I recognized that the text of Nehemiah was not one contiguous story, set in one context, warranting a singular, linear leadership style. Instead, the text of Nehemiah was filled with varying contextual situations involving different characters, different emotions, and different challenges requiring different forms of leadership.

With this overarching concept understood, I then incorporated Thomas, Hebdon, Novicevic, and Hayek's (2015) study into my model of analyzing Nehemiah's leadership.[81] This study provided me the catalyst for the development of a process that uses both biblical studies and leadership studies together to explain the leadership of Nehemiah. Furthermore, the process can be performed on many biblical texts in the future with successful results. Where Thomas et al. started a process of dividing the text into individual contexts, this thesis will expound on this idea and bring it into better use upon the biblical text. The premise here holds that the biblical text of Nehemiah is not a continuous process of leadership that has a singular leadership style being used throughout. Instead, it is a collection of twenty-six contextual situations, each presenting a unique environment to which Nehemiah used different leadership styles to engage each situation effectively. Each of these contexts within the Scripture are held within one of eight phases of time within the biblical text.

In my analysis of the text, I began by dividing the text into phases — each including a section of the text that either had a unique location or primary task that solidified itself as its own group of time and actions. Next, I subdivided each phase into unique contexts that represent individual actions or scenes involving a specific act of leadership that Nehemiah portrays. With the text divided into sectioned contexts, each context was then analyzed as an individual act of leadership to which one or several leadership styles were attributed, producing a road of leadership involving one contextual situation after the next with its own style of leadership attached to it. With this process in place, an analysis of each context pieces together the pathway of leadership of Nehemiah helping us to understand the leadership of Nehemiah as a whole.

---

[81] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts."

Construction of a Leadership Commentary

To best analyze each context and draw conclusions on Nehemiah's leadership within each context a pioneering leadership commentary was created that moved through the text of Nehemiah, context-by-context, and discussed Nehemiah's leadership using leadership theory. Themed commentaries have gained some popularity in scholarship over the last decade or so. While I have yet to find a themed commentary on leadership that uses leadership theory, principles on creating themed commentaries are represented in other commentaries that focus on specific topics. For example, there are several commentary series that focus on preaching that take a book of the Bible and specifically address how a preacher might use the text in their sermons. Examples include the *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* series,[82] and the *Kerux Commentaries: A Commentary for Biblical Preaching and Teaching* series.[83] These series focus the readers' attention on how one might use the biblical text in their sermons or in leading Bible studies. Additionally, there are other commentaries that focus on a specific ideology, such as women's' studies and the Bible,[84] that can be used to see common trends in the construction of a themed commentary.

The important aspect that I gleaned from reviewing these works is the intentionality placed on the subject of the commentary. It is important to focus the commentary on the subject at hand and to not stray into areas of general commentary. This is difficult when attempting to provide background information and context to reinforce the subject matter. These themed commentaries aided in the construction of my themed commentary on the leadership of Nehemiah as it helped me stay focused on the leadership material.

---

[82] Mark A. Throntveit, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, ed. James Luther Mays (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012).

[83] Jeffery Arthurs and Gregory MaGee, *Ephesians: A Commentary for Biblical Preaching and Teaching* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2021).

[84] See Carol A. Newsom, Sharon H. Ringe, and Jacqueline E. Lapsley, eds., *Women's Bible Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012). This includes a chapter on Ezra-Nehemiah by Eskenazi.

Use of Leadership Theory

Leadership theory is used to properly analyze the leadership of Nehemiah in the biblical text. Modern leadership studies aids in analyzing leaders and leadership situations through incorporating varying styles of leadership with specific leaders or leadership environments. There are multiple leadership theories that have been created each with ideas of how leadership is constructed, attributes and characteristics that leaders express, empirical data to support findings, and examples of when leadership styles are shown in society. While there are multiple theories, six theories were found that best analyze the leadership of Nehemiah. Path-goal leadership theory, transformational leadership theory, charismatic leadership theory, authentic leadership theory, servant leadership theory, and adaptive leadership theory will be used to analyzed Nehemiah's leadership. Within each theory, three different models of that leadership theory will be used to study Nehemiah's leadership. Each model is unique and discusses certain aspects of the leadership theory.

Three models of each leadership theory were chosen because using one model does not properly analyze the full scope of leadership of an ancient character such as Nehemiah. Each model focuses on different aspects of the leadership theory that can be used in different contexts of Nehemiah's leadership. Attempting to analyze Nehemiah's leadership through one model would widely underrepresent the scope of the leadership theory and would not provide adequate examination of Nehemiah's leadership acts. Each leadership theory and model will be overviewed in Chapter 1 to provide a basis for how Nehemiah's leadership will be evaluated. Then, different models of leadership will be used in each context of the leadership commentary to focus on the specific leadership act of Nehemiah and to analyze the style of leadership Nehemiah uses in each context. This will provide a holistic evaluation of Nehemiah's leadership and further explain his use of different leadership styles in different contexts.

The Use of "Other" and the Context of Nehemiah's Leadership

It is important to recognize the specific theme of the "other" that Nehemiah incorporates into his leadership. This will be a theme that he uses often and, therefore, it is important to discuss the idea as part of the methodology of this thesis. Johannes Fabian (1990) says, "Our ways of making the Other are ways of making ourselves. The need to go there. . .is really our desire to be here (to find or defend our position in the world)."[85] Often we define ourselves and mark our identity by what we are not. This action is not limited to one religion, empire, or people group, but to a degree, most group identity finds delineation between what belongs and what is deemed "other."[86] In doing so, we require an object contrary to ourselves as proof that we are in fact not that object, but instead the opposite. In Second Temple Judaism, there is a desire to bring the Jewish people together as a collective entity (Ezra 2; 3.2-11; 6.13-22; Neh 2.17-18; 3; 5.1-13; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11.1-24; 12.27-43). With dispersion, captivity, and a destroyed Temple occurring in this time, the Jewish people desired, as Flusser (2020) explains, "to view the totality of the Jewish people as an organic whole, almost like a single body that was chosen by God."[87] However, there are different opinions as to the boundaries and definitions of a Jewish person. The methods to unify typically include a collection of like-people exhibiting similarities and a stark contrast of "other" to define the group. Nash (1989) shows that the most fundamental way to separate the "in-group" from the "other" is through names.[88] As Nash says, "Names not only mark group boundaries, they also implicate relations of super- and subordination, relative power, status, economic and more worth positions of the different entities."[89] Bourdieu (1991) agrees noting that using names institutes identity, which

---

[85] Johannes Fabian, "Presence and Representation: The Other and Anthropological Writing," *Crit Inq* 16, no. 4 (Summer, 1990): 756-757.

[86] Edward Breuer, "Particularity and Pluralism: Judaism and the 'Other' in an Age of Dialogue," *Rel Ed* 90, no. 2 (Spring 1995): 281.

[87] David Flusser, *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*, vol. 2, trans. Azzan Yadin (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2020), 8.

[88] Manning Nash, *The Cauldron of Ethnicity in the Modern World* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 9.

[89] Nash, *The Cauldron of Ethnicity,* 9.

then creates boundaries.[90] We will see Nehemiah implement the use of names and titles in several ways.

First, how he introduces his enemies is significant as he does not mention their leadership titles, but instead uses ethnicity as a marker that makes them seemingly "other" to the Jewish people (Neh 2.19). Additionally, the importance of names comes into importance as he names certain people or groups of people in his lists and purposefully leaves out certain people who are no longer people of God, but instead outcasts designated as "other" (Neh 3, 7.4-73, 10.1-27, 11.3-36, 12.1-26, 12.28-43). Producing boundaries then allows enough separation to create distinctions based on preconceptions of self, further defining our self through identifying what we are not.[91] Knoppers (2007) explains the creation of the "other" to articulate one's own *ethnos*, while at the same time recognizing the *ethne* that is the opposite.[92]

This process comes naturally as a way of self-preservation — a method distinguishing ourselves from others. Different circumstances project different levels of intensity as to how the "other" is viewed. In some instances, it is not a matter of exaggerating differences, but instead, is more focused on self-definition based on who else is in the world.[93] The use of the "other" also aids in explaining the wrong in the world, and counteractively, providing exoneration to us as we are presented, in our own personal view, as the hero, the good, and the better. We naturally want to be the hero in our own story, and every hero needs a villain.

The use of the "other" also works to generate boundaries along ethnic and racial lines defining collective groups based on genealogy or geography. Struggles along ethnic lines heavily influenced the landscape of Yehud as different "ethnic" groups jockeyed for claim upon the

---

[90] Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, ed. John B. Thompson, trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 120.

[91] Jeremiah W. Cataldo, "The Other: Sociological Perspectives in a Postcolonial Age," in *Imagining the Other and Constructing Israelite Identity in the Early Second Temple Period*, eds. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana V. Edelman, 1-19. *Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies* (London, UK: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016), 12.

[92] Gary N. Knoppers, "Nehemiah and Sanballat: The Enemy Without or Within?" in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.,* eds. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainer Albertz, 305-331 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 308.

[93] Ehud Ben Zvi, "Othering, Selfing, 'Boundarying' and 'Cross-Boundarying' as Interwoven with Socially Shared Memories: Some Observations," in *Imagining the Other and Constructing Israelite Identity in the Early Second Temple Period,* eds. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana V. Edelman, 20-40. *Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies* (London, UK: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016), 20.

land.[94] We must recognize that arbitrarily defined ethnic groups mask diversity on multiple levels. As intersectional theory amply demonstrates, we cannot work with the illusion that ethnic groups are/were holistically intact, with each member of the group somehow synonymous to the next.[95] Additionally, the malleability of ethnicity is widely debated in scholarship. Ethnicity can be seen as rigid and unmovable, linked to primordial origins, bloodlines, and birth records.[96] On the other hand, ethnicity can also be thought of as fluid, as it ascribes to situations that are continually shifting due to political, social, and economic changes in a particular culture or society. Here, ethnicity is seen more as a system of allegiance that can fluctuate based on necessity. This debate of rigidity versus fluidity of the term "ethnicity" does not only move in scholarly circles, but also is interpreted differently by different readers based on their definition and life experiences.

Only since the 1940s has the word "ethnic" or "ethnicity" been used in social theory.[97] Thus, the word is a recent neologism, and one that does not map easily onto ancient biblical texts.[98] However, as Horrell (2018),[99] Hannaford (1996),[100] Kidd (2006),[101] and Miller (2012)[102] show, contemporary theories of race and ethnicity incorporate into our analysis of people groups found in the biblical text. Each author brings to focus the idea of race and ethnicity altering the accurate portrayal of ancient life and skewing analysis to a modern connotation that does not work within the confines of ancient mentality or social living.

---

[94] David G. Horrell, "Introduction," in *Ethnicity, Race, Religion: Identities and Ideologies in Early Jewish and Christian Texts, and in Modern Biblical Interpretation,* eds. Katherine M. Hockey and David G. Horrell, 1-20 (London, UK: T & T Clark, 2018), 1-6.

[95] Horrell, "Introduction," 1-6.

[96] Knoppers, "Nehemiah and Sanballat," 306-307.

[97] Horrell, "Introduction," 1-6.

[98] Horrell, "Introduction," 1-6.

[99] Horrell, "Introduction," 1-6.

[100] Ivan Hannaford, *Race: The History of an Idea in the West* (Washington, DC/Baltimore, MD: Woodrow Wilson Center/John Hopkins University Press, 1996), 3-4.

[101] Colin Kidd, *The Forging of Races: Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600-2000* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 1-2.

[102] David M. Miller, "Ethnicity Comes of Age: An Overview of Twentieth-Century Terms for *Ioudaios*," *CurBR* 10 (2012): 296.

Weber uses ethnicity to describe a group of people based primarily on a belief centered on a common origin.**[103]** Therefore, different ethnicities are groups of people all sharing a common belief. This is far too vague a definition—though for the purposes of this study, ethnicity could be seen in terms of divisions of religious beliefs to a point, though the definition of religion is also debated. Schermerhorn (1978) offers a structured definition of ethnicity**: "**An ethnic group is a collectivity within a larger society having real or putative common ancestry, memories of a shared historical past, and a cultural focus on one or more symbolic elements defined as the epitome of their peoplehood."[104] However, there is something tautologous about the idea that an ethnicity needs to have a collective sense of "being a people" in order to be classified within the same ethnic group.[105] This definition at least provides us with vocabulary that is useful to help group people together. But again, the definition becomes blurred in our case as the people in Yehud had a common ancestry (even in the case of Samaria), but whose historical past saw division.[106] Brubaker (2004) discards the entire attempt of dividing people into ethnic groups and instead desires to pursue "how, when, and why people interpret social experiences in racial, ethnic, or national terms."[107] He sees people arranged within ethnic groups as radically diverse from one another, to the point where the need for a group is pointless and misleading.[108]

For this thesis, we will draw on Schermerhorn's (1978) definition based on common ancestry, common history, and common symbols to rally around. As we recognize the great diversity that groups mentioned in Ezra and Nehemiah portray, we will use these groupings to analyze the events and actions of leadership depicted to grasp a better meaning of the context in which Nehemiah led. I will, however, continue to remember the words of Langille (2015) who states, "ethnic identity is under constant negotiation – boundaries change, people's ethnic

---

[103] Max Weber, "Race Relations," in *Selections in Translation,* ed. W.G. Runciman (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 364. Weber gives a definition of ethnic groups, "which cherish a belief in their common origins of such as kind that it provides a basis for the creation of a community."
[104] Richard A. Schermerhorn, *Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research (*Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1978)*,* 12.
[105] Schermerhorn, *Comparative Ethnic Relations,* 12.
[106] Horrell, "Introduction," 1-6.
[107] Rogers Brubaker, *Ethnicity Without Groups* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 87.
[108] Brubaker, *Ethnicity Without Groups*, 87.

identities can change, and people can hold more than one ethnic identity. In this sense, ethnicity is not defined by biological terms."[109]

Different biblical texts bring the notion of ethnicity to light as it sometimes sections off people groups into specific ethnic clusters. At times, different biblical texts show the "people of God"[110] as the hero, and any other group is downgraded to compliant, enemy, or villain.[111] Examples of this ethnic division include Canaanites (Gen 13.7; 24.3; Exod 23.23), Egyptians (Gen 43.32; Exod 1.13; Josh 24.7), Philistines (Gen 26.15; Judg 10.7), a variety of enemies from various kingdoms and nations (Gen 14.1-20; Exod 17.8-15; Num 21.21-35; Josh 7.1-12; 11.1-23), Samaritans (2 Kgs 17.29; Matt 10.5), and into the New Testament with various gentile groups such as Romans and Greeks (John 7.35).

It is important to recognize that there is a high level of malleability in Nehemiah's concept of "other" as it pertains to ethnicity.[112] With foreigners, at least to Nehemiah's definition, being allowed to join the community (Ezra 6.21; Neh 10.29) the lines are blurred as far as ethnic division in post-exilic Yehud.[113] The influx of diverse peoples into Yehud played a crucial role in the area economically, socially, and politically.[114] Therefore, Nehemiah sought to clarify the lines by creating a very clear, bipolar line of who were the true people of Yehud and who were not that directly interacts with his leadership style and strategy (Neh 3.5; 4.4; 7.64-65; 9.2; 11; 13).[115]

---

[109] Tim Langille, "Hybrids, Purification, and Multidirectional Memory in Ezra-Nehemiah," in *History, Memory, Hebrew Scriptures: A Festschrift for Ehud Ben Zvi*, eds. Ian Douglas and Diana V. Edelman, 375-386 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, Inc., 2015), 382.

[110] In some instances, this means Abraham, the Israelites, the Jews, or even the church in the New Testament

[111] Examples of this would be Isaac and Ishmael in Gen 21, Joseph's rise to the throne of Egypt in Gen 41, Moses' dominance and heroism freeing the Israelites from Egypt in Exod 7-11, the destruction of Jericho and subsequent conquest of the North in Josh 6 and 11, and the many examples found where Israel overcomes great adversity in battle in Judg, 1-2 Sam, 1-2 Kgs, and 1-2 Chr.

[112] Saul M. Olyan, "Purity Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah as a Tool to Reconstitute the Community," *JSJ* 35, no. 1 (2004): 1.

[113] Ranier Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period Volume II: From the Exile to the Maccabees,* trans. John Bowden (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 449.

[114] Lee I. Levine, *Jerusalem: Portraits of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E. – 70 C.E.)* (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 2002), 6.

[115] Knoppers, "Nehemiah and Sanballat," 309.

Nehemiah's accepted group of people, הַיְּהוּדִים, consisted of individuals who were tied to the land, but who do not necessarily live there (Neh 1.1-2).[116] The use of the Hebrew word הַיְּהוּדִים, translated as "The Judeans," brings with it political, ethnic, and organizational meaning that incorporates these individuals with the "people of Israel," but separates the focus of the people from the more religious connotation when using the word יִשְׂרְאֵלִית, "Israelite" (Neh 1.6; 2.10; 13.18).[117] Most of the time Nehemiah uses the term הַיְּהוּדִים to designate the protagonists of his story (Neh 2.16; 3.33-34; 4.6; 5.1, 17; 6.6; 13.23). He also uses the terms "Judah," יְהוּדָה (Neh 2.5; 4.10; 5.14), "house of Judah, בֵּית יְהוּדָה (Neh 4.16), and the "children of Judah," מִבְּנֵי יְהוּדָה (Neh 11.4, 25; 13.16) to designate his "in-group" of people.[118] There are other references to those accepted by Nehemiah that carry different connotations. These include "the people of the providence who came up out of the captivity," בְּנֵי הַמְּדִינָה הָעֹלִים מִשְּׁבִי הַגּוֹלָה (Neh 7.6), and tribal references to Yehud and Benjamin as specific people groups who found favor with Nehemiah (Neh 11.4, 7, 20, 25, 31, 36).

Where there are positive references to "the Judeans" whom Nehemiah accepts, there is a second group of "others" whom Nehemiah rejects, helping solidify the identity of the true Judean in Nehemiah's mind. Olyan sees three reasons why these individuals or groups are presented as "other" or opposition to Nehemiah.[119] First, there are alleged acts (such as idolatry, sexual offense, or moral violation) that these individuals practice with aliens seen as תּוֹעֵבָה, "an abomination," to Ezra that Nehemiah uses to separate the "other" (Ezra 9.1-2, 10-12, 14).[120] Second, Olyan shows the "other" engaging in marriage with aliens that are against Nehemiah's reading of the law (Neh 13.28-30).[121] And third, Nehemiah shows the male alien as a continual pollution to Jewish ritual (Neh 13.4-9).[122] These individuals or groups were not enemies stemming from the Achaemenid king, but instead came from neighboring leaders, Yahwists, and even fellow Jews. Nehemiah uses terms such as לַגּוֹיִם or הַגּוֹיִם, "the nations" (Neh

---

[116] Knoppers, "Nehemiah and Sanballat," 309.

[117] Donna Laird, *Negotiating Power in Ezra-Nehemiah* (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2016), 138.

[118] Knoppers, "Nehemiah and Sanballat," 311.

[119] Olyan, "Purity Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah," 4-5.

[120] Olyan, "Purity Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah," 4-5.

[121] Olyan, "Purity Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah," 4-5.

[122] Olyan, "Purity Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah," 4-5.

5.8, 9, 17; 6.6; 13.26), or הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר־סְבִיבֹתֵינוּ, "the nations roundabout us" (Neh 5.17; 6.16). Additionally, Nehemiah distinguishes the "other" from the people of Yehud by using the term or a variant of the term used by both Ezra and Nehemiah, the "peoples of the lands," עַמֵּי הָאֲרָצֹת (Ezra 3.3; 4.4; 9.1, 2, 11, 14; 10.2, 11; Neh 9.24, 30; 10:29, 31, 32). Nehemiah also distinguishes the people of Yehud from the "other" by directly naming other ethnicities including the אַשְׁדּוֹדִים (Ashdodites), עַרְבִים (Arabs), and עַמֹּנִים (Ammonites) (Neh 4.7). Finally, Nehemiah directly uses the term אֹיֵב, to designate his enemies (Neh 4.15; 5.9; 6.1, 16).

As Nehemiah produced his clear dividing line between his allies and the "other," it is also important to investigate the motives for him doing so. Most leaders, both in antiquity and in modern times, desire power and support. We will see as we analyze leadership studies, the need to gain power can work from a collective drive or from selfish aims. Nehemiah is no different as he was a leader who came to an unfamiliar environment, quickly recognized the political, social, and religious condition of Yehud, and quickly began to gain control of the situation (Neh 2.11-16). Nehemiah first gains support from the town leadership in Jerusalem and motivates them to rebuild the wall (Neh 2.17-18). We will also see Nehemiah eliciting support by first providing support to the Levites through ensuring their pay and their status (Neh 8.9-1; 9.4-5; 10.1-29, 38-40; 12.27-30; 13.10-13, 29-31).

As Sanballat acquired allies in Tobiah, Geshem, and other key leaders of Yehud, Nehemiah also gained loyal support to create alliances and push his agenda (Neh 2.17-18; 6.15-19; 8.4-7; 9.4-5; 10.1-27; 11. 3-24; 12.1-21, 27-43; 13.13).[123] This coincided with Nehemiah's desire to win over the populace through showing that the actions of Nehemiah's opposition were against the well-being of the people of Jerusalem and, therefore, should be opposed by the masses.[124] Just as Sanballat attempted a smear campaign to tarnish Nehemiah's name on several occasions (Neh 2.19; 4.1, 7-8; 6.2, 5-7, 10-12), so too did Nehemiah begin his own campaign to show the negative consequences of Sanballat and his allies (Neh 4.4, 14; 6.8, 14). Another strategy to gain support by Nehemiah was to draw away the people of Yehud from those who associated with those deemed "alien." Nehemiah deals harshly with נָשִׁים נָכְרִיּוֹת or

---

[123] Levine, *Jerusalem,* 28.
[124] Knoppers, "Nehemiah and Sanballat," 313.

הַנָּשִׁים הַנָּכְרִיּוֹת, "foreign wives" or "foreign women" (Neh 13.26-27; Ezra 10.2, 10-11, 14, 17-18, 44) and he outlaws mixed marriages to prevent the loss of heritage and language (Neh 13.23-26; 1 Kgs 11.1-11). An interesting use of זֶרַע הַקֹּדֶשׁ, "holy seed," is introduced by Ezra showing the necessity of dividing the people of Yehud from the "peoples of the land" based on preserving a lineage created by God that man should not taint (Ezra 9.2).[125]

All these actions work to create a binary view of ethnic identity that drives a wedge between those whom Nehemiah sees as the "true people of Yehud" and the "other."[126] Again, we must be reminded that these divisions along ethnic lines by Nehemiah included men who were YHWH worshipers and the women and children associated with them. Adams (2014) shows that Nehemiah required these expulsions, punishments, and divisions to protect ancestral property rights, ensure authority and financial control over the region, to strengthen the future for the people of Yehud, and to prevent any future issues due to inheritance claims.[127] Hoglund (1992) will go as far as to show Nehemiah's tight control over the region indicates imperial policy.[128]

Grabbe (2007) remarks on grouping individuals in the biblical text by showing that our understanding of groups in the ancient Near East is based on words and texts and not on the direct account of people who lived in that time.[129] We are not afforded direct individualized accounts confirmed by multiple sources from different vantage points and from different "groups." Instead, we are confined to broken pieces of stories, letters, and texts that inevitably include bias, opinion, and agenda as its primary driving force. This bias is not to be lamented. For while it may limit what can be said of the text, if those biases did not exist then nothing would have been recorded. Their subjectivity is what gives us evidence in the first place.

---

[125] Samuel L. Adams, *Social and Economic Life in Second Temple Judea* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 26.
[126] Knoppers, "Nehemiah and Sanballat," 315.
[127] Adams, *Social and Economic Life,* 26-27.
[128] Kenneth G. Hoglund, *Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series* 125 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 239.
[129] Lester L. Grabbe, *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2007), 19.

Using Herodotus to Show Persia as the "Other"

As we have discussed Nehemiah's use of the other, it is important to recognize that other ancient writers have also incorporated the concept of "other" into their writings as well. This further solidifies the concept that context dictates leader behavior. Just as the context surrounding Yehud during the time of Nehemiah dictates Nehemiah's leadership style and how he treats his followers and his enemies, so too does the context surrounding the world of Herodotus dictate his views on the Persians.

Our source material on Persian society is limited and is subjected to the personal agenda of the writer. This is specifically true of Herodotus in his description of the Persians. Van Seters shows that Herodotus's primary agenda is to determine who is responsible for provoking hostilities that leeds to the Persian wars.[130] Van Seters also shows that Herodotus directly investigates his source material and employs new critical methods of research that places him above other researchers of history at that time.[131] Additionally, Herodotus tends to take a more historical approach to his writing that de-mythicizes the heroism of history and instead, attempts to provide an accurate chronological record of events.[132] However, Herodotus is a Greek and, as a writer, is not void of exaggeration and fanciful depiction of other cultures.[133]

This practice is exemplified in Herodotus' depiction of the Persian having a fanatical desire to assimilate any foreign customs into their daily lives.[134] There are customary ties to tribes in which the Persian empire is formed as well as customs of people groups in which they conquered. Examples during the Second Temple period described by Herodotus includes the Persians adopting the dress and fashion of the Medes and wearing the Egyptian breastplate during war.[135] Herodotus also castigates their taste for lust and sensual pleasures borrowed from the Greeks, as well as the embrace of polygamy and the use of concubines as customary

---

[130] John Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983), 2.
[131] Van Seters, *In Search of History,* 9.
[132] Van Seters, *In Search of History,* 13.
[133] Van Seters, *In Search of History,* 23.
[134] Herodotus, *Histories,* trans. George Rawlinson (Coppell, TX: Digireads.com Publishing, 2016), 64.
[135] Herodotus, *Histories,* 64.

practice.[136] Olmstead adds that Persian art began to find influence from Assyrian, Hittite, Babylonian, Greek, and Egyptian artists and art forms.[137] Herodotus presents the Persians as having an insatiable desire for luxury, desiring the best of everything and stopping at nothing to obtain it. They drank heavily, ate lavishly, and overall saw entertainment as the only goal in life.[138]

Additionally, Herodotus depicts the Persians as having an inappropriate hierarchical caste system presenting those low on the ladder as "other" and contrasting them with a valid Greek system of power and social interaction. The hierarchal system finds everyone accepted but placed upon an order. Those who can trace their lineage to an original tribe are more esteemed and the farther away from the original tribe the lower the person goes on the social order. The underlying ideal that drives this system is simple: Persians are better than everyone else and the more "Persian" someone is the better they are in life.[139]

Herodotus also drives at the patriarchal nature of Persians and characterizes beyond historical record their enormous importance on bearing male children and raising them to be ideal Persians. Second only to military prowess, the Persian male is venerated by the number of male children he produces. Once the male turns five he is dedicated to learn three aspects of life — to ride a horse, to learn to use a bow, and to always speak the truth.[140] Herodotus shows the limits of the Persian people as inferior to the Greek child as they find education of the mind and body as equally important. Instead, to a Persian, there is nothing more honorable than to be a valiant warrior and an honest citizen. In the words of Herodotus, "The most disgraceful thing in the world, they think, is to tell a lie; the next worst, to owe a debt."[141] Patriarchal leadership and a desire for honesty finds direct agreement with the biblical text (Gen 3.16; Exod 18.21; 20.16; Lev 19.11; 1 Kgs 9.4-5; Ps 78.72; Prov 6.16-20; 11.1; 12.22; 16.28; 19.1; Isa 33.15). However, other aspects of Persian high society, such as its fashion, desire for luxury, and

---

[136] Herodotus, *Histories,* 64.
[137] A.T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1948), 67.
[138] Herodotus, *Histories,* 63.
[139] Herodotus, *Histories,* 64.
[140] Herodotus, *Histories,* 64.
[141] Herodotus, *Histories,* 65.

exorbitant taste for drink and lust, are in direct contention to biblical Judaism (Exod 20.17; Deut 5.21; Num 15.39; Job 31.1; Ps 101.3; Prov 6.25; 31.30; Isa 3.16-26; Jer 13.27).

It is important to recognize Herodotus's attempt to "other" the Persians, just as Nehemiah attempts to "other" the Samaritans and his adversaries. This further shows the important use of the "other" to highlight one's own agenda and stature.

Outline of Chapters

The thesis begins in Chapter One with an overview of leadership studies to familiarize the reader with the necessary details of the discipline and to recognize its potential contribution to the biblical study of Nehemiah's leadership. A short introduction of the genre of leadership studies will be given followed by an overview of the six specific leadership theories that will be used to analyze the leadership of Nehemiah. Within each leadership theory, three models of that theory will be discussed as they will serve as the primary means in which to analyze Nehemiah's use of each leadership theory. Chapter Two provides an innovative approach to analyzing biblical leadership by offering a leadership commentary on the book of Nehemiah which incorporates the leadership models and leadership theories discussed in Chapter One. Chapter Three then provides analysis and discussion on Nehemiah's leadership by describing his overall use of each leadership theory and model to analyze Nehemiah's leadership. Finally, the last section makes concluding remarks of Nehemiah's leadership and provides a description of this thesis' contributions to academia.

Chapter 1

Walking the Path of Leadership Studies:

Overview and Analysis

We search eagerly for leadership yet seek to cage and tame it. We recoil from power yet we are bewitched or titillated by it. We devour books on power — power in the office, power in the bedroom, power in the corridors. Connoisseurs of power purport to teach about it — what it is, how to get it, how to use it, how to "gain total control" over "everything around you." We think up new terms for power: clout, wallop, muscle. We measure the power of the aides of Great Men by the number of yards between their offices and that of Number One. If authority made the powerful "giddy, proud, and vain," as Samuel Butler wrote, today it entrances both the seekers of power and the powerless.[1]

- James MacGregor Burns

This chapter will begin by providing a short description of the popularity and need for leadership studies, a basic overview of the discipline itself, a discussion on the definitions of leadership, and a concise overview of the history of leadership theory. Once a general overview is complete, most of this chapter will be devoted to giving detailed information of the specific theories that will be used to analyze Nehemiah's leadership. Through my study of leadership theory, I selected six theories of leadership that best analyze Nehemiah's leadership. These theories are path-goal leadership, transformational leadership, charismatic leadership, authentic leadership, servant leadership, and adaptive leadership.

Each theory will be evaluated separately, and four areas of each theory will be discussed. First, the general characteristics of the theory will be discussed to provide an overall scope to the theory. Second, three models of the theory will be selected and examined. Third, I will discuss how this theory and these models will be used to evaluate Nehemiah's leadership. And fourth, a list of characteristics and key terms that encompass the theory will be given that

---

[1] James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership* (New York, NY: Harper Perennial Political Classics, 2010), 9.

will be used in the leadership commentary to help decide the primary styles of leadership that Nehemiah represents in each context. These characteristics and terms come from the models used from each leadership theory. The information gained from these six theories will provide help analyze Nehemiah's leadership.

The Popularity & Use of Leadership

The study of leadership and the training of leadership principles has increased in popularity and use in recent decades. The increase in focus on leadership produced the need for a discipline in academia centered on the study of leadership. The popularity of the study of leadership is evidenced by the attention it has gained in scholarship. To give a general idea of the increase in popularity of leadership studies, Storey (2004) calculated only 136 articles on leadership in 1970 compared to 1105 articles in 1990, and 10,062 articles on leadership in 2001.[2] Middlehurst (2008) conducted a search on the internet in 2003 that gave just over 11,000 books on the subject of leadership.[3] In just five years, Middlehurst conducted the same search and found that the number of books doubled to 25,784 books on the topic of leadership.[4] In performing my own search in March of 2023 using "leadership" in the title, searching peer-reviewed journals on EBSCOhost, I found 318 articles produced in the 1950s, 417 articles in the 1960s, 961 articles in the 1970s, 1,387 articles in the 1980s, 3,880 articles in the 1990s, 15,545 articles in the 2000s, and 29,953 articles in the 2010s. While some of these numbers could be attributed to an increase in population, increase in academic journals, or due to better record keeping, interest in leadership has grown significantly. This provides excellent testing grounds to use the field of leadership studies to analyze leadership portrayed in ancient texts using modern leadership theory.

---

[2] John Storey, "Signs of Change: 'Damned Rascals' and Beyond," in *Leadership in Organizations: Current Issues and Key Trends,* ed. John Storey, 3-16 (London, UK: Routledge, 2004), 7.

[3] Robin Middlehurst, "Not enough Science or Not enough Learning? Exploring the Gaps Between Leadership Theory and Practice," *High Educ Q* 62, no. 4 (2008): 323.

[4] Middlehurst, "Not enough Science," 323.

Overview of Leadership Studies

Different theories on leadership and leadership practice coming from a variety of disciplines arose throughout the ages that addressed the question, "What makes a good leader and how do leaders create a better world?" The discipline of leadership studies incorporates psychologists, sociologists, and historians. There are political analysists, educators, businesspeople, and philosophers. Politicians, military commanders, schoolteachers, religious leaders, and social activists all come giving their idea of the appropriate model of leadership.[5] They come with psychological profiles, empirical studies, and business journals backed by economic forecasts and managerial questionnaires. Each sphere of academia brings its own questions, its own conclusions hoped for, and its own set of methodological tools to analyze leadership.

For years, each discipline took upon the study of leadership within their own sphere, and very little cooperative study was conducted. Therefore, each sphere continued to develop their theories and models to the point where concrete, evidence-based data on leadership was produced. Then, in the 1990s, the time had come where the study of leadership could stand on its own.[6]

Many scholars resisted the call for leadership studies to gain its independence and were hesitant to enter their work into an arena that may be unsuccessful.[7] It was Burns (2010) who said, "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth."[8] It would make sense that scholars hesitated to enter such a new discipline that was teeming with confusion and lacking structure. The discipline began with psychological scholars desiring to discern what made good leaders, and business researchers who investigated how they could

---

[5] S. Alexander Haslam, Stephen D. Reicher, and Michael J. Platow, *The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence, and Power* (Hove, East Sussex, UK: Psychology Press, 2011), 1.

[6] Ronald E. Riggio, "Introduction: The Dialogue of Disciplines," in *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*, ed. Michael Harvey and Ronald E. Riggio (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2011), 15.

[7] J. Thomas Wren, "Of History and Leadership: The Discipline of History and the Understanding of Leadership," in *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*, eds. Michael Harvey and Ronald E. Riggio, 66-81 (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2011), 66.

[8] Burns, *Leadership*, 2.

train better leaders to strengthen the economic bottom line.[9] These two disciplines had obvious differences in approach. Soon other disciplines would join including the fields of the arts, humanities, sciences, social sciences, and the applied fields.[10] Moreover, the discipline, one that predominantly began in the United States, quickly became a global collaboration. Therefore, with a global infusion of scholars studying leadership, the discipline exploded with various thoughts and theories on the topic of leadership.[11]

The trans-disciplinary property of leadership studies opens it up to inconsistencies.[12] These come not only in the theories presented, but also in the methodologies used to generate conclusions. There is little to do to help the fact that leadership studies is a multifaceted, complex discipline. However, implementation of structure, organization, interdisciplinary communication, and mediation brings order and balance to the maturing discipline.

The Search for a Definition of Leadership

In 1991, Rost surveyed articles and books from 1900 to 1990 and found over 200 unique definitions to the term "leadership."[13] These definitions run the gambit of terms including, but not exclusive to: control, centralization of power, traits, groups, individuals, influences, unity, initiation, service, transformation, and transaction.[14] The term "leader" could mean a specific individual in a specific role at a specific time, while at the same time stand for an existential mindset developing a concept of a group or organization coming together to achieve collective goals.[15] We see definitions from Hollander (1992) that say "Leadership is a process not a

---

[9] Carolyn M. Cunningham, Michael Hazel, and Tracey J. Hayes, "Communication and Leadership 2020: Intersectional, Mindful, and Digital," *Commun Res Trends* 39, no. 1 (2020): 5.

[10] Cunningham, et al., "Communication and Leadership 2020," 5.

[11] Cunningham, et al., "Communication and Leadership 2020," 5.

[12] William E. Allen, "Leadership Theory: A Different Conceptual Approach," *J Leadersh Educ* (April 2018): 149.

[13] J.C. Rost, *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century* (New York, NY: Praeger, 1991), 37-96.

[14] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 2-5.

[15] Joanne B. Ciulla, "Handmaiden and Queen: What Philosophers Find in the Question: 'What is a Leader?'" in *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*, eds. Michael Harvey and Ronald E. Riggio, 54-65 (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2011), 58.

person."[16] This is coupled with Plato's (1945) understanding that leadership is made not born.[17] However, there are definitions that would say the exact opposite — that leaders are born, not crafted, and that there are certain traits that are inborn in certain individuals that make them leaders.[18] When it comes to actually defining leadership there is a wide diversity of purposes. Some, such as Greenleaf,[19] see leadership providing the basic needs for others with the heart of a servant at its core.[20] However, others, such as Burns (2010), see leadership as bringing in followers uniting a group together under certain values, motivating the entire group to move forward.[21] Some see leadership as a polarizing entity, whereas others see it as unifying.[22] W.G. Bennis (2007) says, "The subject is vast, amorphous, slippery and above all, desperately important."[23]

While some might see it as vital to come to a consensus on one agreed definition of leadership, I do not see that as a necessity. I see the vast array of definitions of leadership to be a positive tool in the analysis and development of leadership and leadership studies. To attempt to limit the idea of leadership to one definition constricts the diversity of the term that is inherently involved. Therefore, instead of debating over which definition is correct or better, I stress that we should begin asking how the various definitions of leadership can come together to produce a better understanding of leadership and how leadership can apply to the analysis of past leaders, the development of today's leaders, and the production of leadership ideas, training, and structures that will produce better leadership in the future. Therefore, several definitions and concepts of leadership will be used throughout this thesis to show the richness of the discipline.

---

[16] Edwin P. Hollander, "The Essential Interdependence of Leadership and Followership," *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 1, no. 2 (1992): 71.

[17] Plato, *The Republic*, trans. F.M. Cornford (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1945), 64.

[18] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 7.

[19] Robert K. Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership: A Journey Into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* (New York, NY: Paulist Press, 2002).

[20] Houston, "Biblical Models of Leadership," 227.

[21] Burns, *Leadership,* 19.

[22] Bernard M. Bass, *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*, 3rd ed. (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1990), 11.

[23] Warren G. Bennis, "The Challenges of Leadership in the Modern World: Introduction to the Special Issue." *Am Psychol* 62, no. 1 (2007): 2.

Leadership Theories — Brief History, Timeline, & Overview

Before using specific leadership theories to analyze the leadership of Nehemiah, it is important to gain a holistic understanding of the variety of theories present in leadership studies. Like other disciplines, the process of theory development occurred mostly along a linear timeline where one theory of leadership led to another. Evolving thoughts and deeper research provided opportunities for new areas of theory to develop. While there is overlap of time when it comes to leadership theory development, it seems that the evolution of leadership theory occurred in chunks all centering on a primary focus until that focus was radically shifted to another. Table 1 (below) provides a broad overview of the different eras of leadership theory and a list of theories that are included in each era. While there are many leadership theories, I will briefly summarize thirteen theories which represent many of the established theories of leadership at the present time and provide the reader with an understanding of the general scope of leadership studies. This will aid the reader when specific leadership theories are applied to the text of Nehemiah. Specifically, six theories are shown to interact with the leadership of Nehemiah and will be discussed in detail.

Table 1: Eras of Leadership and Theories Associated

Era Associated	Leadership Theory
Leader-Centered Era (Pre-1900-1980)	Trait/Great Man Theory
	Skills Theory
	Behavioral Theory
Context Era (1940-1980)	Situational Theory
	Contingency Theory
	Path-Goal Theory
Relational Era (1970-Present)	Leader-Member Exchange Theory
	Transformational Leadership Theory
	Charismatic Leadership Theory
Integrated Era Of New Leadership (2000-Present)	Authentic Leadership Theory
	Servant Leadership Theory
	Adaptive Leadership Theory
	Complexity Leadership Theory[24]

Trait/Great Man Theory – This leadership theory began in the 1840s with Carlyle's (2019) "great man" who possessed inherent traits of leadership that made him the perfect leader.[25] It was the work of great men (emphasis on males during this time) who built the world and it was their natural abilities, or traits, that allowed leadership to exist.[26] The idea of the "great man" would fade away to be replaced with trait theory that would dominate the leadership scene until the 1980s.[27] Leadership, according to trait theory, is driven by the leader's personality, or the sum of his or her most dominating and important traits. Those specific traits come from within — residing within the person from birth – and are hard-wired, innate, and impossible to alter.[28] The research focus is on identifying the specific traits necessary for successful leadership to ensue.

---

[24] Albert S. King, "Evolution of Leadership Theory," *Vikalpa* 15, no. 2 (1990): 44-45. I used King's table of evolutionary stages of leadership theory to construct a simplified overview of the eras of leadership and the theories included in each era.

[25] Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and The Heroic in History* (Whithorn, UK: Anodos Books, 2019), 1-2.

[26] Bass, *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook*, 37.

[27] Cunningham, et al., "Communication and Leadership 2020," 5.

[28] Andromachi Athanasopoulou and Sue Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their Links to EC," in *Developing Leaders by Executive Coaching: Practice and Evidence*, 117-142, 1st ed. (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2015), 119.

Skills Theory - Skills theory allows the possibility that anyone can develop specific skills necessary to become an effective leader.[29] Skills theory looks at the specific skills leaders possess. The theory does not discount personality but sees it taking a backseat to knowledge and trainable abilities that primarily drive effective leadership.[30] While this theory was short lived in the 1950s, the theory was reawakened in the early 2000s as the United States Army took interest in developing needed skills in their officers.[31]

Behavioral Theory – Behavioral or styles theory focuses not on what the leader has, whether that be traits or skills, but instead focuses on what the leader does. The key question researchers in this field focus on is whether successful leaders act differently than unsuccessful leaders or non-leaders alike.[32] Based on this question, researchers work to identify types of behaviors that leaders engage in that improve follower effectiveness.[33] A key innovation within this theory is that of follower involvement.[34] The approach helps leaders see that their actions have causal effects upon subordinates in regards to the task appointed, and their relational interaction with individuals involved in the task.[35]

Situational Theory - Situational theory dismisses leader-centered approaches and instead recognizes that leaders must lead in and adapt to specific situations that arise in leadership. This requires the leader to assess follower needs and then act accordingly based on both the physical and relational needs of the follower.[36] Adaptation is key for the leader as he or she analyzes the situation and environment at hand and adapts his or her leadership style to fit the

---

[29] Athanasopoulou and Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their," 120.

[30] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 43.

[31] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 47.

[32] Sharon C. Hoffman, "Credible Leadership—In the Eyes of the Follower: A Historical Review of Leadership Theory Throughout the Twentieth Century in the United States," PhD diss., The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska, 2008, 126.

[33] Alan Bryman, *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations* (London, UK: Sage Publications, 1993), 4.

[34] Athanasopoulou and Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their," 121.

[35] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice,* 79.

[36] Cunningham, et al., "Communication and Leadership 2020," 6.

situation.[37] Because adaptation is such a necessary quality for the leader, it is important to recognize that leadership traits and styles of behavior are not omitted within situational theory, but instead coincide with the environment to create a better opportunity for all to be successful.[38]

Contingency Theory - Contingency theory proposes that leadership effectiveness is situationally contingent. This means that certain leadership patterns will produce success in certain situations, but not necessarily others.[39] Theorists such as Fiedler (1972)[40] stress that there is no universally accepted style of leadership that works for all situations.[41] Continency theory shows that leaders will not be effective in every situation, thus it is not appropriate for a leader to alter his or her style in order to fit every situation.[42] Instead, leaders should understand and focus on which situations work best for their leadership style.[43]

Path-Goal Theory - Path-goal theory focuses less on the situation or leader behavior and more on creating conditions for subordinates to find success.[44] Path-goal theory concentrates on how leaders use their style of leadership to meet employees' motivational needs so that they can accomplish their goals. If employees believe that their job has a high probability of success, and that they will benefit personally from their work, then their motivation to work will be greater.[45] Therefore, the leader's responsibility in path-goal theory is to find ways to show that it is in the best interests of employees to obtain their goals and that their goals are in fact obtainable.[46] The leader hopes to increase "personal pay-offs to subordinates for work-goal

---

[37] Athanasopoulou and Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their," 123.

[38] Michael Foley, "Doing Leadership: Types, Styles, and Contingency," in *Political Leadership: Themes, Contexts, and Critiques*, 31-58 (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014), 48.

[39] Bryman, *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations,* 11.

[40] F.E. Fiedler, "The Effects of Leadership Training and Experience: A Contingency Model Interpretation," *Admin Sci Q* 17, no. 4 (1972): 453-470.

[41] Bryman, *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations,* 11.

[42] Athanasopoulou and Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their," 124-125.

[43] Athanasopoulou and Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their," 124-125.

[44] Robert J. House, "A Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness," *Adm Sci Q* 16 (1971): 321-338.

[45] Athanasopoulou and Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their," 126.

[46] Chester A. Schriesheim and Linda L. Neider, "Path-Goal Leadership Theory: The Long and Winding Road," *Leadersh Q* 7, no. 3 (1996): 317-318.

attainment and make the path to these pay-offs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing road blocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction en route."[47] Leader effectiveness is still contingent upon the leader's ability and style to work with certain employees and situations; however, the focus is on the follower's wellbeing. Additionally, the leader is responsible for providing an environment where the follower not only finds financial well-being, but also emotional and mental wellbeing.[48]

Leader-Member Exchange Theory - According to leader-member exchange theory, leaders create unique dyadic relationships with each specific subordinate.[49] Leadership occurs, therefore, during these relationships where the leader bestows information, motivation, trust, and benevolence upon the follower, who in turn, reciprocates that trust and performs. This theory focuses on the relationship quality of two individuals, the leader and a single follower.[50] The higher the quality of relationship the more effective the leader.[51] A low-quality relationship between leader and follower produces a more transactional relationship.[52] This form of relationship is produced when the leader wants production from his or her subordinate and therefore, generates a transaction that is mutually beneficial.[53] However, a high-quality relationship between leader and follower will produce a more transformational experience where there is sharing of influence, trust, and respect that continually transforms the follower into the image of the leader to a certain degree.[54] The goal of the leader should always be to engender high-quality relationships with all employees where everyone is in the "in- group." A

---

[47] Schriesheim and Neider, "Path-Goal Leadership Theory," 317.

[48] Patterson Dwyer Ellis, "Contrasting Jesus' Leadership Style with that of Selected Old Testament Prophets, Pre-Christian Leaders, and His Contemporaries," (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1994), 77-78.

[49] Marissa L. Shuffler, C. Shawn Burke, William S. Kramer, and Eduardo Salas, "Leading Teams: Past, Present, and Future Perspectives," in *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership*, ed. Michael G. Ramsey, 144-166 (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2012), 148.

[50] Athanasopoulou and Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their," 126.

[51] Ronald E. Riggio, "The Management Perspective: Engineering Effective Leadership in Organizations," in *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*, eds. Michael Harvey and Ronald E. Riggio, 119-128 (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2011), 123.

[52] Shuffler, et al., "Leading Teams," 148.

[53] Shuffler, et al., "Leading Teams," 148.

[54] Shuffler, et al., "Leading Teams," 148.

leader's effort should work to develop each unique relationship in different ways so that the subordinate feels accepted within the group and feels connected with his or her leader.

Transformational Leadership Theory – When transformation is taken down to its central elements, the primary notion is change. Whether it is altering follower motivation points, enhancing productivity, training leaders in different mindsets, or rallying followers to a leader's ideals, change is the force that drives the transformation desired.[55] Therefore, a leader's role is to be a change agent with the purpose of bringing followers through positive change that benefits the organization, the leader, and the follower altogether. Leaders help to expose the shortcomings of the status quo and then help guide the follower to better thoughts and actions that produce results.[56] Northouse (2016) provides a concise description of transformational leadership, "Transformational leadership is the process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower. This type of leader is attentive to the needs and motives of followers and tries to help followers reach their fullest potential."[57] Therefore, the defining characteristic of transformational leadership is that leaders create positive change that extends beyond transactional leadership that benefits most aspects of the leader, the follower, and the organization's well-being.

Charismatic Leadership Theory – Charismatic leaders shock and motivate, inspire and encourage, bring others out of crisis, and can reach an individual at an emotional level, moving them to act. Qualities of awe, power, and mystique are typically present within charismatic leaders. It has been argued by Haslam, Reicher, and Platow (2011) that the most essential quality of leadership is charisma, and that all other aspects of leadership pale in comparison.[58] There tends to be an extra measure of esteem and energy when the charismatic leader enters the arena and a specific feeling that the individual has the power to alter the course of the

---

[55] Catalina Andra Rosca and Dan Florin Stanescu, "The Influence of Values on the Leadership Style," *Manag Dynam Knowl Econ* 2, no. 3 (2014): 481.

[56] Silke Astrid Eisenbeiß and Sabine Boerner, "A Double-Edged Sword: Transformational Leadership and Individual Creativity," *Br J Manag* 24, no. 1 (2013): 56.

[57] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 162.

[58] Haslam et al., *The New Psychology of Leadership,* 101.

world, does not live by the rules, and is there to get the job done. They are there to disrupt the status quo, to rebuff the typical, and to bring unbalance to a system that needs shaking.[59] They are the instrument of change required in a society looking for answers and in desperate need for something new.[60] There are key aspects that are congruent with most definitions of charismatic leadership. First, charismatic leaders possess certain characteristics or behaviors indicative of successful leadership. Second, charismatic leaders possess a clear vision that is established and realized through action. Third, leaders require followers, and therefore, an importance is placed on followers and their needs. Fourth, the aim of leaders is to promote transformation and change within their followers towards the vision presented. Fifth, leaders and followers interact within a specific environment and situation with a view to the mitigation of crisis. And sixth, this process typically is one that works through unconventional means and an overturning of the status quo.

Authentic Leadership Theory - Authentic leadership theory arose out of the aftermath of sociological upheaval after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, business corruption scandals in several large corporations such as Enron, and destructive failures in the banking industry in the early twenty-first century.[61] A call for authentic leadership became palpable as societies, businesses, followers, and leaders alike desired to find real and true leadership devoid of corruption, unethical behavior, and misguided trust.[62] A leadership theory was born that defined authenticity, as Kernis (2003) puts it, "as the unobstructed operation of one's true, or core, self in one's daily enterprise."[63] Therefore, authentic leaders are those possessing the self-knowledge needed to formulate a personal point of view, allowing them to be clear about their convictions and values.[64] Leaders advance if they learn more about themselves and are

---

[59] Jay A. Conger, *The Charismatic Leader: Behind the Mystique of Exceptional Leadership* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1989), 4.

[60] Michael Harvey, "Questioning Leadership: An Integrative Model," in *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*, eds. Michael Harvey and Ronald E. Riggio, 199-230 (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2011), 215.

[61] Nijole Petkeviciute, Violeta Barvydiene, and Natasija Surpikiene, "Authentic Leadership: Leader-Follower Relationship Genesis," *Transform Bus Econ* 17, no. 1 (2018): 84.

[62] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 84.

[63] Michael H. Kernis, "Towards a Conceptualization of Optimal Self-Esteem," *Psychol Inq* 14, no. 1 (2003): 1-26.

[64] Athanasopoulou and Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their," 130.

introspective in the pursuit of being true to one's self.[65] Authentic leaders are self-referential and true to their inner morals regardless of the surrounding populace. Leaders offer a transparent view of their true self to their followers which engenders deeper leader-member relationships, allowing for goals and objectives to be mutually accomplished.[66] The overall goal is to produce true change in a system where everyone works within a construct of proper values and vision that continues the spread of authenticity.[67]

Servant Leadership Theory – Servant leadership, in its essence, is about withdrawing power from leaders and bestowing power upon the follower through the act of service.[68] Servant leadership theory is about teamwork and community as the leader strives to grow and develop everyone within his or her team by working shoulder-to-shoulder in lifting the other up to greater heights.[69] The development of the leader is based on generating a servant instead of being a focal point. Development includes growing the leader's empathy towards his or her followers, being attentive to the concerns of subordinates, and empowering followers first by helping them reach their full capacity.[70] A leader's acts of service is coupled with a high level of integrity, a strong code of ethical behavior, and a position of humility for the greater good of others that models the very behavior desired for followers to enact.[71]

Adaptive and Complexity Leadership Theories – A complication arises when new leadership theories are created in that different researchers name and categorize leadership theories differently. This is the case when it comes to describing complexity leadership theory and adaptive leadership theory. Athanasopoulou and Dobson (2015) differentiate the two and see

---

[65] Athanasopoulou and Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their," 130.
[66] Athanasopoulou and Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their," 130.
[67] P. Alex Linley, Susan Harrington, Fred O. Walumbwa, Jakari Griffith, Robert B. Kaiser, Robert E. Kaplan, Tara S. Wernsing, Bruce J. Avolio, and Nicola Garcea, "What is Authentic Leadership Development?" In *Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology and Work*, vol. 1, eds. P. Alex Linley, Susan Harrington, and Nicola Garcea, 39-52 (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2009), 44.
[68] Cunningham, et al., "Communication and Leadership 2020," 7.
[69] Cunningham, et al., "Communication and Leadership 2020," 7.
[70] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 225-226.
[71] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 225-226.

two directions of leadership thought reflected in them.[72] Northouse (2016), however, describes adaptive leadership as an element or subset of complexity leadership theory.[73] Finally, Uhl-Bien and Marion (2009) see adaptive leadership theory and complexity leadership as parallel theories that are in constant connection with one another.[74]

Complexity leadership theory sees leadership arising from complex interactions of individuals working together within a group or organization.[75] The theory looks at individual interactions between one person and another and considers context and situational factors that produce the need for leaders to adapt depending on the situation at hand. Therefore, leadership does not develop from a programmed or engineered platform but is generated through an ongoing series of adaptive situations that the leader engages with daily.[76] Complexity theory redirects focus away from leader traits and behaviors and focuses the attention of leadership upon the day-to-day activity of the changing field.[77]

Adaptive leaders encourage followers to face the challenges of change and provide a safe working environment where they learn new ways of adapting to the multi-faceted environment of assumptions, beliefs, attitudes, behaviors, and perceptions that they meet within their workspace.[78] Adaptive theory focuses on how leaders aid followers to face the adaptive challenges that arise within their jobs.[79] The work environment is too complex for a specific style of leader to emerge and consistently find success. Therefore, leaders are required to help followers navigate the convoluted work environment.

---

[72] Athanasopoulou and Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their," 138.

[73] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 260.

[74] Mary Uhl-Bien and Russ Marion, "Complexity Leadership in Bureaucratic Forms of Organizing: A Meso Model," *Leadersh Q* 20 (2009): 631-650.

[75] Riggio, "The Management Perspective," 125-126.

[76] Riggio, "The Management Perspective," 125-126.

[77] Benyamin B. Lichtenstein, Mary Uhl-Bien, Russ Marion, Anson Seers, James Douglas Orton, and Craig Schreiber, "Complexity Leadership Theory: An Interactive Perspective on Leading in Complex Adaptive Systems," *E:CO* 8, no. 4 (2006): 3.

[78] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 258.

[79] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 258.

Analysis of Leadership Theories Used to Evaluate Nehemiah

Six leadership theories will be used to evaluate Nehemiah's leadership. Each theory will be explored individually by 1) analyzing three models of the leadership theory, 2) describing how theory will be used to evaluate Nehemiah's leadership, and 3) generating a list of characteristics and key terms indicative of the leadership theory. For each theory, models were chosen that are specific to that leadership theory, are well reviewed and critiqued, and together, provide a well-rounded analysis of the leadership theory altogether. It is important to analyze Nehemiah's leadership using several models to properly analyze his leadership according to each leadership theory. Additionally, a list of characteristics and key terms will be generated that will be used in the leadership commentary to help ascertain the primary styles of leadership used by Nehemiah in each context. These characteristics and key terms come from the models of scholars of that leadership style chosen to analyze Nehemiah. In future research, I intend to use coding structures and empirical tools to code each context of Nehemiah's leadership to better ascertain the leadership style portrayed in each context. This thesis provides the preliminary work to show the viability of using leadership commentary and leadership theory to analyze biblical leadership.

Path-Goal Leadership Theory

Model #1 – Vroom's Expectancy Theory of Motivation

Path-goal theory was born out of Vroom's (1995) initial thoughts on motivation and his expectancy theory.[80] Vroom states that followers will work harder if they believe that increasing their work efforts will lead to higher performance and better rewards.[81] Vroom's theory includes three components. The first aspect of Vroom's theory is expectancy. This refers to the idea that if someone raises their efforts in a task, then there will be an increase in

---

[80] Victor H. Vroom, *Work and Motivation* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995), 20.
[81] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 20.

reward.[82] Therefore, if an individual believes this to be true, then he or she will be motivated to work harder, expecting a higher reward. The second aspect of Vroom's theory is instrumentality. Here, followers believe that if they accomplish the expectations put forth by their leader, then they will be rewarded for their efforts. Therefore, rewards are then based on job performance.[83] The third aspect of Vroom's theory is valence. Valence interacts with the level of value the follower places on the reward. If the follower has a high value of the reward he or she will receive, that individual will work harder to obtain it.[84] Therefore, Vroom's theory shows that a person will be more motivated and a better worker if they work harder, meet expectations, and highly value the reward they receive. A leader, therefore, needs to motivate the follower to work harder by creating high expectations for their followers and provide compensations that would be deemed highly valuable to each individual follower.

This model shows strengths in its simplicity. Having three terms each having basic cause-and-effect processes allows for ease in transferring these principles to modern and ancient leaders and evaluating if expectancy, instrumentality, and valence produce higher work ethics, output, and satisfaction. However, the model's simplicity is also its shortcoming. There is an inherent concept within the theory that each follower will accept the reward equally and that any reward will produce increased satisfaction and work output. There is very little discussion about different follower personalities and their connection with different approaches to expectancy, instrumentality, and valence. Therefore, while this theory will be efficient in analyzing Nehemiah to see if he uses expectancy, instrumentality, and valence, this model will only present a surface level analysis of Nehemiah's leadership.

Model #2 – House & Mitchell's Path-Goal Theory of Leadership

House and Mitchell (1974) found that "leaders are effective because of their impact on subordinates' motivation, ability to perform effectively and satisfactions."[85] Therefore, the

---

[82] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 20.
[83] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 19.
[84] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 18.
[85] Robert J. House and T.R. Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," *Organizational Effectiveness Research Programs,* Office of Naval Research (April, 1975): 1.

theory's major focus is concerned with "how the leader influences the subordinates' perception of their work goals, personal goals and paths to goal attainment."[86] Their study found that the strategic function of a leader consisted of six actions: 1) recognizing the needs of followers and motivating followers to desired outcomes, 2) increasing personal follower payoffs to satisfy follower needs, 3) making the path for followers to obtain those payoffs easier through coaching and direction, 4) helping followers clarify expectations, 5) reducing follower frustrations and barriers that they come into contact with in their professional and personal lives, and 6) increasing opportunities for personal growth and satisfaction that are related to their effective performance.[87] Therefore, the leader facilitates a path where followers can obtain payoffs which will in turn create motivation for the follower to work harder and more efficiently as he or she sees value in the path that has been created.[88]

The benefits of House and Mitchell's (1974) path-goal theory lies in its efficient list of actions that path-goal leaders use to produce effective followers. Each action can be directly applied to the actions of Nehemiah to see if Nehemiah shows path-goal leadership in different contexts. The challenge in House and Mitchell's model is that it lacks description of how leaders achieve these actions of path-goal leadership. For instance, the third action describes a path-goal leader making an easier path for a follower to navigate. However, it does not explain how a leader creates an easier path, nor does it differentiate between different situations where different challenges are present. Therefore, these actions are based in general circumstances and cannot be applied specifically to different challenges that arise in unique leadership contexts. This is a common challenge in this model that will prevent us from evaluating how Nehemiah produces follower output within a path-goal process. However, this theory will allow us to evaluate if Nehemiah acts as a path-goal leader and why this style of leadership is preferred in different contexts.

---

[86] House and Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," 1.
[87] House and Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," 5.
[88] House and Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," 5.

Model #3 – House's Reformulated Path-Goal Theory of Leadership

House, twenty-five years after his creation of the first theory of path-goal leadership, reformulated his theory in 1996 to include over forty empirical studies conducted on path-goal leadership and brought in additional concepts that warranted investigation.[89] House (1996) did not necessarily change any of his previous positions on path-goal theory, but instead offered a new vantage point in which to view leadership that was more applicable to modern leadership.[90] The new perspective looked more at contingency where leaders and followers move through a lens of work-unit leadership that describes leader behaviors that increase subordinate empowerment, work satisfaction, and work effectiveness. Here, positive leader behavior directly improves current and future follower satisfaction, performance, motivation, task-relevant abilities, and work unit relationships.

House (1996) found eight classes of leader behaviors that provide appropriate paths to achieve these follower improvements.[91] First, leaders who act in nonauthoritarian ways will provide clarification to followers who will increase their performance and gain more satisfaction in their work.[92] Leaders who are direct in their instructions allow followers to understand expectations, aid in developing schedules, provide guidance to work-related tasks, and clarify policies, rules, and procedures. This provides nonpunitive interaction between leader and follower that creates a nonauthoritarian work environment that promotes higher work production and motivation.[93]

Second, path-goal leaders develop supportive professional relationships where the follower recognizes that they are supported by their leader. This includes behaviors that lead to the satisfaction of follower needs and preferences that promotes a friendly and inviting work environment.[94] This provides physical, emotional, and psychological support for the follower

---

[89] Robert J. House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership: Lessons, Legacy, and a Reformulated Theory," *Leadership Quarterly* 7, no. 3 (1996): 323-324.

[90] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-324.

[91] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-324.

[92] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 330.

[93] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 326.

[94] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 326.

that increases the quality of relationship between leader and follower while decreasing follower stress. This allows for followers to maximize the application of their intelligence.[95]

Third, path-goal leaders show participative leader behaviors that help influence the decisions of followers. These include leaders listening to the opinions and ideas of followers and including them in the decision-making process. This produces clarity of path-goal relationships, to bring together subordinate and organizational goals, increase subordinate autonomy, and to increase overall employee motivation due to peer pressure.[96]

Fourth, path-goal leaders act in achievement-oriented behaviors that encourage follower performance excellence. By setting high goals, giving standards of improvement, and emphasizing excellence, followers strive for higher standards in their own work and gain confidence in their abilities.[97]

These first four behaviors were described initially in House and Mitchell's 1974 theory but were elaborated on in House's 1996 theory. The next four behaviors were new constructions in House's reformulated theory. The fifth path-goal behavior has the leader focused on work facilitation. Leaders actively engage in scheduling and organizing work, coordinating work directly with followers, mentoring and guiding their followers to develop higher knowledge and skills to meet high expectations, and reduce obstacles such as roadblocks and bottlenecks that prevent follower achievement. When this is accomplished, followers can be more effective in their production, enjoy a reduced stress environment, and, therefore, experience higher job satisfaction.[98]

Sixth, path-goal leaders facilitate interaction with followers in a collaborative and positive environment. This provides nonauthoritarian conflict management and facilitates clear and interactive communication between leaders and followers, as well as between peers in work environments. Path-goal leaders need to provide team collaboration that promotes teamwork and healthy group relationships.[99]

---

[95] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 340.
[96] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 327.
[97] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 327.
[98] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 339.
[99] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 341.

Seventh, path-goal leaders provide necessary resources that followers need to be successful. These include physical, emotional, psychological, and heath-benefiting resources that allow followers to achieve their expectations and work in a satisfying environment. Leaders who can acquire necessary resources and provide for their followers gain legitimacy in the eyes of their subordinates and have a greater ability of interacting with their work unit.[100]

Eighth, path-goal leaders show value-based leader behaviors such as articulating a vision, displaying passion, demonstrating self-confidence, understanding individual follower motives, taking risks, communicating high expectations, and giving frequent positive evaluations of their followers. When leaders behave in this fashion, followers benefit in increasing their sense of identity, self-efficacy, and self-worth that increases their motivation and satisfaction.[101]

House's (1996) model of path-goal leadership provides an opportunity to evaluate eight classes of leader behavior and directly apply them to Nehemiah's leadership. Additionally, House's model also allows us to be prescriptive in our analysis as we can ascertain the best path, or leader behavior, that is used for a specific type of follower working within a specific type of environment. This broadens the analysis of leadership in that it brings in context and a variety of different styles of followership. However, by taking in multiple types of followers, different contexts, and the varying behaviors that leaders can use, this model becomes overwhelming and can make the interpretation of this model confusing. Also, House's model does not interact with the relationship between leader behavior and follower motivation. It leaves out the needed conversation of how followers are motivated by leader behavior. Therefore, this model will better analyze ancient leaders as we can see which behaviors are used by Nehemiah and how these behaviors effect outcome.

---

[100] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 342.
[101] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 343.

Use of Path-Goal Leadership Models on Nehemiah

These three path-goal models of leadership build upon each other as the theory progressed in development. One might suggest to only look at the latest version of the path-goal theory to analyze Nehemiah's leadership. However, it is important to recognize the specific aspects of each theory and focus on what each has to offer in analyzing Nehemiah's leadership. Vroom's (1995) theory will be used to analyze Nehemiah's ability to motivate his followers. There can be discussion as to whether Nehemiah provides an environment where expectancy, instrumentality, and valence are present for followers to be properly motivated. Once motivation is analyzed, we can use House and Mitchell's (1974) model to ascertain if Nehemiah influenced his subordinates' perception of their work goals, personal goals, and paths to goal attainment. Here, we can use House and Mitchell's (1974) six leadership actions and analyze the contexts of the text of Nehemiah to see if Nehemiah used path-goal leadership based on the six leadership actions. Path-goal leadership can further be analyzed by using House's 1996 model by seeing how Nehemiah behaves in each context and how that interacts with House's eight classes of path-goal leadership behaviors.

These three models can provide a holistic analysis of Nehemiah as a path-goal leader. This will be valuable in decerning which leadership style Nehemiah portrays in different contexts during the leadership commentary. These models can also be beneficial in discussing Nehemiah as a path-goal leader and how he models this style of leadership in the biblical text.

List of Path-Goal Leadership Characteristics & Key Terms

Based on the three models analyzed, path-goal leaders possess varying levels of the following terms and actions: motivates followers, communicates high expectations, provides value, provides compensation,[102] influences followers, recognizes follower needs, motivates followers to desired outcomes, increases payoffs, satisfies follower needs, removes obstacles, coaches, clarifies expectations, reduces follower frustrations, increases opportunities, allows

---

[102] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 18-20.

for personal growth, facilitates a path,[103] promotes clarity, develops schedules, provides guidance, leads in nonauthoritarian ways, supports followers, promotes inviting environments, develops relationships, maximizes application of intelligence, influences follower decisions, listens, includes followers in decisions, aligns follower to goals, increases follower autonomy, increase employee motivation, encourages follower excellence, gives standards of improvement, organizes, reduces stress, reduces conflict, moderates conflict, promotes team collaboration, provides resources, gains legitimacy, articulates a vision, displays passion, has high self-confidence, understands follower motives, takes risks, and gives feedback.[104]

Transformational Leadership Theory

Model #1 – Bass & Avolio's Full-Range Leadership Theory

Bass and Avolio (1994), in their full-range leadership theory, found three methods of leadership that combine in different ways in different leaders. The two desirable methods include transactional leadership and transformational leadership. A third, undesirable method of leadership is pseudo-leadership (also called *laissez-faire* leadership) where leaders are after selfish gain and do not have a desire to lead followers or the organization towards growth or benefit.[105] According to Bass and Avolio, the combination of these three methods encompass the full range in which a leader can operate.[106] First, transactional aspects of leadership are necessary for day-to-day operations of leadership to exist.[107] This includes contingent rewards where leaders assign specific tasks for which the follower is rewarded with agreed compensation for satisfactory work.[108] Also, transactional leadership includes management by exception where the leader institutes punishments or negative consequences for unsatisfactory work. These two components make up transactional leadership. Bass and Avolio found that

---

[103] House and Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," 1-5.

[104] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.

[105] Bruce J. Avolio and Bernard M. Bass, eds., *Developing Potential Across A Full Range of Leadership* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, Associates, 2002), 2.

[106] Avolio and Bass, *Developing Potential Across,* 2.

[107] Avolio and Bass, *Developing Potential Across,* 3.

[108] Avolio and Bass, *Developing Potential Across,* 3.

transactional leadership, while necessary in some actions of leadership, is best used in combination with transformational leadership.[109]

The second method of Bass and Avolio's (1994) full-range leadership theory is transformational leadership. Here, four specific components contribute to a leader's capacity to facilitate transformation.[110] These came to be known as the "Four I's" of transformational leadership.[111] Each of these are specific behaviors harnessed by leaders to transform followers. The four components of transformational leadership are:

- **Idealized Influence (II)** – This factor of transformational leadership is also called "charisma." It represents the emotional aspect of leadership development in followers.[112] Leaders act as role models respected and admired by their followers. They possess clear visions that followers desire to emulate.[113]

- **Inspirational Motivation (IM)** – Inspiration is brought about through a leader's ability to convey a clear, concise, and motivating vision that others desire to follow.[114]

- **Intellectual Stimulation (IS)** – Leaders must also capture the follower's mind and appeal to their intellect as they consider the leader's position versus their previous assumptions of the status quo. Leaders must show, intellectually, how they can solve the follower's problems through a system involving the follower in the solution process.[115]

- **Individualized Consideration (IC)** – Leaders provide an environment where each follower feels supported, heard, and cared for by the leader.[116] Leaders provide attention to individual needs and goals, consideration of follower's personal lives both inside and outside of the workplace, established trust and respect through relationship development, and encourage responsibility through showing trust in the follower's abilities.[117]

---

[109] Avolio and Bass, *Developing Potential Across,* 3.

[110] Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1994), 2.

[111] Bernard M. Bass and Ronald E. Riggio, *Transformational Leadership*, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2014), 6.

[112] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

[113] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

[114] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

[115] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

[116] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

[117] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

Bass and Avolio's (1994) full-range leadership theory sees successful leaders as inspirational motivators and positive role models for followers to emulate.[118] A transformational leader is successful when followers become inspired, feel challenged, and reach extraordinary levels beyond their initial potential and eventually become leaders themselves.[119] Alatawi (2017) describes this as the "additive effect of transformational leadership model."[120] For Bass and Avolio (1994), each leader possesses different amounts of each component combining to produce an overall degree of transformational potential within the leader.[121] Therefore, no two leaders will be the same as they possess different degrees of different components.[122]

Bass and Avolio (1994), in their full-range leadership model, see a transformational leader exhibiting all levels of transformational and transactional leadership to some degree.[123] An optimal leader exhibits transformational leadership behaviors more frequently than transactional ones to foster commitment and change within the organization.[124] To Dumdum, Lowe, and Avolio (2008) transformational leadership behavior is paramount as it creates trust and relational connection within the leader-member experience, producing increased commitment, trust, and loyalty from followers.[125] As leaders trade immediate goals for deeper relationships, leaders find that immediate goals tend to strengthen nonetheless.[126] Bass & Avolio concluded that transformational leadership 1) increases follower consciousness of the

---

[118] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

[119] Riggio, "The Management Perspective," 124.

[120] Massad Awdah Alatawi, "The Myth of the Additive Effect of the Transformational Leadership Model," *Contempt Manag Res* 13, no. 1 (2017): 19.

[121] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

[122] Alatawi, "The Myth," 19.

[123] Bass and Riggio, *Transformational Leadership*, 7-9.

[124] Jan Stewart, "Transformational Leadership: An Evolving Concept Examined Through the Works of Burns, Bass, Avolio, and Leithwood," *Can J Educ Adm Policy* 54 (2006): 13.

[125] Uldarico Rex Dumdum, Kevin B. Lowe, and Bruce J. Avolio, "A Meta-Analysis of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction: An Update and Extension," in *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead,* vol. 2, eds. Bruce J. Avolio and Francis J. Yammarino, 35-66, *Monographs in Leadership and Management* (Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2008), 38-39.

[125] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

[126] Dumdum, et al., "A Meta-Analysis of Transformational," 38-39.

value of goal creation, 2) helps followers transcend personal self-interest for the betterment of the organization, and 3) aids followers to address higher-order needs.[127]

There are several benefits to this model. First, it shows the full range of leadership moving from non-leadership to transactional to transformational forms of leadership that provide the entire breath of leadership action. Therefore, one can analyze a biblical leader such as Nehemiah and evaluate each context of leadership and ascertain the mode of leadership used in each. Additionally, as transformational leadership is broken into four components, it is easier to evaluate the different components that Nehemiah possesses in different contexts. However, a difficulty comes in separating Nehemiah's leadership into transformational modes of leadership and charismatic acts due to charisma (idealized influence) being the first component of transformational leadership. Bass & Avolio's model is at times too broad as it encompasses other leadership models blurring the remarks of a leader's style of leadership.

Model #2 – Bennis & Nanus's Four Strategies of Transformational Leaders

Bennis and Nanus (2007) chose to focus their attention on the organizational aspects of transformational leadership and the necessary components required for organizations to transform through leadership behavior.[128] Bennis and Nanus found that leadership fragmented through corruption and a lack of leadership.[129] They looked back at the many men and women in history who changed the world and compared them to a present void of great leaders who are hungry for power, self-preservation, and more power. [130] For them, transformation is needed and leaders must step up and be the agents of change through transformational principles.[131]

---

[127] Bass and Riggio, *Transformational Leadership*, 4-7.
[128] Warren G. Bennis and Burt Nanus, *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge* (New York, NY: HarperBusiness Essentials, 2007)*, 89, 110.
[129] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.
[130] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.
[131] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.

They came up with four common strategies used by leaders within transformational environments.[132] The first common strategy that transforming leaders embrace is to express a clear vision of the future of their organization.[133] This helps the follower focus on the work at hand by understanding the path that the leader is creating.[134] The leader's vision grabs the follower's attention that entices them to want to follow, no longer bound by contingent reward, but internally motivated due to belief in the leader's vision.[135] The second strategy brings meaning through communication.[136] Here, transforming leaders work as social architects being sensitive to their organization's construction and how it runs.[137] Bennis and Nanus call this the "management of meaning" which is inseparable from effective leadership.[138] The primary method of "managing meaning" is to present clear and effective communication.[139] This can be done in many different ways, but without leader communication, leadership will not succeed.[140] The third strategy for transformational leaders is to engender trust through positioning themselves in an authentic state where they communicate vision and then stand by their beliefs.[141] Bennis and Nanus liken trust to the lubrication of an engine. Without trust, the organization cannot move.[142] The vision may be set and the leader effectively communicating; however, if the follower does not trust the leader's vision, the organization is doomed to fail.[143] Bennis and Nanus describe a trustworthy leader as one who can be predictable, whose position is known, and who models the attitude he or she expects in followers.[144] The fourth and final strategy for transformational leaders is for the leader to personally and professionally develop themselves.[145] Bennis and Nanus found that the higher the rank of the leader the more

---

[132] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 24.
[133] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 26.
[134] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 26.
[135] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 26.
[136] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 31.
[137] Hoffman, "Credible Leadership," 223.
[138] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 31.
[139] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 34.
[140] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 34.
[141] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 41.
[142] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 41.
[143] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 41.
[144] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 41.
[145] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 52-53.

interpersonal, relatable, and involved that leader must be to his or her followers.[146] This begins and ends with the leader's "management of self" where he or she continues to develop his or her own strengths, leadership, and process with his or her followers.[147]

Bennis and Nanus' model is a simplistic structure of four common strategies likened to transformational leaders. These strategies are easily identifiable and understandable. Transformational leaders need to express a vision, communicate, engender trust, and improve themselves. These notions can be compared to the leadership of Nehemiah to see if these attributes are present in Nehemiah. Therefore, it works as a simple way to ascertain the presence of transformational leadership. However, these strategies are not exclusive to transformational leadership and could be applied to several other leadership theories. Therefore, the presence of these strategies does not wholly define a leader as being transformational. Even the presence of all four within a single context does not fully define a leader as transformational. This constricts the limitations in which this model can be used. For this thesis, Bennis and Nanus' model will be used to see if Nehemiah has the potential to express transformational leadership in different contexts when he uses these four strategies.

Model #3 – Kouzes & Posner's Five Practices of Transformational Leaders

Kouzes and Posner (2017) created their leadership model in their work *The Leadership Challenge*.[148] Their model focuses on behavior, not intent. Therefore, they describe acts of leadership, which they coin "practices" instead of discussing concepts of leadership. For example, they do not discuss the concept of vision as a necessary component to leadership. Instead, they use terms such as "model the way" and "inspire a shared vision" to describe the actions and behaviors that leader must do to be an effective transformational leader. It is a prescriptive model applying to leaders in a range of fields in the world today. It is also a set of

---

[146] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 52-53.
[147] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 52-53.
[148] James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner, *Leadership Challenge: How to Make Extraordinary Things Happen in Organizations*, 6th ed. (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2017), 12.

practices open to anyone to incorporate into their routine, having direct results regardless of the level of leadership the individual possesses.[149]

The first practice that makes leaders effective is to "model the way." In the words of Kouzes and Posner (2017), "Titles are granted, but it's your behavior that earns you respect."[150] The second practice is to inspire a shared vision amongst one's followers.[151] The third practice of leaders being transformative is to challenge the process.[152] After authentic leaders have inspired their followers with a unique vision, the leader must act and resist the status quo through action. Leaders must take risks for followers to be inspired to move themselves.[153] The fourth practice of effective leadership enables others to act. Here, the authentic leaders, who cast a vision and acted on that vision, must now bring others with them.[154] The fifth and final practice of effective leaders is to focus on the heart of their followers. Once the leader is working with a team who have caught the vision and are acting upon it, the leader cannot forget the sacrifice and effort of the followers.[155]

Kouzes and Posner's (2017) model was created with over twenty years of research and planning. It provides an excellent guide to identify transformational markers in leaders as each practice can be seen or not seen in ancient and modern leaders. There are also unique practices that the authors give that represent transformational leadership in a different way allowing a diverse perspective when it comes to analyzing leadership. However, these practices can quickly become confused with other leadership theories, especially charismatic leadership. Aspects of modeling, inspiring a shared vision, and challenging the process are also key markers indicative of charismatic leadership. The difference comes in the severity in which these practices are used. Mild or moderate use of these practices would lean the leader towards a more transformational practice. Use of these practices in the extreme would move the leader

---

[149] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 20-21.
[150] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13.
[151] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 14-16.
[152] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 16-17.
[153] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13.
[154] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 17-18.
[155] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 18-20.

into more charismatic attributes. Therefore, it is important to ascertain the level in which these practices are being used to justify the style of leadership implemented.

Use of Transformational Leadership Models on Nehemiah

The models of Bass and Avolio (1994), Bennis and Nanus (2007), and Kouzes and Posner (2017) were selected because they have similar leadership characteristics that are presented in their model, but also approach these characteristics in different ways. Each model shows that vision and the transformational leader communicating and expressing that vision is extremely important in producing success. Also, all three models show that the leader needs to be attentive to follower needs to know what is required to motivate their followers and to inspire them to become better workers, better individuals, and better leaders. Each model has an end goal of promoting change, or transformation, in the follower by the leader. These similarities display congruence among the three models that help show overall transformational leadership principles.

However, each model approaches this goal in different ways. Bass and Avolio (1994) present a theoretical model based in four overarching characteristics that uniquely combine in each leader to create an array of leadership possibilities. This allows us to use the "four I's" both in the leadership commentary and in the analysis of Nehemiah's leadership to ascertain the level in which Nehemiah possesses each quality. Bennis and Nanus' (2007) model describes transformational leadership working through specific strategies that transformational leaders enact to reach the goal of follower transformation. We can take each strategy and analyze its use in Nehemiah's leadership to see if his actions are transformational. Kouzes and Posner (2017), on the other hand, present five practices in which transformational leaders act in to transform their followers. We can use these practices to analyze Nehemiah's behaviors and actions to evaluate Nehemiah's transformational leadership. Each of these models will provide a well-rounded evaluation of Nehemiah's leadership and will allow a different perspective of Nehemiah's transformational leadership.

List of Transformational Leadership Characteristics & Key Terms

Based on the three models analyzed, transformational leaders possess varying levels of the following terms and actions: Possesses charisma, inspires, motivates, stimulates intellect, considers individuals, offers compensation, gives consequences,[156] gives a clear vision, organizes, creates trust, gives clear expectations, creative, builds self-respect, empowers others, creates focus, entices the follower, develops internal motivation, manages meaning, clearly communicates, stands by beliefs, predictable, models attitude, interpersonal, relatable, involved, develops self,[157] models leadership, inspires a shared vision, challenges the status quo, enables action, and encourages others.[158]

Charismatic Leadership Theory

Discussion of Max Weber and Charismatic Leadership

Before discussing models of charismatic leadership, no conversation about charismatic leadership is complete without the inclusion of Max Weber and his thoughts on charisma. His work created a sociological foundation for addressing concepts of authority and how it relates to aspects of leadership situations.[159] Weber's original concept of charisma involves the perception of a divine bestowal of extraordinary talents upon a particular individual who has a specific vision arising in a time of crisis.[160] This general concept concerned itself with how the charismatic leader worked within organizational environments and much of Weber's career centered on leader interaction within an organized group or setting.[161] Weber never attempted to formulate a congruent leadership theory complete with systematic description of

---

[156] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

[157] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.

[158] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.

[159] Ylva Sandberg and Christopher M. Moreman, "Common Threads among Different Forms of Charismatic Leadership," *J Relig Bus Ethics* 3, no. 1 (2015): 2.

[160] E. San Juan Jr., "Orientations of Max Weber's Concept of Charisma," *Centen Rev* 11, no. 2 (Spring, 1967): 272.

[161] Roger Eatwell, "The Concept and Theory of Charismatic Leadership," *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 7, no. 2 (2006): 141.

charismatic leader qualities or conclusions of relational dynamics between leader and follower.[162]

However, due to Weber's work, we have a collection of thoughts, observations, and analyses of the human condition that is left for us and other scholars to take and further develop.[163] Weber defines charisma as "a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional qualities."[164]

Charismatic leaders, as Weber saw it, were social transformers whose aim was to, in Weber's words, "recrystallize the core of society," whether within the workplace, within an organization, or within society.[165] Bass (1990) outlined Weber's overall concept of charisma as having five specific components.[166] The first is a condition in which charisma is warranted by followers.[167] To Weber, this is facilitated by a crisis occurring in some way which affects individuals causing them to need a charismatic leader.[168] The second component consists of a person endowed with extraordinary gifts arising to take on the crisis.[169] Third, there is a radical solution to the crisis which the leader with extraordinary gifts achieves.[170] Fourth, the charismatic leader needs followers who are attracted to the leader and believe that they connect to the leader.[171] And finally, the fifth component of charisma in leadership is the proof of validation through the leader's repeated success at solving the crisis for his or her followers.[172] These components are reflected in Weber's analysis, albeit discussed in much more depth, and never put together in a succinct list or structured theory.

---

[162] Jay A. Conger and Rabindra N. Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2003), 12.

[163] Chanoch Jacobsen and Robert J. House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership: A Process Theory, Simulation Model, and Tests," *Leadersh Q* 12, no. 1 (2001): 76.

[164] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* xviii.

[165] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* xlv.

[166] Bass, *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook*, 185.

[167] Bass, *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook*, 185.

[168] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* xxii.

[169] Bass, *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook*, 185.

[170] Bass, *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook*, 185.

[171] Bass, *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook*, 185.

[172] Bass, *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook*, 185.

Model #1 – House's 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership

In his article "A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership," House (1976), using Weber's work as a guide, outlined specific leader characteristics, behaviors, and follower outcomes associated with charismatic leadership from multiple angles.[173] House was the first to produce testable hypotheses on charismatic leadership, including specific hypotheses surrounding charismatic leader characteristics, behaviors, followership, and situational factors.[174]

House (1976) constructs a list of characteristics essential to the charismatic leader including the attributes of vitality, style, inspiration, image, and symbol.[175] House uses Weber's unspecified "gifts" of charisma as a "complex interaction of personal characteristics, the behavior the leader employs, characteristics of followers and certain situational factors prevailing at the time of the assumption of the leadership role."[176] House sees charismatic leaders possessing personal characteristics including: 1) extremely high levels of self-confidence, 2) the need to dominate subordinates, 3) strong convictions connected to their beliefs and morals, and 4) an unfaltering urge to influence others.[177] Additionally, House saw morals and ethics as central to charismatic leadership arguing that they provided the mechanism to allow decisions which would be beneficial to all and help the leader stay true to his or her mission.[178]

Apart from a list of characteristics, House (1976) also formulated a list of behaviors synonymous with charismatic leadership. 1) Charismatic leaders are role models for the values and actions they expect in their followers.[179] 2) Charismatic leaders appear knowledgeable and skilled in their position and are viewed as capable of leading followers in the appropriate

---

[173] Robert H. House, "A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership," in *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*, eds. J.G. Hunt and L.L. Larson, 189-207 (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977).
[174] House, "A 1976 Theory."
[175] House, "A 1976 Theory," 190-191.
[176] Robert H. House, "A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership," *Working Paper Series.* Faculty of Management Studies, University of Toronto (Toronto, Canada: Toronto University, 1976), 10.
[177] House, "A 1976 Theory," 190-200.
[178] John Antonakis and Robert J. House, "The Full-Range Leadership Theory: The Way Forward," in *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead,* vol. 2, eds. Bruce J. Avolio and Francis J. Yammarino, 7.
[179] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.

direction.[180] 3) Charismatic leaders express ideological goals with moral underpinnings that provide a baseline for values amongst the leader and followers.[181] 4) Charismatic leaders have high expectations for their employees generating motivation to work hard and aspire to something greater.[182] This behavior is also coupled with the leader instilling confidence in the subordinate producing higher levels of self-esteem.[183] 5) Charismatic leaders provide task-relevant incentives spurring on follower motivation towards a specific goal.[184] This aids in providing an environment where followers can build affiliation, power, and esteem.[185]

House (1976) insisted that crisis provides the best situation for charismatic leadership to thrive.[186] He saw a natural connection between the essential characteristics and behaviors of a charismatic leader and a crisis where a charismatic leader organically moved into a distressing situation producing positive results.[187]

From these characteristics, behaviors, and situations House (1976) saw nine specific outcomes of charismatic leadership that include: the instilling of follower trust, resonance with the leader's beliefs, unquestionable acceptance of the leader's role, emotional connection with the leader, follower obedience, personal and professional identification with the leader, emotional involvement with the goals of the leader, increased goal production for followers, and increased confidence within followers.[188]

An immediate strength in this model is its focus on situational factors and context while also identifying personal characteristics and behaviors that are common in charismatic leaders. House's (1976) model allows for an easy ability to use these personal characteristics and behaviors upon Nehemiah's leadership and make conclusions as to whether Nehemiah uses charismatic leadership in different contexts. Additionally, House provides a list of outcomes

---

[180] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[181] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[182] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[183] Kyoungsu Kim, Fred Dansereau, and Insook Kim, "Extending the Concept of Charismatic Leadership: An Illustration Using Bass's (1990) Categories," in *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead,* vol. 2, eds. Bruce J. Avolio and Francis J. Yammarino, 143-172, *Monographs in Leadership and Management* (Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2008), 149.
[184] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[185] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 164-165.
[186] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[187] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[188] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.

that provide a cause-and-effect evaluation where if these outcomes are present in a particular context, then the presence of charismatic leadership is possible. It is important to say "possible" in that these characteristics and outcomes are not exclusive to charismatic leadership. It is important to also examine the level of severity that these characteristics are portrayed in the leader. House highlights the need for extreme levels of these personal characteristics to divide charismatic leadership from other styles of leadership.

Model #2 – Jacobsen & House's Steps of Charismatic Leaders

In 2001, Jacobsen and House used the model of Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993)[189] to extrapolate a step-by-step process helping explain charismatic leadership.[190] While this process does not describe every instance of charismatic leadership, it provides steps that occur most times.[191] Additionally, it shows the charismatic leader, the follower(s), and the situation all playing important roles in the process.[192]

In phase one, the charismatic leader is introduced to the follower resulting in the follower identifying with the leader's personality and charisma.[193] In the second phase, the leader casts his or her vision and, if successful, arouses the follower to action.[194] Phase three finds the leader modeling his or her vision in a self-sacrificing way inspiring a core group of followers who emulate the leader's behavior and commit to the leader's vision.[195]

It is at this point where the leader has a dedicated following and the leader and organization experience a season of prosperity and success. However, success does not last forever and at some point, phase four begins where the followership becomes disenchanted as routinization within the organization sets in.[196] Followers no longer feels the excitement that

---

[189] Boas Shamir, Robert J. House, and Michael B. Arthur, "The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-Concept Based Theory," *Organ Sci* 4, no. 4 (November, 1993): 577-594.
[190] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[191] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[192] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[193] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[194] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[195] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[196] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

the leader's modeling originally produced and extraordinary accomplishments turn into ordinary daily activities. This produces phase five where leaders begin to routinize by managing followers through defined tasks and specific job descriptions to produce efficiency and effectiveness within the organization.[197] This depersonalizes followers making them more of an impersonal employee rather than a hero. This creates apathy in some and resentment in others that lead to phase six where followers alienate themselves from the leader's mission and depart the collective.[198] This model presents an excellent observational structure where charismatic leadership is evaluated in real-time within leadership situations.[199]

This model provides a succinct step-by-step process of charismatic action that can be used to follow the timeline of a leader's tenure to see if charismatic leadership is shown. This can occur in an acute leadership setting where a charismatic path is created within a short amount of time, or it can be used to analyze the charismatic path of a leader over his or her entire leadership campaign. While Jacobsen and House (2001) provide this step-by-step process, it is important to recognize that not all charismatic leaders will walk this exact path. Therefore, it is important to not use this path as an absolute, but to see trends in a leader's timeline that will help evaluate the level of charismatic leadership within a particular leader.

Model #3 – Conger & Kanungo's Theory of Charismatic Leadership

Conger and Kanungo (1987) sought to demystify "[Charismatic leadership's] elusive nature and the mysterious connotation of the term…[to] strip the aura of mysticism from charisma and to deal with it strictly as a behavioral process."[200] However, as Zehir et al. (2014) show, while charismatic leaders were not divinely appointed superhumans, they were key organizational reformers and entrepreneurs who boldly came into leadership positions with a

---

[197] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[198] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[199] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[200] Jay A. Conger and Rabindra N. Kanungo, "Towards a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings," *Acad Manage Rev* 12 (1987): 637-639.

defined vision with the intention of producing change within organizations, providing a brighter future for all.[201]

To Conger and Kanungo (2003), charismatic leadership is an attributional phenomenon where followers dictate leader success through their choices to subscribe to the charismatic leader's behaviors and vision.[202] Therefore, Conger and Kanungo's model focuses on the specific behaviors that charismatic leaders employ to persuade followers.[203] These leader behaviors foster a group atmosphere where leadership occurs as a by-product of the effectiveness of the group.[204] Followers will then achieve status within the group as they fulfill group objectives. The selection process of who is the leader and who are the followers occur as people observe group dynamics and interactions between members.[205] Those exhibiting influence over others are deemed the leaders, and those who do not exert influence are relegated to the status of followers.[206] Therefore, charismatic leaders must exert influence over their followers to a point where followers view the individual as in fact the leader.[207]

Conger and Kanungo (2003) set out to describe specific leader behaviors perceived and approved by followers.[208] Their model consists of four stages of leader development building upon each stage as leaders grow in understanding of which behaviors are beneficial to leadership.[209] The first stage shows the leader being sensitive to the context.[210] Charismatic leaders are highly sensitive to the social and physical aspects of the environment in which they lead and ascertain the appropriate steps to alter the status quo.[211] This process is ongoing as the leader continually adapts to new situations and adjusts his or her actions based on follower needs.[212]

---

[201] Cemal Zehir, Büşra Müceldili, Erkut Altindağ, Yasin Şehitoğlu, and Songül Zehir, "Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Role of Ethical Climate," *Soc Behav Pers* 42, no. 8 (2014): 1366.

[202] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 48.

[203] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 48.

[204] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 48.

[205] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 48.

[206] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 48.

[207] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 48.

[208] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 51.

[209] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 51.

[210] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 51.

[211] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 51.

[212] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 26.

The second stage occurs when the charismatic leader, understanding the environmental context, sets his or her vision and establishes his or her future goals. These goals center on the organization's objectives, not the leader's needs, and are generally idealized and tend to disrupt the normal pathways established by the organization or its followers.[213] Additionally, charismatic leaders tend to differ from other leaders in how they express their vision, which typically is different from the status quo, and then show a path to make the situation better for everyone.[214] Charismatic leaders also describe their goals in ways that make them sound attractive to the point where there are no other reasonable alternatives to that vision.[215]

The third stage involves leaders developing the vision and building follower trust. It is vital for followers to buy into the leader's vision, and it is important that charismatic leaders build loyalty and devotion to their vision before attempting to put the vision into practice.[216] This takes place through the leader building relationships and rapport with his or her followers as the leader models self-sacrifice, takes personal risks, performs in unconventional ways, generates mystique and excitement, and uses other actions setting him or her apart from the typical leader.[217]

Once leaders cast their vision and gain support for that vision from their followers, they then move to stage four where they achieve the goals set forth.[218] Charismatic leaders have direct involvement in achieving goals by using unconventional tactics that make them extraordinary leaders through their actions. They also encourage high levels of empowerment through trusting and relying on their followers to get the job done.[219]

This model shows promise within modern leadership analysis as it modernizes the theory of charismatic leadership. It moves away from the "superhuman" or "divine nature" of charismatic leaders and moves into a more constructive approach of analyzing the actual leadership characteristics and stages in which a charismatic leader moves through. This helps to

---

[213] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 53-54.
[214] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 53-54.
[215] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 29-30.
[216] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 32-33.
[217] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 32-33.
[218] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 53-54.
[219] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 34.

apply the model to modern leaders and ancient leaders alike. However, it also presents a problem as ancient biblical texts tend to be steeped in representing the divine and bestowing divine or superhuman attributes to leaders such as Nehemiah. Therefore, it can become difficult to separate the divine from Nehemiah as Conger and Kanungo desire. Overall, this model allows for a more simplified analysis of the different stages that Nehemiah goes through and to evaluate which contexts Nehemiah uses charismatic leadership.

Use of Charismatic Leadership Models on Nehemiah

One of the best examples of charismatic leadership in the Bible is that of Nehemiah.[220] As we analyze the leadership of Nehemiah, considering the context presented in the text, there are specific aspects of charismatic leadership theory that can be used to properly evaluate Nehemiah as a leader and come to some conclusions surrounding his leadership and leadership style. In doing so, I will use Weber's overarching concepts of charisma as a basis for analyzing Nehemiah's leadership. While it is not a structured theory, key concepts of Nehemiah's leadership can be analyzed using Weber's ideas.

I will then use the three models discussed to evaluate Nehemiah's leadership. Each model presents a specific focus that provides a holistic look at charismatic leadership that can be used to analyze each context of the text of Nehemiah as well as Nehemiah's leadership overall. House's 1976 theory provides a list of characteristics, behaviors, and outcomes that can be used to analyze Nehemiah's leadership characteristics and behaviors. Additionally, House's (1976) list of outcomes can be used to ascertain Nehemiah's use of charismatic leadership in each context based on the outcomes given in the text and their interaction with House's list. Jacobsen and House's 2001 theory provides a list of steps that typical charismatic leaders perform during their leadership tenure. This list can be used to ascertain Nehemiah's use of charismatic leadership as each context is observed to see if in fact Nehemiah and Yehud move down the list of steps that Jacobsen and House (2001) suggest. Finally, Conger & Kanungo's

---

[220] Rhona L. Stanley, "Charismatic Leadership in Ancient Israel: A Social-Scientific Approach," (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2001)," iii.

(2003) theory of charismatic leadership will be used to analyze their four stages of charismatic leadership to see when Nehemiah represents each stage and what that says about his charismatic leadership. These three models, with Weber's ideas of charismatic leadership, will present a well-rounded and detailed look at the charismatic leadership of Nehemiah.

List of Charismatic Leadership Characteristics & Key Terms

Based on the three models analyzed, charismatic leaders possess varying levels of the following terms and actions: has extraordinary talents, has a specific vision, works in crisis, transforms societies, desired by followers, creates radical solutions, needs followers, needs validation,[221] shows extreme self-confidence, needs to dominate, has strong convictions, has high morals, has an extreme urge to influence, role model, appears knowledgeable, appears skilled, appears capable, expresses ideological goals, gives high expectations, aspires followers to grow, instills confidence, provides relevant incentives, builds affiliation, gains power, gains esteem, instills follower trust, gains unquestionable follower acceptance, emotionally connects, gains follower obedience, increases goal production,[222] casts a vision, identifies with followers, models the vision, routinizes eventually,[223] sensitive to environments, alters status quo, adapts, disrupts normal pathways, attractive, builds trust, builds relationships, models self-sacrifice, takes risks, performs unconventionally, generates mystique, is set apart, achieves goals, and empowers.[224]

---

[221] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* xv-xx.
[222] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[223] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[224] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.

Authentic Leadership Theory

Model #1 – Avolio & Et Al.'s 2004 Model of Authentic Leadership

Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, and May (2004) were one of the first teams to construct a model of authentic leadership. They began with a premise rooted in ancient Greece of "Know thyself."[225] To Avolio et al., the root of authenticity is "to know, accept, and remain true to one's self."[226] Authenticity should not be viewed as someone possessing it or not, but instead, should be looked at on a continuum where the more a person holds true to their core values, identity, preferences, and emotions the more authentic they will be.[227] Their model rests on the principle that authentic leaders are "persons who have achieved high levels of authenticity in that they know who they are, what they believe and value, and they act upon those values and beliefs while transparently interacting with others."[228]

Avolio et al. (2004) produced a model where characteristics of authentic leaders were not enough to analyze and show authentic leadership. Their model begins with analyzing authentic leadership and followers' identification to their leaders. Avolio et al. first recognized that leaders affect the identities of their followers in social and personal ways. Personal identification occurs where the follower's beliefs about the leader becomes self-defining in the follower. Avolio et al. show that authentic leaders stimulate personal identification in their followers.[229] Social identification occurs when followers identify with a group, community, or organization, feel pride about being a member of that group, and see their membership to that group as a marker of their identity. They suggest that "authentic leaders increase followers' social identification by creating a deeper sense of high moral values and expressing high levels of honesty and integrity in their dealings with followers."[230] Specifically, Avolio et al. found that

---

[225] Bruce J. Avolio, William L. Gardner, Fred O. Walumbwa, Fred Luthans, and Douglas R. May, "Unlocking the Mask: A Look at the Process by which Authentic Leaders Impact Follower Attitudes and Behaviors," *Leadersh Q* 15 (2004): 802.
[226] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 802.
[227] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 802.
[228] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 802.
[229] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 806.
[230] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 807.

authentic leaders are direct, open, committed to the success of followers, willing to acknowledge limitations, transparent, accountable, reward honesty, and have integrity.[231] These qualities all lead to positive follower identification with authentic leaders.

Once the follower identifies with the leader and the group, specific states of being occur within a follower that produce hope, trust, optimism, and positive emotions.[232] These four states are the central point that directly influences follower work attitudes and behaviors. By identifying with the leader and the group, followers of an authentic leader are given hope, learn to trust their leader and the organization, and develop positive emotions that will allow them to be more authentic themselves and enjoy a better working environment. These states of being provided by an authentic leader produce specific work attitudes of higher commitment, job satisfaction, meaningfulness, and higher engagement with the leader and the group.[233] These work attitudes, coupled with the states of being engender follower behaviors of increased job performance, the follower giving extra effort, and having less withdrawal.

The model of Avolio et al. (2004) makes it possible to evaluate how a leader identifies with the follower and with the group and can help determine if hope, trust, positive emotions, and optimism are produced. Also, it is possible to analyze whether the positive work attitudes and behaviors are produced in a biblical leader's followers. However, a critique on this model is its focus on authentic leadership and whether these qualities and attributes are exclusive to authentic leaders. Can this model be true of transformational or charismatic leaders? Therefore, it will be important to discuss specific attributes of authenticity when using this model to analyze the leadership of Nehemiah.

This model finds initial connection with the text of Nehemiah in that it interacts with a leader's ability to affect the identity of his or her followers. As identity is an important attribute to the people of Yehud, this model naturally connects. Moreover, this model not only evaluates a leader's effect on the identity of individuals, it also evaluates social identity of a people group. This works especially with Nehemiah as he is more concerned with the effect of identity on the entire people of Yehud. Another strength of this model is that it is easy to examine the four

---

[231] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 807.
[232] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 803.
[233] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 803.

states of being presented within the model upon each context of Nehemiah's leadership to see if specific outcomes are present within his collective following. A difficulty comes when trying to examine individual identity change and whether hope, trust, optimism, and positive emotions are seen in individual followers. Additionally, it is difficult to decide whether increased work attitudes are produced due to authentic leadership expressed in the leader or due to natural consequences of being a part of a collective.

Model #2 – Ilies Et Al.'s 2005 Model of Authentic Leadership

Ilies, Morgeson, and Nahrgang's (2005) model of authentic leadership works to substantiate the theory by showing the components of authentic leadership and then listing leader characteristics of authentic leadership. These components and characteristics can be used to analyze the leadership of Nehemiah to ascertain his level of authentic leadership.[234] Ilies et al. bridge the gap between defining authenticity and constructing a model that can be used to analyze authentic leadership. To them, authentic leadership is "a process that combines positive leader capacities and a highly developed organizational context. The authentic leadership process positively influences self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of both leaders and followers, and it stimulates positive personal growth and self-development."[235]

From this definition, Ilies, Morgeson, and Nahrgang (2005) provide a list of characteristics indicative of an authentic leader including confidence, hopefulness, optimism, resilience, high morality, being future oriented, and prioritizes follower development into leaders.[236] Their model proposes that authenticity is shown through leadership practice as a leader interacts with his or her behaviors and experiences and develops authenticity and growth. The process of self-realization allows the authentic leader to become his or her true

---

[234] Remus Ilies, Frederick P. Morgeson, and Jennifer D. Nahrgang, "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic Well-Being: Understanding Leader-Follower Outcomes," *Leadersh Q* 16 (2005): 373.
[235] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 376.
[236] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 376.

self. This all leads to a result where leaders and followers are better off and experience happiness and well-being.[237]

They propose four components that lead to authentic leadership. First, authentic leaders are self-aware.[238] Leaders are aware and trust in their own personal characteristics, values, feelings, motives, and cognitions.[239] This couples with the ability to recognize one's own faults and contradictions.[240] Second, authentic leaders show unbiased processing.[241] Here, the leader can take in feedback and information and choose outcomes that are free of bias, leader selfishness, and impulsivity. This shows the leader as having high levels of integrity and character that have implications on leader and follower well-being.[242] The third component to authentic leadership is behaving authentically. Ilies, Morgeson, and Nahrgang (2005) show that authentic leaders lead in a way that is in accord with their personal values, preferences, and needs and do not lead for the sole reason of attaining rewards or self-preservation.[243] In essence, leaders do the right thing for the betterment of followers and the organization regardless of personal gain or personal loss. The fourth component to authentic leadership is authentic relational orientation. Here, authentic leaders focus on developing openness and truthfulness in relationships with their followers. The leader is vulnerable and willing to self-disclose his or her shortcomings, challenges, hopes, and fears to his or her subordinates. Genuine relationships are formed where the leader shows his or her true self to his followers without expectation of reward in return.[244]

Through using these four components, authentic leaders promote leader well-being. Once the leader is strong, equipped, and working within an authentic leadership platform, the leader can then influence his or her followers which will lead them to well-being. Authentic leaders influence their followers in five ways. First, authentic leaders influence through personal and organizational identification. As the authentic leader shows high levels of self-

---

[237] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 376.
[238] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 377.
[239] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 377.
[240] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 377.
[241] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 377.
[242] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 378-379.
[243] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 380.
[244] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 382.

awareness coupled with a desire to foster relationships, followers can easily identify and relate to their leader.[245] Second, authentic leaders influence through emotional contagion. Here, leaders, working side-by-side with their followers daily, spread their infectious attitude and sense of well-being onto their followers, who then express similar levels of well-being.[246] Third, authentic leaders influence by being a model of positive behavior. Through observation and direct contact with the leader, followers witness and experience the leader's positive behaviors and adapt their behaviors to fit those of the leader.[247] Fourth, authentic leaders influence their followers by supporting self-determination. Authentic leaders foster an environment where followers can experience autonomy, competence, and relatedness that is generated through intrinsic motivation that provides well-being for the follower.[248] The fifth influence that authentic leaders provide are positive social exchanges. Authentic leaders create deep and meaningful relationships with their followers that develop self-worth, value, and care for self and for others.[249]

This model presents a path for authentic leaders to increase their own well-being, which will then influence a higher well-being in their followers. However, the central requirement in this leadership model is proximity between leader and follower. Direct relational building between the leader and one follower is required for authentic leadership to be generated. This is not always seen in leadership positions as individual relationships are not always possible. Therefore, this model lacks the ability to ascertain authentic leadership characteristics on leaders who lead the masses. However, this model can be used to analyze relationships that leaders have to see the level of authenticity present. Also, this model shows redundancy as several of its components remark that authentic leadership is expressed when a leader behaves authentically. This does not help to explain authenticity and can weakens the model's claim.

---

[245] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 383.
[246] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 384.
[247] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 385.
[248] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 385.
[249] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 387.

Model # 3 – Petkeviciute Et Al.'s 2018 Model of Authentic Leadership

Petkeviciute, Barvydiene, and Surpikiene (2018) created a model of authentic leadership that specifically looked at the relationships between authentic leaders and followers.[250] To them, authentic leaders bring increased follower well-being through the development of high-quality relationships based on principles of social exchange where leader and follower reciprocate effort to produce a high-quality relationship.[251] They produced a very simplistic model that shows how authentic leader-follower relationships develop. The model was produced using former models of authentic leadership theory and rely heavily on the acceptance of previous models.[252]

The development of authentic leader-follower relationships works on a four-step process where the initial process produces a deeper level of relationship.[253] This process can then be repeated to create even a deeper relationship between leader and follower. First, an authentic leader accepts the follower for who he or she is and attempts to understand the follower's true self.[254] This also works in reverse as followers also must accept the leader and attempt to understand the true self of the leader. This acceptance and understanding produces mutual respect between the leader and follower.[255] Once the leader and follower respect one another, this provides an environment where trust can be developed where the leader and follower understand each other and take risks in trusting the other for task-achievement, being vulnerable and intimate with one another, and can be open and honest about each other's professional and personal lives.[256] Once trust is established between leader and follower, mutual support can be provided where each can help the other physically, emotionally, and professionally.[257]

---

[250] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 83.
[251] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 87-88.
[252] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 85-88.
[253] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 88.
[254] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 88.
[255] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 88.
[256] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 88.
[257] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 88.

This model, while simple in nature, provides a good pathway in analyzing the leadership of Nehemiah. We can analyze the text to see if these steps are shown in Nehemiah's leadership in specific contexts or in his leadership overall. However, once again, a critique of this model comes in its exclusivity to authentic leadership. Is this model purely ascribed to authentic leadership alone? Therefore, it will be once again important to ascribe specific authentic qualities to this model to show Nehemiah's authentic leadership in the text.

The best aspect of this model is its cyclical nature. The model does not propose an ending point where a leader has arrived and is fully authentic. Instead, authentic leader development occurs in cycles where the leader becomes more and more authentic the more cycles the leader goes through. Each step provides the environment for the next to be possible. This makes it easier to evaluate Nehemiah's authentic leadership potential by investigating the first step of leader acceptance and once found, one can see if the cycle of authentic leadership continues. However, a shortcoming of this model comes in the lack of consistency in how these steps actuate in real life situations and in narrative texts. It is difficult to see each step playing out and it is difficult to evaluate the leader's act connecting with a specific step in this repeated process.

Use of Authentic Leadership Models on Nehemiah

These three models of authentic leadership will be used to analyze the level of authentic leadership used by Nehemiah. However, these models will need to be supplemented with specific characteristics of authentic leadership to come to conclusions on whether Nehemiah was acting authentically or using authentic leadership. This is primarily due to the theory being a relatively recent development that is still in its development phase.

Nonetheless, these three models provide a good scaffolding where we can compare Nehemiah's leadership with authentic leadership. First, Avolio et al.'s (2004) model will be used to provide a comparison with the overall course of Nehemiah's leadership to their specific structure of identification producing specific states of being that then produce follower attitudes and behaviors. Specific contexts within the text of Nehemiah will prove excellent

examples to use Avolio et al.'s (2004) model. Next, Ilies et al.'s (2005) model will be used to evaluate Nehemiah's use of specific characteristics and components of authentic leadership. Their list of qualities and outcomes will provide excellent tools for the analysis of specific contexts and over leadership. Finally, Petkeviciute et al.'s (2018) model will be used to specifically evaluate Nehemiah's relationship with his followers that will provide important discussion on Nehemiah's interaction with his followers and what we can understand about his authentic leadership from the text provided.

List of Authentic Leadership Characteristics & Key Terms

Based on the three models analyzed, authentic leaders possess varying levels of the following terms and actions: authentic, transparent, identifies with followers, stimulates personal identification, promotes group identification, instills pride, increases moral value, honest, has high integrity, direct, open, committed to the success of followers, willing to acknowledge limitations, accountable, rewards honesty, instills hope, instills trust, instills optimism, instills positive emotions, produces higher commitment, produces higher job satisfaction, instills meaningfulness, produces higher engagement, increases job performance, produces higher work effort, decreases follower withdrawal,[258] confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, has high morality, future oriented, prioritizes follower leadership development, personally develops, self-aware, trusts themselves, recognizes own faults, shows unbiased processing, high levels of character, develops openness, develops relationships with followers, promotes leader well-being, promotes follower well-being, emotionally contagious, models positive behaviors, supports self-determination, creates positive social exchanges,[259] develops high quality relationships, accepts followers, understands followers, vulnerable, creates respect with followers, supports followers, and allows to be supported.[260]

---

[258] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 802-808.
[259] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[260] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 83-88.

Servant Leadership Theory

Discussion of Robert Greenleaf and Servant Leadership

Where any overview of charismatic leadership must include Max Weber, so to must any overview of servant leadership include Robert Greenleaf. Greenleaf's (2002) thoughts on servant leadership mark the starting point to new theory development and a new way to analyze leadership. However, Greenleaf (2002) never generated a working theory or model for his ideas. Instead, he collected his thoughts on servant leadership in his seminal work *Servant Leadership*.[261] From his thoughts and ideas, different theories and models on servant leadership were created.

Leaders, to Greenleaf (2002), should be at their core servants, and the work of a servant requires them to be servants first.[262] For when individuals see themselves as leaders primarily then the "need to assuage an unusual power drive" begins to fester within the leader causing him or her to fail in the very act they desire to accomplish.[263] Followers provide the leader's purpose of their meaningful work through building individuals.[264] Followers, in turn, follow because they see leaders with a clear vision of where to go and see the serving nature within the leader that develops trust as the leader has the follower's best interests at heart.[265] Greenleaf sees leadership as a collection of interactions with individuals where the leader serves each person in a unique way which contributes to the overall environment.[266] Servant leaders listen more and talk less.[267] This inspires followers to do the same and serve those around them, eventually creating a community with a changed culture where service is king. In an environment where everyone is serving others, the community fosters support, a collective goal, and trust in each other creating a leadership environment that is strong.

---

[261] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*.
[262] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27.
[263] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 22-25.
[264] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 29.
[265] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 29.
[266] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 29.
[267] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 31-32.

When looking for an overview of servant leadership, Greenleaf (2002) says:

[Servant leadership] begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead…The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant – first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test…is: do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, will they not be further deprived?[268]

We quickly see key aspects of servant leadership in Greenleaf's (2002) words which distinguish it from other leadership theories. First, Greenleaf (2002) sees the creation of servanthood within leaders as a natural phenomenon.[269] While the theory looks like trait theory where qualities are inborn, Northouse (2016) points out that servant leadership begins with an intrinsic motivation that is then conditioned and trained through practice.[270] Some leaders find the intrinsic motivation of service easier to express than others. Therefore, servant leadership allows for possessing specific natural traits and developing specific behaviors and skills to lead effectively.[271]

Additionally, Greenleaf's (2002) definition focuses on follower well-being.[272] The litmus test provided shows a leader's effectiveness is not judged by leader achievement, organizational improvement, or even the achievement of quantifiable employee goals.[273] Instead, leadership effectiveness comes as followers improve as individuals.[274] Leaders become better versions of themselves, live better lives for themselves, and furthermore, live for the sake of others.[275] The third unique aspect of Greenleaf's (2002) concept is the direct attention to the marginalized of society as leaders actively engage in the betterment of those less privileged within their communities. Greenleaf (2002) does not limit leader responsibility to a

---

[268] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27.
[269] Athanasopoulou and Dopson, "Leadership Theories and Their," 130.
[270] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 226.
[271] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 226.
[272] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27.
[273] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27.
[274] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27.
[275] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27.

specific work environment or individual employees but extends responsibility to anyone marginalized within the leader's scope of view.[276] As proximity breeds empathy, Greenleaf (2002) argues for leaders to assume the posture of a servant and serve the least of these.

Model #1 – Spear's List of Characteristics of Servant Leadership

This idea of listing key characteristics of servant leadership became a standard in early servant leadership theory development. Spears (1998) took the work of Greenleaf (2002)[277] and extracted ten primary characteristics of servant leadership prompting various models of servant leadership theory:[278]

1. **Listening** – Servant leaders listen more than they talk by cultivating the discipline of hearing and being receptive to follower feedback before speaking.
2. **Empathy** – Servant leaders stand in the follower's shoes attempting to see their side of the story first before making decisions. This makes the follower feel valued, heard, and unique.
3. **Healing** – Servant leaders make their followers whole by caring about their entire well-being. As followers are healed, so too are leaders.
4. **Awareness** – Servant leaders understand their role and the influence they have on followers as they are intensely aware of their physical, social, and political environments.
5. **Persuasion** – Servant leaders engage in clear and constant communication shaping followers, beliefs, and expectations. However, this persuasion occurs in non-confrontational, non-judgmental ways allowing freedom of follower's choice.
6. **Conceptualization** – Servant leaders are visionaries seeing the big picture and sharing the goals and processes necessary to achieve that vision.

---

[276] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27.
[277] Greenleaf originally wrote *Servant Leadership* in 1977.
[278] L.C. Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact of Servant Leadership," In *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant-Leadership*, ed. L.C. Spears, 1-12 (New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, 1998), 3-6.

7. **Foresight** – Servant leaders can predict future events through knowing and understanding the current trends.

8. **Stewardship** - Servant leaders take full responsibility in the management and dissemination of work, effort, vision, and leadership. They bear the brunt of risk and difficulty to protect their followers.

9. **Commitment to the Growth of People** – Servant leaders treat each follower as special and someone who requires specific assistance to reach their full potential.

10. **Building Community** – Servant leaders engender thriving and supportive communities. Followers identify with something outside of themselves and feel a part of something bigger than themselves.[279]

While this is not a theorized model of servant leadership, it does provide an understanding of qualities of servant leadership. These ten characteristics are not necessarily indicative of servant leadership by themselves, however, a combination of some or all these characteristics build a profile of a servant leader. Therefore, an analysis of not only the presence of these characteristics, but also the level of presence of these characteristics on the biblical character of Nehemiah can provide an understanding of whether Nehemiah acted as a servant leader in specific contexts of his leadership. It also needs to be noted that Spears (1998) does not include Greenleaf's (2002) concepts of spirituality or a focus on the marginalized which shows a different perspective of servant leadership and diverts somewhat from the original concept of servant leadership.

Model #2 – Sendjaya Et Al.'s Model of Servant Leadership

In 2008, Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora produced a list of six key dimensions of servant leadership that constituted twenty-two themes pertinent to servant leadership.[280] Their goal was to take the thoughts of Greenleaf (2002) and servant leadership theory and use them to

---

[279] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[280] Sen Sendjaya, James C. Sarros, and Joseph C. Santora, "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership Behaviour in Organizations," *J Manag Stud* 45, no. 2 (2008): 403-406.

specifically analyze different organizations.[281] Additionally, they wanted to emphasize the act of service, the specific type of follower that servant leaders interacts with, and the moral-spiritual dimension of servant leadership.[282]

Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora (2008) produced a list of six dimensions of servant leadership that included voluntary subordination, authentic self, transcendental spiritualism, covenantal relationships, responsible morality, and transforming influence.[283] These characteristics extend beyond the typical range of servant leadership and include aspects of transformational, authentic, and spiritual leadership. Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora see servant leadership encompassing the whole of the follower, requiring a servant leader to be cognizant of the physical, mental, and spiritual well-being of the follower.[284] Additionally, Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora link this style of leadership to biblical principles, especially as it pertains to the seven Greek words that English scholars translate as "servant."[285]

The first dimension of Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora's (2008) model is voluntary subordination. Here, servant leaders willingly give up their leadership status to place themselves in the position of a servant. The mindset shows that it is not only doing acts of service that is important to a servant leader, but also to identify as a servant first that is of utmost importance.[286] Prominent themes in this dimension include being a servant and performing acts of service.[287]

The second dimension of servant leadership, being your authentic self, continues the idea of "being" and shows a servant leader as an authentic leader. Servant leaders do not simply act as a servant for eventual benefit, self-glory, or for organizational gain. Instead, they truly act as a servant because that is an inborn desire.[288] Themes in this dimension of servant leadership include being humble, having integrity, being accountable, being secure in who they

---

281 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 402.
282 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 402-403.
283 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 403-406.
284 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 403-406.
285 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 403-406.
286 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 406.
287 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
288 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 407.

are, and being vulnerable to their followers.[289] Servant leaders do not care who gets the credit and are comfortable working behind the scenes to reach their goals.[290]

The third dimension of servant leadership brings the necessity of creating covenantal relationships to the forefront of a servant leader. Servant leaders interact with their followers with an unqualified acceptance of who they are. Servant leaders treat everyone with "radical equality."[291] This type of relationship is called a covenant-based relationship because it is an "intensely personal bond marked by shared values, open-ended commitment, mutual trust, and concern for the welfare of the other party."[292] Themes in this dimension include accepting everyone, being available to followers, promoting equality, and collaborating with all followers.[293]

The fourth dimension of servant leadership is responsible morality. Here, servant leaders ensure that the goals they hope to achieve and the means in which they will achieve them are morally legitimized, thoughtfully reasoned, and ethically justified.[294] This dimension includes themes of moral reasoning and moral action that show both the need for cognitive morality, but also requires morality in the acts that come out of contemplation.[295]

The fifth dimension of servant leadership, transcendental spirituality, is the more unique characteristic of Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora's (2008) model and, to my knowledge, is a unique characteristic only found in their model of servant leadership. The relationships that servant leaders build and the moral principles in which they hold are imbued with spiritual values. Where disconnectedness, compartmentalization, and disorientation plague organizations, servant leaders hope to restore wholeness within their followers and foster a holistic, integrated life.[296] Calling is another spiritual aspect important to servant leaders as they see leadership and followership as a spiritual act that intersects the internal self and the

---

[289] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
[290] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 407.
[291] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 407.
[292] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 407.
[293] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
[294] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 407.
[295] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
[296] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 408.

external world.[297] Themes in this dimension include interaction with religion, interconnectedness, having a sense of mission, and wholeness.

The sixth and final dimension brings in the notion of servant leaders possessing transforming influence upon their followers. Servant leadership is demonstrated when those served by servant leaders are positively transformed in multiple dimensions into servants themselves.[298] Therefore, a leader is being a servant leader when followers become servants. Themes in this dimension include the servant leader having a vision, modeling service, mentoring followers, trusting those around them, and empowering others.

This model provides a robust pathway to analyze Nehemiah's servant leadership. It is important to note that Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora's (2008) model integrates aspects of authentic, transformational, spiritual, and other leadership theories. It will be important to recognize the aspects of other leadership theories when using this model to describe Nehemiah's leadership. This causes a bit of concern as it will be important to justify Nehemiah's actions within a particular context as truly servant.

Model #3 – Liden Et Al.'s Model of Servant Leadership

Liden, Panaccio, Hu, and Meuser (2014) created a model of servant leadership consisting of three components of leadership necessary for servant leadership to be possible.[299] These three components include antecedent conditions, servant leader behaviors, and leadership outcomes. These components are conditional in that the correct antecedent conditions must be present for servant leader behaviors to exist. Likewise, the correct servant leader behaviors must be present for servant leader outcomes to be possible.

The first component of Liden et al. (2014) servant leadership model includes three antecedent conditions. First, servant leadership requires the proper context and culture to be in place for servant leadership to be effective. Certain environments, organizations, or spheres of

---

[297] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 408.

[298] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 408.

[299] Robert C. Liden, Jeremy D. Meuser, Sandy J. Wayne, John P. Dugan, Susan R. Komives, Jia Hu, and Alexandra Panaccio, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents, Processes, and Outcomes," in *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations*, vol. 1, ed. David V. Day (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014), 361.

society are more servant in nature and therefore will be more prone to accepting a servant leader.[300] For instance, health care systems are naturally aligned with servant ideas due to the servant nature and care performed in that profession.[301] The second antecedent involves leader attributes that are necessary for servant leadership to exist. These include the traits and skills possessed by the leader that will make him or her more of a natural servant leader. This also includes past experiences of the leader that open him or her to servant ideals.[302] The third and final antecedent to servant leadership is follower receptivity. The conditions can be right for servant leadership, and the leader can be predisposed to servant leadership qualities, however, if the group of followers is unwilling to follow a servant, the servant leadership platform will not stand.[303] Again, certain individuals, groups, and organizations will have better acceptance of a servant style of leadership, while others are conditioned to other leadership styles. This is especially true of certain cultures typically aligned to different leadership structures.[304]

Once conditions are appropriate for servant leadership to exist, Liden et al. (2014) found seven servant leader behaviors indicative to successful servant leadership. Servant leaders first conceptualize and understand the purposes, complexities, and mission of the group being led.[305] Second, servant leaders can emotionally heal their followers by being sensitive to their personal well-being and concerns.[306] Third, servant leaders put their followers first that demonstrates a posture of humility that gives priority to others.[307] Fourth, servant leaders help followers grow and succeed. The servant leader recognizes the professional and personal goals of their followers and actively helps them achieve those goals.[308] Fifth, servant leaders behave ethically. The ideal leader does the right thing, the right way, all the time. Servant leaders never compromise their ethical integrity to achieve success.[309] Sixth, servant leaders are empowering. They allow followers the freedom to be autonomous, to make decisions on their own, and to

---

[300] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361.

[301] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 231.

[302] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361.

[303] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361.

[304] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 231.

[305] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361.

[306] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361.

[307] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361.

[308] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361.

[309] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 235.

learn to be self-sufficient.[310] The seventh, and last, servant leader behavior occurs when servant leaders create value for the community. Here, servant leaders consciously give back to the community and that ideal is engrained in the organization's purpose and goals.[311]

From these servant leader behaviors comes three outcomes. If servant leaders succeed at behaving correctly, followers will first perform better and grow professionally and personally. Greater self-actualization will occur when followers are mentored within a servant leader environment. Second, the organization will benefit from individual servant leadership relationships as each follower benefits, which creates a compounding effect where the organization benefits as well. Third, servant leader behavior has a positive effect on societies.[312] When servant leadership affects individual followers and organizations, the communities and environments around the organization benefit because the idea of service moves into the greater community as others become servants themselves and begin to serve those around them.[313]

This model will be used to analyze Nehemiah's leadership, his environment, and the outcomes that occurred due to his leadership. Antecedents can be evaluated to see if certain contexts can house servant leadership. Servant leader behaviors will be used to evaluate the behaviors of Nehemiah, and Liden et al. (2014) outcomes will be used to see if the same outcomes were produced from the leadership of Nehemiah. Liden et al. recognized the possible shortcomings of servant leadership and their model. They recognize that not all situations will be primed for servant leadership.[314] Therefore, it is not purposeful to attempt to make each environment and leadership situation successful for servant leadership. Also, not every follower desires a servant leader. These aspects are important to understand as we use this model, and other models of servant leadership, upon the text of Nehemiah.

---

[310] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361.
[311] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361.
[312] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361.
[313] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 237.
[314] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 362.

Use of Servant Leadership Models on Nehemiah

Robert Greenleaf's (2002) servant leadership theory,[315] with the help of Spear's list of servant leadership characteristics,[316] Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora's (2008) model of servant leadership,[317] and Liden et al.'s (2014) model of servant leadership[318] helps us see the biblical text infused with the concept of service working within a leadership role. The theories can be used to analyze the leadership of biblical characters such as Nehemiah to gather conclusions to enhance our understanding of the Bible, its theology, and the characters within it. Each provides specific attributes that allow us to analyze Nehemiah's leadership in a different way that provides a holistic look at Nehemiah's interaction with servant leadership.

List of Servant Leadership Characteristics & Key Terms

Based on the three models analyzed, servant leaders possess varying levels of the following terms and actions: act as servants first, listens, inspires service, changes communities, humble, self-sacrificial, increases follower growth, serves the less privileged, intrinsically motivated, increases follower well-being,[319] empathetic, heals, aware, persuasive, conceptualizes, has foresight, a steward, committed to growth of people, builds communities,[320] subordinates oneself, has the mindset of a servant, performs acts of service, authentic, has integrity, accountable, being secure, vulnerable, does not take credit, works behind the scenes, creates covenantal relationships, accepts everyone, possesses radical equality, shares values, gives open ended commitments, instils mutual trust, has concern for others, available to followers, promotes equity, collaborates, has high moral reason, has high moral action, spiritually minded, restores wholeness, fosters an integrated life, religious, interconnected, has a sense of mission, whole, influences others, transformational, models

---

[315] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*.
[316] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[317] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 408.
[318] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[319] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*.
[320] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.

service, mentors, trusts others, empowers,[321] creates value, increases follower performance,

increases follower growth, increases follower self-actualization, increases organizational

performance, improves societies.[322]

Adaptive Leadership Theory

Model #1 – Heifetz's Model of Adaptive Leadership

As adaptive leadership theory is still a relatively recent development, there are not a lot

of independent models ascribed to the theory. However, the models that we do have are

robust and help describe adaptive leadership in a way that is useful in the leadership field as

well as for biblical studies. One of the most recognizable and popular models of adaptive

leadership is Heifetz's (1994) model. In his model, specific situational challenges are present

that provide an environment for six leader behaviors to arise that will lead to adaptive work.[323]

Heifetz's (1994) primary goal in his model was to focus on the dynamics of mobilizing people to

address change.[324]

In the first phase of adaptive leadership, certain situational challenges are naturally

present in organizations. Of the three situational challenges, two of these categories lead to a

proper environment where adaptive leadership can be possible. The first group of challenges

are technical in nature that have clear and defined solutions already in place and can be solved

using organizational rules and procedures.[325] These challenges do not need adaptive leadership,

but instead, require the leader to use conventional organization tactics to solve the problem.[326]

The second set of challenges involve those that are technical and adaptive in nature. Here, the

challenges are clearly defined, however, the solution has not been gained and, therefore,

---

[321] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 408.
[322] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[323] R.A. Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 13-28.
[324] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 260.
[325] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[326] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 261.

requires the leader to work with his followers, helping them adapt to find the solution.[327] This is a vital aspect of adaptive leadership that separates it from other complexity theories. Heifetz does not call for the leader to adapt and find the solution. He, instead, calls the leader to work with his followers and help them learn how to adapt so that they might solve the problem.[328]This is also true of the third situational category where the challenge is fully adaptive in that not only is the solution unclear, but the initial problem is not clear as well. Leaders, in this situation, are required to lead their followers to explore challenging situations and implement solutions.[329]

From two of the situational categories, technical and adaptive challenges and adaptive challenges, come six leader behaviors, also called activities, that play a vital role in adaptive leadership.[330] These are prescriptive in nature that leaders employ in aiding their followers to confront the challenges the organization faces and to find and implement the proper solutions that the challenges required.[331] First, Heifetz (1994) encourages leaders to "get on the balcony," i.e. asks leaders to step out of the general public, and rise above those individuals to get a clear view of the situation. The leader is away from the direct challenge and has the chance to gain a perspective that will aid him or her in how to lead followers.[332] Actions can include taking some quiet time alone, forming an advisory group, or taking time to simply observe the problem.[333]

The second activity for adaptive leaders is to identify the adaptive challenges present in the situation. Leaders must decide if the challenge is technical or adaptive, and if it is adaptive, then to decide between four potential patterns of adaptive change that the challenge calls for. These four patterns are 1) gaps between espoused values and behaviors where the organization's claim of values does not match with their actions. 2) Competing commitments, where the organization has too many commitments that conflict with each other. 3) Speaking

---

[327] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[328] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 262.
[329] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[330] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[331] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 263.
[332] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[333] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 263.

the unspeakable, where radical or unpopular ideas have not been expressed creating tension and untapped potential ideas. And 4) work avoidance, where followers stay in their "comfort" zone and do not want to address the challenge before them.[334]

Once the pattern of adaptive challenge has been identified, leaders move to the third activity of regulating distress. Adaptive leaders help their followers recognize the need for change that in of itself is causing distress.[335] Adaptive leaders help their followers move into a season where they are addressing the challenge and causing change, which then begins to alleviate stress.[336] Adaptive leaders, according to Heifetz (1994), do this by 1) creating a holding environment that is a safe place for followers to deal with challenges, 2) provide the means to help the follower either through direction, protection, orientation, conflict management, or productive norms, and 3) regulate their own personal stress.[337]

As the adaptive leader has begun interacting with his or her followers in regulating distress, he or she moves to the fourth activity in maintaining disciplined attention. Leaders encourage their followers to focus on the work at hand and to move into the challenging work before them.[338] This moves into Heifetz's (1994) fifth activity where leaders "give the work back to the people."[339] Adaptive leaders recognize the balance between getting involved and directing followers and allowing their followers autonomy in completing the work themselves. This balance is represented in Heifetz fourth activity, which has leaders intervening, and his fifth activity, allowing the followers to do the work on their own. However, whether the leader is directly involved or taking a step back, Heifetz's sixth activity is vital in adaptive leadership as the leader always protects leadership voices from below. Here, adaptive leaders are highly protective of their follower's ideas and opinions, especially from those who come from marginalized or minority groups.[340]

---

[334] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[335] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[336] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 263.
[337] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 266-268.
[338] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[339] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[340] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.

These six leader behaviors or activities produce the adaptive work desired in followers. The primary effect comes in leader-follower interaction where the leader has created a relationship with followers and is able to provide an environment where the followers can succeed in addressing the challenges present and reducing the stress that the challenge presents. Heifetz's model is a good model to use in analyzing Nehemiah's leadership as it allows us to take each context of Nehemiah and ascertain whether adaptive challenges are present that can call for adaptive leader behaviors to be performed. However, the model is also overly complex and can be a bit too abstract to provide definitive examples of adaptive leadership in Nehemiah. However, Heifetz's (1994) six leader behaviors will provide an excellent source to evaluate Nehemiah's adaptive leadership as there will be direct connections observed within the text.

Model #2 – Glover, Friedman, & Jones's Model of Adaptive Leadership

Glover, Friedman, and Jones (2002) recognize that "coping with change has become a constant challenge for contemporary leaders."[341] While this is true, I would extend this need for coping with change to the ancient world as complex leadership situations were prevalent in Nehemiah's leadership as well. Therefore, the need for adaption and training followers on how to adapt is a necessary component to leadership and organizational structures. Glover, Friedman, and Jones created a model that sought out to explain the process of adaption.[342] This model can be used to describe how leaders train followers on how to adapt. They used human development ideas from Piaget (1971)[343] who attempted to explain how human beings learned. Glover, Friedman, and Jones found that Piaget's ideas can be modeled to help understand the dynamics of adaptive leadership.[344]

---

[341] Jerry Glover, Harris Friedman, and Gordon Jones, "Adaptive Leadership: When Change is Not Enough (Part One)," *Org Dev J* 20, no. 2 (2002): 15.
[342] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23.
[343] J. Piaget, *The Biology of Knowledge* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1971).
[344] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23.

First, humans learn through assimilating, using pre-learned structures to attach meaning to the information being received.[345] Second, humans learn through accommodation where the learner goes through an internal change of beliefs, ideas, or attitudes as learners adapt to new experiences found in the changing world.[346] Adaptive leadership occurs when leaders use a combination of assimilation and accommodation to interact with the challenges faced in the organization. Glover, Freidman, and Jones (2002) found four responses to change depending on the level of assimilation and accommodation used by the leader.

The first response, maladaptive cultural traps, occurs when assimilation and accommodation are both low. Here, cultural aspects in our world prevent seeing the need to adapt to changes in the world. This produces an unwillingness or an inability to change based on the current situation. Regardless of the obvious need to change, leaders are unable to recognize the need and therefore, choose not to adapt.[347]

The second response, leading change by chance, occurs when assimilation is high, but accommodation is low. Also coined as "natural selection," by Glover, Freidman, and Jones (2002), this response is produced when leaders do a good job of collecting data from the environment, but do not make use of that data and fail to take the proper adaptive steps to solve the problem facing them. Therefore, adaptive success hinges on chance as the leader has all the information he or she needs but does not have the adaptive knowhow to choose what to do. As the leader chooses a path, there is a chance it will be successful, but also a chance that it will fail.[348]

The third response, entitled "serendipity," occurs when assimilation is low, and accommodation is high. Glover, Freidman, and Jones (2002) also call this "change for the sake of change." Here leaders are constantly changing and making adaptive decisions without sufficient information or feedback. Chance is once again the only agent that can provide success. The leader blindly chooses a path with little data to tell if that path will be successful or not.[349]

---

[345] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23.
[346] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23.
[347] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 25.
[348] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 25.
[349] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 26.

The fourth and final response to adaptive learning comes when assimilation and accommodation are both high. When this occurs, the adaptive leader finds maximum adaptive potential. Leaders make decisions and adapt to leadership challenges using careful and continuous use of environmental information. The leader is free to make decisions that are calculated and understood, which benefits the leader, followers, and the organization.

Glover, Freidman, and Jones's (2002) model will be used to evaluate Nehemiah's adaptive learning path and to ascertain which type of adaptive leader he shows in different contexts. This model is selective in the information that can be gained as it only discusses four types of adaptive leader responses. Three of these four leader responses are undesirable for successful leaders. Therefore, it is likely that only one of these responses, maximum adaptive potential, will be shown in Nehemiah. Therefore, this model will be used with other models of adaptive leadership to gain a more holistic idea of Nehemiah's leadership.

Model #3 – Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelvey's Complexity Leadership Model

The third model does not come from adaptive leadership theory, but instead comes from a closely related group of theories called complexity leadership theories. Complexity leadership theory postulates that there are complex interactions between leaders, followers, and situations that require the leader to adapt to the challenges presented. Where adaptive leadership theory looks at how leaders train and help followers adapt, complexity leadership theory looks at the actual adaptation the leader takes in a situation. This is important because we can analyze how Nehemiah trains his followers to adapt, but we also need to analyze how Nehemiah adapts himself. Therefore, one model of complexity leadership theory will be presented.

Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey's (2007) model of complexity leadership presents a well-rounded analysis of complexity leadership and aids us in evaluating the leadership of Nehemiah.[350] They see three leadership functions that occur in leadership situations. Adaptive

---

[350] Mary Uhl-Bien, Russ Marion, and Bill McKelvey, "Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting Leadership from the Industrial Age to the Knowledge Era," *Leadersh Q* 18 (2007): 305.

leadership functions occur when tension due to new or demanding challenges occur in an organization. These require adaptive measures to solve these challenges and relieve the tension.[351] Second, administrative leadership functions occur in formal managerial roles focused on accomplishing organizationally-prescribed outcomes. This includes planning, building vision, allocating resources, and managing conflict.[352] Third, enabling leadership functions allow for adaptive practices to thrive as leaders manage complex interactions between adaptive leadership functions and administrative leadership functions. First, this occurs by creating appropriate organizational conditions to allow adaptive practice to occur when innovation and adaptability is needed. Second, this occurs when it is necessary to bring adaptive and creative ideas into administrative structures.[353]

While these three functions exist in organizations, the crux of Uhl-Bien et al.'s (2007) complexity theory shows that these three functions are entangled within each other and do not present clear and defined boundaries. Therefore, the actualization of this process is very complex, and it is not helpful to attempt to section out adaptive and administrative functions, but instead, it is important to see how they entwine together and how leaders can act to help the two work together.[354] This is where enabling leadership functions works to bring the two functions together and bring success.[355]

Within the function of adaptive leadership, Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) found a list of contexts that are present in the complex environment that adaptive leadership must work in and specific mechanisms that adaptive leaders use to effect leadership within these complex environments. The contexts, which include networks of interaction, complex patterns of constraints, patterns of tension, independent relationships, rules of action, direct and indirect feedback, and rapidly changing environmental demands can, in some situations, produce the result of adaptability, learning, and creativity. The mechanisms, which include resonance, catalytic behaviors, stable and unstable behaviors, transitions of leadership, nonlinear change, information flow and pattern formation, and accreting nodes, also can produce adaptability, learning, and creativity

---

[351] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 305.
[352] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 305.
[353] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 305.
[354] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 305.
[355] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 306.

by themselves. However, it is best when emergence occurs where adaptive leaders take the contexts they are presented with and use appropriate mechanisms to adapt to those contexts to produce new paths of leadership that will produce adaptability, learning, and creativity.[356]

Uhl-Bien et al.'s (2007) model will be used to analyze the contexts Nehemiah acted in and the mechanisms he used, and help determine whether Nehemiah emerges as an adaptive leader in adaptive situations. This allows us to evaluate the adaptive nature of Nehemiah himself, and not just his ability to help his followers adapt. However, this model is extremely complicated and can be difficult to understand at times. It was difficult to glean the innerworkings of the theory and understand exactly how complexity could be expressed and analyzed in leaders. Once it is better understood, this model shows promise to accurately analyze a leader's ability to adapt in different situations.

Use of Adaptive Leadership Models on Nehemiah

This thesis discusses that leadership is best analyzed when dividing the text into contexts of leaderships for independent analysis. Also, this thesis shows that many leaders, including Nehemiah, adapt their leadership styles to the situation or context that is presented before them. As this is a crucial point in my thesis, analysis of adaptive and complexity leadership will be important to my conclusions of Nehemiah's leadership. This will occur both in how Nehemiah trains and prepares his followers for adaptive challenges (adaptive leadership theory) and in how Nehemiah adapts to different contexts himself (complexity leadership theory). Therefore, having two models of adaptive leadership (Heifetz and Glover, et al.) to show how Nehemiah interacts with his followers and one model of complexity leadership (Uhl-Bien et al. (2007)) to show how Nehemiah adapts as a leader will be useful to create an overall discussion on the use of adaptive leaderships in the text of Nehemiah.

---

[356] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 308.

List of Adaptive Leadership Characteristics & Key Terms

Based on the three models analyzed, adaptive leaders possess varying levels of the following terms and actions: cause adaption in followers, finds quiet environments to asses, gains perspective, gains advise, observes problems, identifies challenges, analytical, regulates distress, provides safety to followers, helps followers, directs followers, protects followers, orients followers, manages conflict, produces norms, regulates own stress, maintains follower focus, empowers followers, relinquishes control, trust followers, gives autonomy, protects follower voices, concerned for the marginalized,[357] assimilate information, accommodate change,[358] mitigates tension, enables creativity, enables change, enables cooperation, innovative, creative, administrative, gains success in complex environments, navigates complex patterns of constraint, navigates complex patterns of tension, develops independent relationships, copes with rapidly changing environmental demands, creates catalysts, and is emergent.[359]

---

[357] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[358] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.
[359] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 305-308.

Chapter 2

A Leadership Commentary of Nehemiah by Contexts

You may not control all the events that happen to you, but you can decide not to be reduce by them.[1]

-   Maya Angelou

<u>Introduction</u>

To analyze Nehemiah's leadership specifically, I created a unique commentary on the text of Nehemiah in its final form focusing specifically on leadership. An analysis of the biblical text of Nehemiah is conducted to grasp specific aspects of Nehemiah's leadership, the individualized situations and contexts affecting his leadership, and the outcomes occurring based on his leadership. This enables me to draw conclusions about Nehemiah's leadership and aids in comprehending the different styles of leadership presented in the text. To accomplish this, I first divide the text of Nehemiah into phases grouped by locations that Nehemiah is situated in or general events or tasks that are performed. Next, I divide each phase into individual contexts that represent a specific act of leadership for Nehemiah. Each of these contexts will be individually analyzed through the lens of leadership studies. This analysis has two separate areas of focus: 1) the actions and events described in the text, and 2) Nehemiah's self-presentation in his first-person account, both of which shed light on Nehemiah's leadership style.

Twenty-six different contexts across eight different phases comprise Nehemiah's leadership as portrayed in the biblical text. Each of these phases and contexts disclose different needs, different levels of crisis, different emotions and sensitivities on the part of Nehemiah and others, and different decisions Nehemiah took. This commentary will show that Nehemiah chose to lead differently depending on the context at hand.

---

[1] Maya Angelou, *Letter to My Daughter* (New York, NY: Random House, 2008), xii.

Table 2: Description of Phases & Contexts within the Text of Nehemiah

Phase	Context	Description	Verses
1		**Nehemiah as Cupbearer to the King in Susa**	1.1-2.8
	1	Nehemiah hears news of his homeland	1.1-1.3
	2	Nehemiah weeps & prays to God for his homeland	1.4-1.11
	3	Nehemiah presents his request before the king	2.1-2.8
2		**Nehemiah's Journey to Jerusalem with the King's Authority**	2.9-2.10
	4	Nehemiah interacts with governors, adversaries affected	2.9-2.10
3		**Pre-Work & Communication Before Building the Wall**	2.11-2.20
	5	Nehemiah inspects the wall without communication	2.11-2.16
	6	Nehemiah decides to rebuild the wall & gains support	2.17-2.18
	7	Nehemiah interacts with adversaries for the first time	2.19-2.20
4		**Building the Wall**	3.1-7.4
	8	Nehemiah organizes the work & assigns tasks to allies	3.1-3.32
	9	Nehemiah interacts with adversaries while building	4.1-4.23
	10	Nehemiah interacts with Jews oppressing their own	5.1-5.13
	11	Nehemiah's acts as governor versus others in the past	5.14-5.19
	12	Nehemiah interacts with further plots from adversaries	6.1-6.14
	13	Nehemiah's posture & position on completing the wall	6.15-7.4
5		**Census of Citizens by Genealogy After the Wall is Rebuilt**	7.5-7.73
	14	Nehemiah organizes the government by a census	7.5-7.69
	15	Nehemiah contributes to the building fund	7.70-7.73
6		**Reinstitution of Social, Political, & Religious Law in Yehud**	8.1-12.47
	16	Day 1 of reading the Law to the people	8.1-8.12
	17	Day 2 of reading the Law to the people	8.13-8.18
	18	National confession & the people sign the covenant	9.1-10.39
	19	Casting lots to decide where people should live	11.1-12.26
	20	Nehemiah dedicates the wall to God	12.27-12.43
	21	Nehemiah appoints Temple personnel	12.44-12.47
7		**The People Separate Foreigners from the Land**	13.1-13.3
	22	The People separate foreigners from the land	13.1-13.3
8		**Nehemiah's Return to Jerusalem & Continued Reform**	13.4-13.31
	23	Nehemiah expels Tobiah & provides priestly support	13.4-13.14
	24	Nehemiah institutes Sabbath reform	13.15-13.22
	25	Nehemiah condemns mixed marriages	13.23-13.29
	26	Nehemiah recounts his actions & pleas to God	13.30-13.31

The methodology used for this analysis begins by briefly examining each phase, offering an overview of the phase and the setting of Nehemiah's leadership, the timeframe, the characters involved, the number of contexts present, and verses included. Then, each context is

taken individually and analyzed through the lens of leadership studies. Within my commentary on each context, I often list specific characteristics associated with particular styles of leadership. These terms are gathered in chapter 2 from the three models chosen within each of the six leadership styles used to analyze Nehemiah's leadership. The terms and the models used analyze Nehemiah's leadership styles within each context. This commentary is not focused on analyzing theology, historical accuracy, chronological congruency, or spiritual meaning. Instead, this commentary is focused on analyzing leadership as it is portrayed in the modern text, the style of leadership reflected, and the outcome produced.

Each context will be analyzed using six primary questions to help focus the discussion on leadership and, specifically, the leadership of Nehemiah:

1. What is the setting and what are the environmental factors shaping this context?

2. What leadership actions are depicted in this context?

3. What Hebrew words denoting leadership are used in the context that help us understand Nehemiah's leadership and his actions and what do those words represent in this context?

4. How do the leadership models discussed earlier in this project shed light on Nehemiah's leadership as portrayed in each context?

5. Is Nehemiah portrayed as successful in his leadership in this context? Why or why not?

6. How does the success or lack of success within a particular context contribute to Nehemiah's overall leadership ability or his success as a whole?

These questions will provide the bases for analysis of each context, helping to produce more systematized and consistent conclusions surrounding Nehemiah's leadership.

Phase 1 — Nehemiah as Cupbearer to the King in Susa

The first phase in the biblical text of Nehemiah introduces Nehemiah to the reader as the cupbearer to the Persian king Artaxerxes who governs from Susa (Neh 1.1, 11). Three specific contexts in the biblical text belong to this phase: Nehemiah hearing of the condition of his homeland, Nehemiah weeping and praying to God for his homeland, and then several months later, Nehemiah's request to the king to restore Yehud. Scholars debate the specific years in question; however, most agree that this phase occurs in history around 450-400 BCE.[2] The characters include Nehemiah as the primary character, Hanani, Nehemiah's "brother," king Artaxerxes of Persia, the queen of Persia, and YHWH God of heaven (יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמָיִם). The entire phase encompasses Nehemiah 1.1-2.8 introducing Nehemiah, the trials at hand, and Nehemiah's goals and tasks.

Context 1 — Nehemiah Hears News of His Homeland — Neh 1.1–1.3

The opening three verses of the book of Nehemiah provide the overall setting, some character introduction, and the presentation of the overall plot of this phase in which Nehemiah announces his goals. Nehemiah, identified only as the son of Hacaliah (of whom we have no historical record), is in Susa, home to a winter palace for the king of Persia (Neh 1.1). We are informed that the action takes place in the month of Chislev in the twentieth year (Neh 1.1). We assume the twentieth year is the same twentieth year of king Artaxerxes referred to in Neh 2 (Neh 2.1). Nehemiah recognizes that a contingent from Yehud, including Hanani, Nehemiah's "brother," has arrived in Susa. Nehemiah has the desire to hear of his homeland and therefore makes the effort to inquire of Hanani. The news is grim as Hanani portrays a province in dire need, especially due to the walls and gates of Jerusalem being in ruin (Neh 1.3). This is of historical importance as the original sack of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar occurred over a century before (2 Kgs 25.8-17).[3] Therefore, it can be hypothesized that another disaster

---

[2] H.G.M. Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary: Ezra-Nehemiah*, vol. 16, eds. David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, John D.W. Watts, and Ralph P. Martin (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2018), xxxvi.
[3] Lester L. Grabbe, *Ezra-Nehemiah* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 1998), 40.

occurred in Yehud during or just before Artaxerxes' reign that has left Yehud in a worse state.[4] Regardless, according to the book of Nehemiah, a great crisis has arisen in Yehud requiring Nehemiah to choose between his own comforts and position in Susa, and the needs of his people.[5]

This first context presents us with the crisis Nehemiah faces — the awful state of Yehud and its people, and the need to rebuild the city wall. While Nehemiah has other goals that arise in his leadership campaign, the city wall stands at the center of all his actions. It is important to attend to the word חוֹמָה, translated in the NRSV as "wall," due to the fact that the word is used in twenty-nine verses in the Masoretic Text in the book of Nehemiah, while remaining absent in the text of Ezra.[6] Within the text of Nehemiah, the word is translated by Brown-Driver-Briggs (BDB) (2010) as "city wall," and "wall."[7] The implication in Nehemiah is that this word represents the wall around Jerusalem as a primary marker and reference point for Jerusalem as a whole, and is juxtaposed to Ezra's focus on the בַּיִת ("house") of God (Ezra 1.2; 3.8) and the מִזְבֵּחַ ("altar") of God (Ezra 3.2).

While there are no specific references to leadership in this first context, it does begin to set the scene of Nehemiah's leadership. The status of Yehud provides an opportunity for Nehemiah to either rise to the call of his people, or for him to take in the news, grieve over Yehud's state, and then continue with his duties and everyday life. It is not a mistake that Hanani comes to Nehemiah with the news of Yehud and it would be remiss if we do not recognize that Hanani, along with his entourage, had an agenda in coming to Susa.[8] They sought out Nehemiah due to his brotherly connection to Hanani, his connection by heritage to the province of Yehud, and his leadership position within the king's court, allowing him the ability to act on behalf of the Jewish people.[9] It is Nehemiah's leadership position that

---

[4] Grabbe, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 40.

[5] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 127.

[6] The word חוֹמָה is used in Nehemiah in Neh 1.3; 2.8, 13, 15, 17; 3.8, 13, 15, 27; 4.1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 13, 15, 17, 19; 5.16; 6.1, 6, 15; 7.1; 12.27, 30, 31, 37, 38; and 13.21.

[7] Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Gravesboro, CA: Snowball Publishing, 2010), 327.

[8] Loring W. Batten, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*, The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh, UK: T & T Clark, 1913), 183.

[9] Batten, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 183.

especially sets the stage for Nehemiah's leadership. Not only does Hanani present an opportunity for Nehemiah to actualize his leadership potential, but the offer also confirms that Nehemiah was already in a position of leadership.[10]

We see the first hints of leadership qualities in Nehemiah such as recognizing follower needs,[11] promoting an inviting environment,[12] considering individuals,[13] clearly communicating, being interpersonal, being relatable, being involved,[14] working in crisis, being desired by followers,[15] having strong convictions, building affiliation, instilling follower trust, emotionally connecting,[16] identifying with followers,[17] being attractive, building relationships,[18] listening,[19] being empathetic, being aware,[20] having strong concerns for others, collaborating,[21] gaining perspective,[22] assimilating information, and accommodating change.[23]

In this first context, he is presented with an opportunity to exercise leadership in a new environment and makes the choice to pursue it. Therefore, Nehemiah gains initial success in finding out needed information about his homeland and as we see in the second context, he has chosen to empathize with his kin in Yehud and pursue a path towards action that will alter his life's trajectory, setting the stage for all future leadership decisions in Yehud. The list of characteristics comes from almost every one of the six theories used to analyze Nehemiah. This suggests that there is not enough leadership action to section out a single leadership style. However, the presence of crisis in the introduction sets up an environment for a charismatic leader to find success. It is important that Nehemiah's leadership begins with a crisis being presented and followers asking Nehemiah to lead them through the crisis. As Jacobsen and House (2001) describe, the first step in charismatic leadership is an introduction of followers to

---

[10] The leadership implications of Nehemiah's position as cupbearer will be addressed in the next context.

[11] House and Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," 1-5.

[12] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.

[13] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

[14] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.

[15] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* x-xx.

[16] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.

[17] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

[18] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.

[19] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27-32. And House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.

[20] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.

[21] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.

[22] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.

[23] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.

the personality and charisma of the leader.[24] This is portrayed here in the opening context. Overall, while we do not see specific leadership actions, we do see the context and environment begin to solidify for Nehemiah to become a leader.

Context 2 — Nehemiah Weeps & Prays to God for His Homeland — Neh 1.4–1.11

In the second context, while still in Susa, the text describes secondary acts of leadership that provide insight into Nehemiah's leadership styles and how the environment affects his leadership characteristics. Nehemiah is still absorbed in preparations, bringing him into a new leadership position where we will see more active leadership portrayed.

The news of his homeland prompts an expression of emotions which in turn prompts prayer and fasting as he pleads for God to remember his promises and bring relief to his people. There are three specific markers in this second context of Nehemiah's eventual leadership. The first marker is found in Nehemiah's emotional reaction to the news of his people in Yehud. The text shows Nehemiah weeping and mourning for days (Neh 1.4). The word בָּכָה may indicate weeping of varying intensity.[25] In this context, the Hebrew shows a strong emotional response to the point of prolonged weeping (Neh 1.4).[26] Batten (1913) also points out that Nehemiah's emotions are so strong that even months later, when he is once again in the king's presence, he is still unable to control his emotional state (Neh 2.1-3).[27]

Nehemiah, in this context, is a man driven by his emotions, moving him to action. We see a sensitive man who deeply cares for others. This emotional representation of Nehemiah shapes the reader's understanding of Nehemiah's future acts of leadership (Neh 5.6; 12.27-43; 13.8, 11, 17, 25, 28). Therefore, we are given insight into Nehemiah's character, the quality of his faith, and his drive to help others through his reaction and subsequent steps towards resolution of the problem at hand.[28] Nehemiah's emotional reaction also provides us insight into the context surrounding the text of Nehemiah. As Nebuchadnezzar laid waste to Jerusalem

---

[24] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[25] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 113.
[26] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 113.
[27] Batten, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 184.
[28] Myers, *Ezra Nehemiah*, 95.

and brought his people into captivity some 140 years prior (2 Kgs 25.8-17), we must assume that something drastic has occurred in Yehud closer to Nehemiah's present time to elicit such an emotional outburst. Williamson (2018) references Ezra 4.23, where Rehum and Shimshai force the Israelites to stop construction of the Temple due to Artaxerxes' command.[29] Something significant most likely occurred creating further problems for the remnant of Yehud that would provide such an emotional outcry from Nehemiah.[30] Ilies et al. (2005) argues that emotional contagion is a characteristic of an authentic leader.[31] We will witness Nehemiah's ability to transfer his strong emotions onto his followers to achieve his goals. Weber (1968) shows that a charismatic leader can be highly emotional due to extraordinary qualities found in the leader and the intense situations that can occur in proximity to charismatic leadership.[32] House (1976) further shows that emotions are indicative of charismatic leadership outcomes.[33] House also shows that charismatic leaders are role models, express lofty goals that require high expectations, and lead with extreme qualities.[34] This requires emotional involvement with their followers that then produce emotional connections with the leader and emotional involvement with the goals that the leader projects.[35] This context shows Nehemiah capable of having strong emotions. This information helps us analyze how he uses his emotions in his leadership.

The second marker of Nehemiah's future leadership is found in his practice of immediately resorting to prayer when in need. We see Nehemiah as a leader who prays to his God and seeks guidance from a higher power. Within the text of Nehemiah, we find five specific prayers of Nehemiah (Neh 1.5-11; 3.36-37; 5.19; 6.9, 14) and in several instances we are told that Nehemiah prayed before making an important decision or when faced with a difficult obstacle (Neh 2.4; 4.3).[36] The prayers of Nehemiah portray a leader who is spiritually inspired and help establish Nehemiah as a leader who listens to counsel from a superior source, recognizes the need for others, and who trusts God for his direction. This prayerful posture will

---

[29] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 172.
[30] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 172.
[31] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[32] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* x-xx.
[33] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[34] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[35] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[36] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 375.

be a cornerstone in Nehemiah's leadership as we see him return to prayer in his most difficult times of leadership (Neh 1.5-11; 2.4; 4.4-5; 6.14; 13.14, 22, 29, 31).[37] Additionally, we are shown Nehemiah's endurance and stamina as we see him engage in prayer and fasting for months leading up to his interaction with king Artaxerxes (Neh 1.4; 2.1). Nehemiah's persistence in prayer is another leadership quality that is often seen in the biblical texts through examples such as Abraham, Elijah, and Hannah (Gen 12.4; 21.5; 1 Kgs 17.1; 18.42; 1 Sam 1.10-16).

As this context introduces Nehemiah's use of prayer, it also presents us with his first and longest prayer in the text. We are introduced to many leadership qualities Nehemiah possesses and portrays, building his leadership profile. These qualities include agreeableness (Neh 1.5, 9, 11), articulation (Neh 1.9, 10), authenticity (Neh 1.6, 7, 8, 9, 10), balanced processing (Neh 1.8, 9, 10), sound communication (Neh 1.6, 9, 10), confrontation (Neh 1.9, 10, 11), courage (Neh 1.8, 9, 10, 11), determination (Neh 1.9, 10, 11), taking initiative (Neh 1.6, 9, 10, 11), having a protective nature (Neh 1.9, 10, 11), providing expectations (Neh 1.8, 9, 10, 11), being relational (Neh 1.10, 11), being respectful (Neh 1.5), taking responsibility (Neh 1.6, 7), being self-aware (Neh 1.8, 10), being self-sacrificial (Neh 1.6, 7), being sensitive (Neh 1.5), being spiritual (Neh 1.5-11), strategizing (Neh 1.5, 9, 10), and being supportive (Neh 1.5, 10). All these qualities can be found in Nehemiah's first prayer and are indicative of his future leadership.

Leadership studies provides context for Nehemiah's prayer in two ways. First, it shows the preparation of Nehemiah as he prepares to lead. As a transformational leader, he is "modeling the way" in taking the time and energy to compose himself and bring this crisis to a higher power.[38] As he is cultivating his vision, his preparation and time spent with God allows for that vision to cure as he allows God to transform him into the leader that he will become.[39] This also brings the supernatural qualities of a charismatic leader as he interacts with the divine and gains instruction, vision, and "powers."[40] Moreover, this act shows Heifetz's (1994) adaptive leadership idea of "getting on the balcony" as Nehemiah removes himself from the

---

[37] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 104.
[38] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge,* 13.
[39] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.
[40] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* x-xx.

environment to gain perspective of the situation.[41] Nehemiah's movement to prayer also shows servant leadership qualities such as transcendental spiritualism that shows Nehemiah as one who is willing to build spiritual connections with his God that will build him as a leader.[42]

Second, leadership studies helps to recognize relational aspects of Nehemiah in his prayer. We will see that while Nehemiah, as described in the modern text, rarely develops individual relationships with his followers, he intentionally develops an individual relationship with God. The development of professional relationships as an important transactional and path-goal step to goal achievement.[43] There is individualized consideration with Nehemiah's relationship with God that works in a reverse way where Nehemiah, as the follower, is transformed by God.[44] Avolio et al. (2004) show that there is personal identification of the follower where the beliefs and leadership of the leader become the beliefs and characteristics of the follower.[45] This is shown in Nehemiah's prayers as Nehemiah personally identifies with God, which then allows him to become the identifying marker to his followers (Neh 2.17-18). As he creates an authentic relational orientation with God, he then learns how to produce authentic relational orientation with his followers when the context requires it.[46]

What is also shown is that Nehemiah possessed qualities allowing him to approach God and interact with him in a manner showing both respect and a willingness to confront, gaining Nehemiah the success he needed to accomplish his eventual goals (Neh 6.15-19; 8; 9.1-5; 10.28-39; 11.1-24; 12.27-43). Nehemiah held God to his promises but did so in a way presenting himself to God and to the reader as a pious and devout follower of God (Neh 1.6, 8, 10, 11). Through this prayer, Nehemiah also forever links himself with the people of Yehud, identifying his cause with theirs (Neh 1.6-7, 10).[47] This is specifically shown in Nehemiah's prayer as it is remarkably like other passages in the Bible.[48]

---

[41] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.

[42] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.

[43] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.

[44] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

[45] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 802-808.

[46] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.

[47] Ralph W. Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, vol. 4, ed. Leander E. Keck (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2015)*,* 70-71.

[48] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 69. Neh 1.5 finds reference to Deut 7.9, 21; 10.17; Dan 9.4; 1 Kgs 8.23. Neh 1.6 finds reference to 1 Kgs 8.28-29, 52; 2 Chr 6.40; 7.15; Ps 130.2. Neh 1.7 finds reference to Deut 5.31;

Nehemiah alludes to the ancient texts as a way of further connecting himself with his people. This will aid in his future attempts to connect with his people as their leader, but also shows his genuine desire to serve his fellow Israelites. This is especially found in Nehemiah's connection in 1.6 with the prayer of Solomon (2 Chr 6.40). In Nehemiah's assumed desire to associate himself with king Solomon he 1) further aligns himself with the people of Yehud through mutual connection with past ethnic kingship, 2) intends to bring the people of Yehud back to a former Davidic code that Nehemiah believes to be the correct line of conduct for the Jewish people, and 3) shows that his interests are not rooted in political maneuvering or a need for power, but instead in a genuine concern for the holy city, the Jewish need for worship at the Temple, and the Jewish way of life.[49] We see this motive confirmed as much of his prayer is not specific to the situation at hand, but offers a theological conversation between man and God that existed since the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 12; 15). It is only at the end of his prayer that Nehemiah addresses the need for success in the current time period and for what Nehemiah is about to do (Neh 1.11).[50]

The third and final marker providing insight into Nehemiah's leadership style comes in the last statement of the chapter, "At that time, I was cupbearer to the king" (Neh 1.11). The word here is שָׁקָה which BDB (2010) translates as "cupbearer" or a person who obtains drink for someone.[51] While Batten (1913) shows that even menial duties within the Persian court were performed by nobility,[52] we find that the position of cupbearer held higher position, above nobility, in the Persian court. Herodotus (2016) shows the cupbearer holding a place of honor amongst the Persians.[53] Tobit tells of Esarhaddon, king of the Neo-Assyrian empire, making his cupbearer second in command (Tob 1.22). In addition, we should note the biblical reference to a cupbearer in 2 Kgs 18 where Sennacherib's *Rabshakeh*, translated from the Akkadian as "chief cupbearer," performed duties well beyond tasting wine (2 Kgs 18.17,19,26,27,28,37).[54]

34.5. Neh 1.8 finds reference to Deut 4.27; 28.64. Neh 1.9 finds reference to Deut 12.5; 30.1-4. Neh 1.10 finds reference to Exod 32.11; Deut 9.29; 1 Chr 17.21.

[49] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 391.

[50] Batten, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 188.

[51] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 1052.

[52] Batten, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 190.

[53] Herodotus, *Histories*, 166.

[54] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 394-395.

Based on the biblical evidence showing that Nehemiah was granted an audience with the king (Neh 2.1), was sad in front of the king and was not punished for it (Neh 2.2) and secured the king's agreement to all of his requests (2.6, 8), Nehemiah was in a significant position of leadership. According to Williamson (2018), Nehemiah was most likely a trusted advisor who held a position of confidence with the king, acting more as a companion than as a servant.[55] It is unlikely that Nehemiah would receive this position arbitrarily. Instead, we must assume that he would have possessed specific leadership skills warranting an appointment. Examples are found in other biblical texts where biblical leaders are given high positions due to their abilities and skills (Gen 41.37-44; Esth 2.9; Dan 2.48). The modern text does not tell of Nehemiah's qualifications; however we can surmise that Nehemiah possessed worthy skills that warranted his appointment and continued use by the king and his future promotion to governor. It can be surmised, due to Nehemiah's direct service to the king that Nehemiah also had direct interaction with the leadership decisions and leadership character of Artaxerxes and learned from his encounters.

While Nehemiah does not assume a leadership role in this context, there are several aspects of leadership that we can discuss. While Nehemiah is a follower of God, he is not idle nor silent in his interaction with God. Instead, Nehemiah reminds God of his promises and uses commands to God asking him to act (Neh 1.6, 8, 11). There are path-goal characteristics of leadership that include communicating high expectations, providing value, providing compensation,[56] removing obstacles, coaching, increasing opportunities, facilitating a path,[57] providing guidance, listening, and reduces conflict[58] that allow Nehemiah to achieve the goal that he desires by reminding God of what he promised and holding God to those "payoffs" if God's people perform to his expectations.[59] Nehemiah is transformational as he attempts to transform God's view of Yehud and to gain a more favorable outcome based on the Jews transforming into obedient followers. Here, Nehemiah uses inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration through his prayer as he attempts to

---

[55] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 174.
[56] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 18-20.
[57] House and Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," 1-5.
[58] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.
[59] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 18-20.

motivate God towards his vision.[60] There are hints of charismatic leadership as Nehemiah shows a lot of charisma in how he orchestrates his prayer for both God and for the readers of his text. We see notions of House's (1976) list of personal characteristics, especially as it pertains to extreme high levels of self-confidence, having strong convictions, and having an unfaltering urge to influence.[61] And finally, there are servant leader qualities present in Nehemiah's prayer, in his desire to serve his people by coming to God on their behalf. Liden et al. (2014) provide a model which serves us well here as we see the proper antecedents present for servant leadership to occur. Nehemiah understands his purpose, puts his followers first, helps followers grow, behaves ethically, and generates empowerment to help fulfill Nehemiah's vision of creating better value for his community. This produces a positive outcome where everyone benefits.[62] I see Nehemiah as mostly transformative in this context as his goal is to transform God's opinion of Yehud into a more positive light that aligns with Nehemiah's vision of a secured and obedient Yehud.

Context 3 — Nehemiah Presents His Request Before the King — Neh 2.1–2.8

The third and last context within the first phase of Nehemiah's leadership provides the climax to this phase and the beginning of Nehemiah's independent leadership. Here, some four months after Nehemiah begins his prayer to God for wisdom and success, he finds himself in front of the king. The text explains that the distress of his people has taken a physical and psychological toll on Nehemiah as he continues to wrestle in prayer and fasting for his people (Neh 2.1-4). His melancholy is palpable to the king, something that in most courts in the ancient Near East would have earned a death sentence (Dan 1.10).[63] This, however, presents an opportunity for Nehemiah and presupposes that he has created a respectful and trusting relationship with the king, allowing him to show his sadness and not be met with punishment. With the opportunity at hand, Nehemiah musters all his courage stockpiled from four months

---

[60] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.
[61] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[62] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[63] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 52.

of prayer, fasting, and preparation, and makes his request to the king (Neh 2.3-5). We are presented with key leadership characteristics in how Nehemiah tactfully addresses the problem in a way that remains respectful to the king, while at the same time secures Nehemiah's success. He is diplomatic in his words and skillful in how he crafts his response.[64]

First, he admits to the king that he is in fact distressed, which displays humility, vulnerability, and courage to the king. Once the king allows him to speak, Nehemiah then laments the destruction of his ancestral home where his ancestors are buried (Neh 2.3). Reverence for ancestral burial grounds was universal in the ancient Near East and would be immediately respected.[65] Once Nehemiah has the king emotionally invested, he says a quick prayer (Neh 2. 4), legitimating his dependence on and connection to his God in the eyes of his readers, and potentially the king, and furthering the notion that Nehemiah is spiritually driven. He then launches into his request (Neh 2.5). Wisdom is required as the topic is a sensitive one for obvious reasons. As Artaxerxes was the king who halted the rebuilding of Jerusalem in the first place, it would be unwise to insist that the king go against his edict (Ezra 4.18-24). Steinmann (2010) shows Nehemiah's intelligent use of his words by mentioning Yehud, not Jerusalem specifically.[66] We see Nehemiah warming the king up to the possibility of reversing his initial decree by starting with Yehud, Nehemiah's homeland, in ruins and in need of repair (Neh 2.3). Only when he gains the king's initial confidence does Nehemiah mention the city walls (Neh 2.5). This allowed Artaxerxes to avoid any shame and allowed him to grant the request (Neh 2.6).[67]

With the king's blessing secured, Nehemiah seeks to secure his safety along the journey and to obtain the necessary materials for the job ahead (Neh 2.7-8). We see that Nehemiah already knew the officer in charge of the timber fields, demonstrating that Nehemiah had been thinking about what would be required and of whom. (Neh 2.7-9).[68] Klein (2015) also presents us with the possibility that Artaxerxes saw Nehemiah's request as an opportunity for Persia as

---

[64] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 72.
[65] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 179.
[66] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 376.
[67] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 376.
[68] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 181.

well.[69] As a trusted ally and advisor, Nehemiah could now be placed in a role of leadership, helping to secure Persia's place in Yehud and create a military force in a strategic area in close proximity to Persia's enemies, such as Egypt.[70] Therefore, it is understandable that Nehemiah followed Artaxerxes' instructions if it gained him the success he needed in rebuilding and fortifying Yehud.

This context provides us with important information regarding the skill and character of Nehemiah. While he has yet to be placed in an independent leadership role, we are once again presented with preparations for Nehemiah's leadership transition. His interaction with the king seems to be a skillful masterpiece of planning as he crafted every word, every posture, and every emotion. His timing was impeccable, knowing exactly when to act and when to speak. When presented with the opportunity, Nehemiah came with a specific plan providing necessary details to the king showing that Nehemiah was able to accomplish the task and equally determined to succeed.[71] His own comforts, position, and security were now set aside, on at least a temporary basis, due to his decision to serve his people over himself, radically altering the trajectory of his career and his entire life (Neh 1.11).[72] It is important to recognize acts of service and self-sacrifice as servant leadership characteristics necessary for Nehemiah to be successful. It would help him establish comradery and establish trust as he interacts with the people of Yehud (Neh 2.17-18).[73]

Nehemiah, in this context, primarily reflects a transformational leadership style. As Bass and Riggio (2014) note, transformational leaders do not simply look for exchanges as a means for profit, but instead, stimulate and inspire others through empowerment and fulfilling needs.[74] Nehemiah presents as transformational in two ways within this context. The first is seen in how he interacts with Artaxerxes. There is a natural exchange of needs between both individuals, however, Nehemiah chooses to align "the objectives and goals of the

---

[69] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 73.
[70] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 73.
[71] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 74.
[72] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 127-129.
[73] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.
[74] Bass and Riggio, *Transformational Leadership*, 3.

individual…leader, the group, and the larger organization."[75] There is a desire in Nehemiah to transform the king. While Artaxerxes is the obvious superior in the leadership relationship, we see Nehemiah's natural leadership characteristics displayed not only in his role as advisor and confidant, but also in his request, as Nehemiah molds the interaction in a way that transforms Artaxerxes's mindset from someone who stopped helping the Jews (Ezra 4.18-24) to one willing to help them fully rebuild (Neh 2.6). There is an obvious and innate desire in Nehemiah to transform his people back to his perception of former glory and prosperity.

We see transformational characteristics in this context such as having charisma, inspiring others, motivating others, stimulating intellect, considering individuals,[76] giving a clear vision, being organized, creating trust, giving clear expectations, being creative, building self-respect, empowering others, creating focus, enticing others, clearly communicating, standing by his beliefs, interpersonal, relatable, involved,[77] modeling leadership, inspiring a shared vision, enabling action, and encouraging others.[78] Nehemiah shows almost every characteristic identified by the three models of transformational leadership used. Nehemiah needed Artaxerxes as an ally and therefore, instead of a simple exchange of needs, Nehemiah recognizes the necessity for relationship and trust to be built so that he and his people may have a powerful ally.[79] Nehemiah remained respectful at all times ensuring that Artaxerxes felt valued, his position was never threatened, and he was empowered to make the decision.[80] Also, Nehemiah was transformative through practical preparation and detailed planning.[81] He was structured in his response, his plan was detailed and set, allowing for Artaxerxes to see the value in Nehemiah's leadership.

Along with transformational leadership, charismatic leadership style emerges for the first time. This is shown in Nehemiah's ability to see a crisis, rally support for his cause, and bring others along in his plans that would aid in its realization.[82] We see charismatic leadership

---

[75] Bass and Riggio, *Transformational Leadership,* 3.

[76] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.

[77] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.

[78] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.

[79] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 24-72.

[80] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 24-72.

[81] Kotter, "Winning at Change," 27-33.

[82] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 51-55.

also in how Nehemiah commands his audience and how he manages to persuade Artaxerxes against all odds.[83] As Nehemiah interacts more with individuals, albeit not followers, we are better able to discern leadership qualities and actions.

Phase 2 — Nehemiah's Journey to Jerusalem with the King's Authority

The second phase of Nehemiah's leadership takes place within a single context, in the province Beyond the River, a translation of the Akkadian "Ebir-nari." Here, Nehemiah acquires the materials needed for his building project and the reader is introduced to Nehemiah's adversaries. The time frame is not given, but it includes enough time to travel and acquire the materials needed. The characters include Nehemiah, the governors of Ebir-nari, the officers of the Persian army and cavalry, Sanballat the Horonite, and Tobiah the Ammonite. This phase is described in Neh 2.9-10.

Context 4 — Nehemiah Interacts with Governors, Adversaries Affected — Neh 2.9–2.10

With the king's support and official documentation in hand, Nehemiah begins his journey to Jerusalem. There are three features providing insight into Nehemiah's position, his authority, and his leadership. First, Nehemiah travels to the governors of the province Beyond the River (עֵבֶר הַנָּהָר) and gives them the king's letters.[84] The possession of the king's letters facilitates safe conduct and grants the authority Nehemiah needed to acquire the materials for the building project ahead. While we are not offered much detail, we recognize the authority Nehemiah commands. In the text, there is no disagreement or resistance from the governors allowing us to conclude that Nehemiah has adequate status to secure immediate obedience (Neh 2.9). This interaction leads Grabbe (1998) to conclude that, although not proclaimed in the text at this juncture, it can be inferred that Nehemiah has been granted the title of governor of Yehud.[85] As the king is the one who grants such an office, and we know that Nehemiah is

---

[83] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 17.
[84] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 719.
[85] Grabbe, *Ezra-Nehemiah,* 41-42.

introduced as governor later in the text (Neh 5.14; 8.9; 10.1; 12.26), it is likely the king granted this title before Nehemiah left.[86] This is corroborated by: 1) The governors of Ebir-nari's acceptance of the king's letters and obedience to Nehemiah (Neh 2.9a). 2) The accompaniment of officers of the army and cavalry as part of a delegation that would travel with a governor (Neh 2.9b). 3) The offense that the current officials, Sanballat and Tobiah, take when hearing of Nehemiah's presence as it implies a challenge of power amongst equals (Neh 2.10). 4) The welcome that Nehemiah receives in Jerusalem from the rulers (Neh 2.17-18). All four of these considerations provide sufficient evidence to show that Nehemiah has been granted a significant leadership role and associated authority.

The second mark of Nehemiah's leadership may be seen in his traveling companions. Unlike Ezra, who came to Jerusalem with an entourage of individuals possessing a variety of positions (Ezra 1.5-11), the text does not indicate that Nehemiah traveled with many close friends, family, or other Jews (Neh 2.12; 5.10; 7.2).[87] He does not arrive to Ebir-nari with as much pomp as Ezra (Ezra 1.5-11). Instead, he arrives with authority and a military escort to ensure his success would draw attention and be seen as a show of power rather than a triumphal return. The word שַׂר provides additional information as these soldiers were more than mere foot soldiers, but rather trained captains or generals of the army (Gen 21.22; Exod 18.21; Deut 1.15; Josh 5.14; Judg 4.2).[88] Nehemiah is focused on getting the materials necessary, getting others to quickly understand his position and his authority, and commanding a presence that demands compliance.

The third mark of Nehemiah's leadership may be seen in the introduction of Nehemiah's adversaries. The modern text wastes no time in using the concept of the "other" to foster unity, generate crisis, and underline the authority of Nehemiah. We are introduced to Sanballat the Horonite and Tobiah the Ammonite official and are told that they were greatly displeased to hear that someone cared about the Israelites and wanted to aid in their rebuilding (Neh 2.10). Further information will be provided later, but the presence of initial opposition to Nehemiah

---

[86] Grabbe, *Ezra-Nehemiah,* 41-42.
[87] Willis J. Beecher, "The Postexilic History of Israel. V: The Reform Under Ezra and Nehemiah," *The Old and New Testament Student* 9, no. 5 (1889): 296.
[88] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 978.

speaks to his leadership in two ways. The very fact that individuals became concerned for their own wellbeing and position due to Nehemiah's presence again speaks to his perceived authority. Sanballat as the governor of Samaria, and Tobiah, also a governmental official, felt threatened by Nehemiah's leadership and were afraid for their wealth and positions in Yehud.[89]

The second way to analyze Nehemiah's leadership in this context is to examine the words used and the information given in the text. Looking at Neh 2.10, we see how Nehemiah refers to Sanballat and Tobiah. An official title is not bestowed upon the two individuals, nor does Nehemiah allow the prestige of their positions to be known. Instead, Nehemiah characterizes these individuals as aliens to the Jewish land and characterizes them as non-Jews. This immediately identifies them as "other" and, to Nehemiah, invalidates their claim to possess authority over Yehud. Even the writer's use of עֶבֶד to describe Tobiah has pejorative connotations.[90] BDB (2010) shows the word indicates a minister, adviser, or official, but can also be translated as servant or slave.[91] However, the term could be used here to suggest someone easily dismissed as inconsequential.[92] Sanballat became the governor of Samaria in 408 BCE, and holds equal weight to Nehemiah's authority.[93] Likewise, Tobiah could have been the governor of Ammon, which would have made him a peer to Nehemiah as well.[94] However, Nehemiah does not treat them as peers, but illegitimizes their claim of authority, and goes even further by calling Tobiah a servant (Neh 2.10), placing him in a subordinate role to both Sanballat and Nehemiah.[95] We see a bent towards nationalism as Nehemiah desires to alienate outsiders and exclude them from leadership. We also see Nehemiah choose to negatively characterize individuals who do not share his vision, thus diminishing their status and effectiveness and conversely elevating his status (Neh 2.19; 4.5; 5.7, 13; 6.3, 8, 11, 14; 7.61-64; 13.7-9, 11, 15, 17-18, 21, 25, 27, 30).

---

[89] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 132.
[90] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 182-183.
[91] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 713-717.
[92] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 713-717.
[93] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 54.
[94] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 54.
[95] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 54.

This approach reflects the leadership styles that Nehemiah embraces in this context. As Nehemiah does not need to establish relationships or to coerce anyone to comply with his wishes, Nehemiah chooses a blended form of leadership centered more on a path-goal process than in relational building. Nehemiah knows what he needs to get the job done, understands the goal, sees the path to obtain that goal, and takes the necessary steps to be successful.[96] To Nehemiah, it is a straightforward transaction with the governors of Ebir-nari and there is no need to exercise charisma. For this reason, Nehemiah can act in a path-goal leadership style as there is no perceived threat or enemy, nor is there any need to persuade or motivate. And while we are introduced to his future enemies in this context, we are not given an indication that there is any altercation between Sanballat and Tobiah with Nehemiah. As we are afforded the understanding that Nehemiah received what he needed, we see a path-goal transaction where both parties benefit and are valued.

We do see an adaptive aspect to his leadership as Nehemiah adapts styles from his interaction with the king in the third context (Neh 2.1-8), to an interaction with the governors Beyond the River (Neh 2.9-10). His style of leadership shifts to accommodate the leadership needs of the situation. Uhl-Bien et al.'s (2007) complexity theory aids our analysis as we view a complex context that has potential constraints and tensions to which Nehemiah imposes adaptive mechanisms such as catalytic behavior, stabilizing behaviors, and clear information flow that allows Nehemiah to be adaptable and creative to the situation at hand.[97]

We also see instances of charismatic leadership in this context in his knowledge, skill, communication, instruction, and his ability to meet the needs present.[98] However, his charismatic style in this context is more organically present and less intentional in its practice. His charismatic leadership style, however, is produced in the writing and his use of words to describe his adversaries. We see strong charismatic language of bolstering his position and rallying support through lowering the status of others — a quality present in many charismatic

---

[96] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership, 323-352.
[97] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 305-308.
[98] J. Kotter, "Winning at Change," *Leader to Leader J 10 (1998):* 27-33. And Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

leaders, especially those who practice personalized charismatic leadership.[99] We see characteristics of extreme high self-confidence and the need to dominate subordinates in Nehemiah's writing that begins to form an understanding of Nehemiah's view of these future enemies.[100] Overall, however, Nehemiah presents a path-goal style of leadership in his actions to gain the materials needed, and his charismatic style in his writing provides the reader an understanding of Nehemiah's mindset when it comes to authority over other leaders in the region.[101]

Phase 3 — Pre-Work & Communication Before Building the Wall

The third phase of Nehemiah's leadership brings Nehemiah into Jerusalem and includes the preparatory work and communication necessary before the building project begins. Three separate contexts are included in this phase. The characters in this phase include Nehemiah, some of his entourage, the current leaders of Jerusalem, Sanballat, Tobiah, Geshem the Arab, a few mentioned inhabitants, and the God of heaven. Phase three consists of Neh 2.11-20 and only occupies several days in real time. These three contexts all display a predominantly charismatic leadership style, and this is the first phase to reflect Nehemiah's primary use of a single leadership style.

Context 5 — Nehemiah Inspects the Wall Without Communication — Neh 2.11–2.16

The fifth context finds Nehemiah arriving in Jerusalem and after three days beginning his work (Neh 2.11). There is an instant recognition of the need or the perceived need for secrecy present in Nehemiah's leadership (Neh 2.12-13). Nehemiah recognizes not only the condition of the wall but must have begun to also recognize the difficult condition of the social, political, and religious atmosphere surrounding Jerusalem. This can be inferred by his secrecy

---

[99] Richard A. Couto, "Dear Publius: Reflections on the Founding Fathers and Charismatic Leadership," in *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead,* vol. 2, eds. Bruce J. Avolio and Francis J. Yammarino, 95-108, *Monographs in Leadership and Management* (Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2008), 96.

[100] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.

[101] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.

and not telling anyone of his plans or his intentions (Neh 2.16). The context opens with Nehemiah spending three days in Jerusalem — what he was doing during that time is unknown, but because he remarks twice that he told no one of his plans, it is likely that Nehemiah was attending to his own set of processes that was not required information to anyone else.[102] Heifetz (1994) would see this as an adaptive leadership strategy as Nehemiah "gets on the balcony" as he steps away from interactions with others and gains intelligence and perspective before acting.[103] As we witnessed in earlier contexts, Nehemiah does not act without planning first and we see this leadership attribute arise again in this context (Neh 1.4; 2.1, 11-16; 4.13-21; 5.7; 6.3). Thomas et al. (2015) contend that Nehemiah attributed the state of the wall and the condition of Jerusalem to a lack of trust and failed promises by other leaders to rebuild the city.[104] This generated hopelessness and skepticism in the people of Yehud regarding their future.[105] Therefore, Nehemiah had to be detailed in ascertaining the context so that he could properly motivate the people against the crisis under his leadership. This reconnaissance proves profitable in the sixth context as he finds success in motivating the people (Neh 2.18).

The use of secrecy in Nehemiah's arrival and subsequent night survey was by design due to necessity. He was new to this area, had little knowledge and insight into the underlying fabric of society, and most likely knew that opposition was lying in wait (Neh 1.2-3; 2.10). Therefore, Nehemiah chose to confide in only those who were ignorant of the plan, such as locals who showed him around, or those closest to his confidence, such as Hanani his brother (Neh 2.12, 16).[106] We know from Ezra 4 that opposition was present, causing further destruction and calamity to the Jewish people and its wall. Nehemiah had the tact and understanding to realize that this opposition, including Sanballat and Tobiah, most likely had informants in Jerusalem (Neh 2.10, 19; 4.1,7; 6.1, 12). Therefore, Nehemiah chose secrecy and brevity in his communication until he ascertained the physical and political situation.[107]

---

[102] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 104-106.
[103] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[104] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 104-106.
[105] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 104-106.
[106] Batten, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 199.
[107] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 187-188.

Additionally, Nehemiah wanted to show that he was not a military threat to the people of Yehud or to the Persian throne. While his military escort came into Jerusalem with him (Neh 2.9), Nehemiah chose not to bring them on the survey (Neh 2.12). Steinmann (2010) sees this as an act of wisdom and discretion on Nehemiah's part to downplay a military presence.[108] However, McEvenue (1981) proposes that Nehemiah's mindset was in fact set on military installation, under the direction of Artaxerxes himself.[109] McEvenue sees the survey in grander terms than mere reconstruction, but of fortification to ensure that a proper military post could be erected with Nehemiah as its military commander.[110] I see Nehemiah surveying the context and adapting his leadership actions to reassure the people of Yehud that he was an ally that had their best interests at heart. Therefore, Nehemiah would not immediately show his military might, but instead chooses a less confrontational path until he gains a followership. Regardless, Nehemiah did not want to project a posture of military superiority upon his initial entrance into Yehud and therefore tactfully surveyed the walls discreetly (Neh 2.11-16).

We see a shift in leadership style from the previous context. Previously, Nehemiah represented the epitome of confidence as he asserted his authority with the king's letters and the sheer force of military presence (Neh 2:9-10). However, as he enters Jerusalem, we see Nehemiah's leadership adapt to a more covert and intentionally clandestine style as he is presented with the immediate threat of opposition and the enormity of his task.[111] The text twice notes that Nehemiah did not tell anyone his plans (Neh 2. 12, 16), showing Nehemiah's awareness of the gravity of the situation and the potential damage that would ensue if information fell into the wrong hands.[112] Therefore, we see a leader confident of his goal and sure of his abilities choosing to refrain from overcommunicating or desiring the spotlight for his grand entrance.[113]

Nehemiah's leadership can be seen as charismatic using Conger and Kanungo's (2003) four stages of charismatic leader development as a representative model in this context.

---

[108] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 408.
[109] Sean E. McEvenue, "The Political Structure in Judah from Cyrus to Nehemiah," *CBQ* 43, no. 3 (1981): 354.
[110] McEvenue, "The Political Structure," 354.
[111] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 193.
[112] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 55.
[113] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 193.

Nehemiah was sensitive to the environmental context which altered his leadership style as well as dictated his actions of secrecy and investigation.[114] This allowed him the space to be able to establish his vision for Yehud and set his future goals. Without this time investigating the ruined walls and without the charismatic understanding of the context he would not have generated follower trust, the development and acceptance of his vision, or the achievement of his goals.[115] Additionally, Nehemiah shows charismatic characteristics of Conger and Kanungo's model including being sensitive to different environments, altering the status-quo, adapting to the situation, disrupting normal pathways, taking risks, performing unconventionally, generating mystique, being set apart, and achieving immediate goals.[116] Therefore, using Conger and Kanungo's model, Nehemiah shows aspects of charismatic leadership in this context. However, when using Weber's ideas of charisma and House (1976) and Jacobsen and House's (2001) models of charismatic leadership, Nehemiah does not represent any of the characteristics listed. This is primarily due to the point that Nehemiah is not interacting with actual followers and therefore, cannot use leadership characteristics upon followers. Weber, House and Jacobsen & House primarily described charismatic leaders and their interaction with followers. However, Conger and Kanungo were more focused on the context and situation that charismatic leaders were in and how they effected those environments.[117]

Thomas, Hebdon, Novicevic, and Hayek (2015) attribute authentic and transformational leadership styles to the bulk of Nehemiah's leadership. While their reasons for choosing these styles are primarily ascribed to popularity and proven methods, not necessarily congruence to Nehemiah's leadership actions, it is important to evaluate the level of other leadership styles present in this context. Nehemiah does not facilitate one characteristic of path-goal leadership, and acts in opposition to those characteristics in many ways. Nehemiah does not promote inviting environments, develop relationships, promote team collaboration, or reduce follower frustration, just to name a few. He is not transformative in that he does not inspire a shared vision, nor does he motivate followers. The only transformative characteristic from the models I

---

[114] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.
[115] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.
[116] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.
[117] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.

used is Bennis and Nanus's (2007) idea of standing by his beliefs,[118] and Kouzes and Posner's (2017) idea of challenging the status quo.[119]

Thomas et al. (2015) found that in Neh 1-2 transformational leadership was a style rarely used. Instead, authentic leadership was their primary leadership style expressed by Nehemiah. My analysis finds authentic characteristics in Nehemiah, from this context, to include being authentic, having high integrity,[120] resilient, being future oriented, self-aware, and trusts himself.[121] However, in using the characteristics generated from the three models of authentic leadership theory, most of the characteristics are not portrayed by Nehemiah in this context. He is not transparent, identifying with followers, honest, direct, or open.[122] Nehemiah does not show priority to follower leader development, trust, or developing relationships with followers.[123] And Nehemiah does not represent an acceptance of followers, vulnerability, or support.[124] This is not to say that Nehemiah will not do these things in future contexts, but using these models as a basis for authentic leadership, the only authentic aspects found come in his belief in himself and him being true to his personality and leadership. However, this does not express to his followers yet. Therefore, Thomas et al. (2015) have not adequately divided the contexts enough to grasp actual leadership styles to generate appropriate conclusions of Nehemiah's leadership style.[125]

Nehemiah expresses servant leadership through being intrinsically motivated,[126] being aware, conceptualizing the environment, having foresight, being committed to the growth of the people, building future communities,[127] being authentic, having integrity, working behind the scenes, having a sense of mission,[128] and improving societies.[129] However, Nehemiah does

---

[118] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.
[119] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.
[120] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 802-808.
[121] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[122] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 802-808.
[123] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[124] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 83-88.
[125] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 106.
[126] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27-32.
[127] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[128] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.
[129] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.

not use these qualities directly with followers. Instead, these qualities expressed in this context set up servant leadership actions in future contexts.

Nehemiah is adaptive in that he finds quiet environments to assess, gain perspective, observe problems, identify challenges, be analytical,[130] assimilate information, accommodate change,[131] gain success in complex environments, navigate complex patterns of constraint, and cope with rapidly changing environmental demands.[132] There are multiple aspects in this context that makes Nehemiah adaptive. The nature of this context, in inspecting the wall, requires someone to adapt to certain situations. Therefore, we see adaption within the realm of complexity theory.[133] However, what we do not witness in this context is Nehemiah ascribing to adaptive leadership theory where the goal is to provide help for followers to adapt to tense or changing situations.[134]

This context shows Nehemiah using charismatic and complexity leadership styles. In the end, based on the next two contexts, we can see the beginnings of a charismatic leader gathering his information to make a successful charismatic entrance that will solidify his follower's loyalty through a charismatic speech in context six (Neh 2.17-18).[135] We also see a leader who adapts to changing contexts and situations, something that will become a staple of his leadership and a primary cause of any success that Nehemiah finds.

Context 6 — Nehemiah Decides to Rebuild the Wall & Gains Support — Neh 2.17–2.18

Now that Nehemiah has gathered all the information that he needs, he brings the full weight of his charismatic leadership to bear. Nehemiah presents himself in front of the סְּגָנִים, or officials. As it is in the plural form in the modern text, we can assume it includes the petty rulers and officials of the community along with the priests and the nobles (Neh 2.16).[136] Nehemiah's

---

[130] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[131] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.
[132] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 305-308.
[133] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 305-308.
[134] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[135] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 51-55.
[136] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 688.

speech works off a three-step approach to motivate and inspire his followers: 1) He brings attention to the awful state of Jerusalem (Neh 2.17a). 2) He seeks to instill hope through a command to rebuild (Neh 2.17b). 3) He provides references, including God and the king, that validates his authority and encourages his followers to realize and agree with his vision (Neh 2.18).

It is important that Nehemiah first establish a consensus that there is a dire crisis that must be resolved. We see Nehemiah use the same vocabulary as Hanani used when telling Nehemiah of the plight of Yehud (Neh 1.3). Since the words had such an emotional effect on him (Neh 1.4), he intends to create the same effect in the leaders by using the same words.[137] He also describes Yehud by using the word חָרֵב which indicates a waste of or desolation of a city (Judg 16.24; 2 Kgs 19.17; Isa 34.10).[138] The intense word seeks to show his audience the severity of the crisis. This sets up the second phase of his speech which begins with an emphatic imperative, לְכוּ ("Come!"). At the peak of the crowd's melancholy and crisis, Nehemiah swoops in with hope and renewed energy.[139] He also continues to pull at the leadership's heart strings by referencing the disgrace that they continue to face (Neh 2.17). The word חֶרְפָּה, translated "reproach" or "disgrace," indicates both the notion of disgrace and shame, but also references reviling or taunting (Gen 30.23; Job 5.9; 1 Sam 11.2).[140] For there to be disgrace, there must be someone doing the reviling or taunting. This harkens back to the initial captivity and the disgrace the people of Yehud inflicted upon themselves because they did not obey the commandments of God (Jer 21.1-10; 34.1-7). Therefore, the wall being in ruins is a continual reminder, or taunt, that God's wrath is still upon them. However, with a rebuilt wall, the disgrace would lift and God's people would once again be seen to be in God's favor (Neh 2.17). Also, note the use of collective pronouns in this verse as Nehemiah uses "us" and "we," which is a further attempt of Nehemiah to identify himself with the community whose plight is synonymous with those who remained.[141]

---

[137] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 55.
[138] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 351.
[139] Martha R. Helland and Bruce E. Winston, "Towards a Deeper Understanding of Hope and Leadership," *J Leadersh Organ* 12, no. 2 (2005): 45.
[140] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 357.
[141] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 410.

Nehemiah completes his speech with a reminder of whose authority he is working under (Neh 2.18). Nehemiah accomplishes three goals with his statement in Neh 2.18. First, he gives the honor and glory to God which further unifies him with the community while projecting humility at the same time.[142] Second, he reminds the people that there is a divine force at work, encouraging the community to follow Nehemiah's leadership as it is supernaturally ordained and sponsored.[143] Third, Nehemiah underlines that his authority is also condoned by the Persian king (Neh 2.18). This not only buttresses Nehemiah's leadership, it also offers further encouragement to God's people that God, and even kings who do not worship God, are supporting this endeavor.[144] The success of the speech is suggested by the community's response of נָקוּם וּבָנִינוּ ("Let us start building!") and their subsequent action by "setting their hands to this good work" (Neh 2.18).

This context shows significant use of charismatic leadership style. The model of Jacobsen and House (2001) can be used to analyze Nehemiah's charismatic leadership. We see Nehemiah has already introduced himself informally through creating mystique as he does not confide in his followers. However, now, Nehemiah formally presents himself as their leader allowing the leaders to identify with his personality and charisma.[145] Then, Nehemiah casts his vision which his followers accept arousing them to immediate action.[146] Additionally, Conger and Kanungo's (2003) four stages of charismatic leadership finds Nehemiah moving past stage one where he is sensitive to environmental contexts and moves into the second stage of setting his vision and establishing his future goals.[147]

From a characteristic standpoint, Nehemiah nearly expresses every characteristic or key term found in Weber and the three models of charismatic leadership used in this thesis. There are other characteristics from other leadership theories that are also expressed in this context. For instance, Nehemiah influences followers, recognizes follower needs, and motivates

---

[142] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 191.
[143] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma*, xviii.
[144] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 76.
[145] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[146] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[147] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.

followers to desired outcomes as House and Mitchell (1974) show in their path-goal model.[148] However, the method in which Nehemiah expresses influence, recognition, and motivation comes out of a charismatic speech that rallies his followers and is filled with extraordinary talent and expression. There is a close connection to transformational leadership theory here as Nehemiah closely resembles three out of the four characteristics of Bass & Avolio's (1994) full-range theory. He expresses charisma, possesses inspirational motivation, gives a bit of intellectual stimulation, but does not have individualized consideration, but instead chooses to express a collective concern.[149] He shows similarity with Bennis and Nanus's (2007) four strategies of transformational leadership in that he embraces a clear vision, he brings meaning through communication, and he engenders trust through being authentic to their values, however, once again, he does not show a desire to personally or professionally develop individual followers.[150] There is good reason as to why Nehemiah closely aligns with transformational leadership. This is due to transformational leadership being closely related to charismatic leadership. The notion of charisma, or as Bass and Avolio (1994) call it, idealized influence, is engrained in the fabric of transformational leadership. Therefore, often will we find connections between the two theories shows within certain contexts. The key will be to discern the primary driver of the leadership style being enacted.

For instance, as Weber describes, charismatic leadership "involves subjective or internal reorientation born out of suffering, conflicts or enthusiasm."[151] This reorientation out of crisis is satisfied by a supernatural being, a leader supported by a supernatural being, or a leader who possesses unique and exceptional talents of leadership that sets them apart from the rest.[152] As Conger (1989) says:

> In crisis, people experience a loss of control, feelings of helplessness, and fears about the future…so people are susceptible to a leader who symbolizes rescue from this

---

[148] House and Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," 1-5.
[149] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.
[150] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.
[151] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma*, xxiii.
[152] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma*, xxiii.

distress. In such cases, followers are more willing to submit to a strong individual – enter the charismatic leader with his clear vision and strength of conviction.[153]

This description by Conger (1989) reflects the scenario occurring in this context and provides the exact climate for successful charismatic leadership.[154] Therefore, while transformational aspects occur, the primary driver is charismatic leadership. The crisis is evident, the need for an exceptional leader is palpable, and Nehemiah recognizes the situation and acts accordingly to become that charismatic leader whom the people need.[155] He does so by addressing the crisis, instilling hope in a common vision, and showing his extraordinary prowess due to both supernatural and royal endorsement (Neh 2. 17-18).[156] He told the story of the people, and then invited, or perhaps ordered, them into the solution for the crisis that was before them.[157]

Context 7 — Nehemiah Interacts with Adversaries for the First Time — Neh 2.19–2.20

Just after a triumphal charismatic event where Nehemiah motivates the people of Yehud to accept and follow Nehemiah and his vision (Neh 2.18), we see the opposite reaction of disdain and mockery from Nehemiah's opponents (Neh 2.19). Nehemiah's need for secrecy upon his arrival in Jerusalem (Neh 2.12-13) is well founded as Sanballat, Tobiah, and a newly introduced opponent, Geshem the Arab, quickly hear of Nehemiah's intentions and attempt to thwart the rebuilding project through mockery and slander (Neh 2.19). The *hiphil* form תַלְעִיג, of the root לָעַג, suggests mocking with the intent to deride someone (Job 21.3; Ps 22.7; 2 Chr 30.10).[158] This is combined with בָּזָה that potentially shows the contempt the adversaries have for Nehemiah.[159] Their words are heavy with scorn, anger, hatred, and threat as they accuse the people of being in league with someone who desires to rebel against the king (Neh 2.19; 6.6-8). Just as Nehemiah has substantiated his divinely sanctioned authority, his opponents immediately attempt to undermine that authority by breeding doubt.

---

[153] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader*, 173.
[154] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader*, 173.
[155] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[156] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 51-55.
[157] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 193.
[158] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 541.
[159] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 102.

Our understanding of Nehemiah's leadership in this context comes in his response to his opponents. As his adversaries breed doubt to his divine claim of leadership over the land, Nehemiah responds in opposite fashion to the taunt given. Just as the hand of God had been gracious to Nehemiah, it will be the God of heaven that will bring God's people success (Neh 2.20a). Nehemiah responds by going to the highest authority he has, one that supersedes that of Artaxerxes, while remaining respectful to earthy authority at the same time.[160] Nehemiah's claim to authority expresses charismatic leadership as the source of Nehemiah's affiliation, source of strength, and, therefore, leadership potential, comes from a divine source. Nehemiah requires no claim to a genealogical line, nor any verifiable credentials to substantiate his right to lead.[161] Instead, he relies on his charismatic authority that has been bestowed upon him by God.

Once Nehemiah establishes where his authority comes from, he then moves to his opponents' claim on the land (Neh 2.20b). With every bit of charismatic authority he can muster, Nehemiah disavows their claim and share of Jerusalem (Neh 2.20).[162] For this is likely a reason why Sanballat and his allies have come to protest and mock the Israelites — they recognize that Nehemiah's presence ushers in the end of their prosperity and the potential to glean profit from the land.[163] Nehemiah directly attacks his opponents' true ambition and recognizes that their hold over Yehud has ended.[164]

What is interesting in the transition from the last context to this one is that Nehemiah exhibits charismatic leadership in both. However, the way in which he uses charismatic leadership changes due to the situation. Therefore, adaptation to the situation occurs as Nehemiah uses different modes of charismatic leadership when dealing with his allies and his opponents. The crisis that was shown in context six is now personified by the presence of direct opposition (Neh 2.17). He responds in a classic charismatic way by invoking the authority of the supernatural while at the same time de-authenticating his opponents' claim of authority on the

---

[160] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 380.
[161] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* x-xx.
[162] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[163] McEvenue, "The Political Structure," 354.
[164] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 56.

grounds of their lack of charismatic, supernatural, or royal support.[165] Nehemiah, as a charismatic leader, acts to de-authenticate Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem's authority. By saying "The God of heaven is the one who will give us success," Nehemiah is charismatically giving himself the authority and lowering the status of those who might oppose him or disagree with him (Neh 2.20).

From my charismatic list of characteristics, we see Nehemiah having a specific vision, working in crisis, creating radical solutions, needing validation,[166] showing extreme self-confidence, needing to dominate, having strong convictions, having high morals, having an extreme urge to influence, being a role model, appearing knowledgeable, skilled, and capable, expressing ideological goals, instilling confidence in his followers, gaining power, gaining esteem,[167] modeling the vision,[168] altering the status quo, disrupting normal pathways, taking risks, performing unconventionally, generating mystique, and being set apart.[169]

House's (1976) model of charismatic leadership provides a description of Nehemiah's charismatic leadership. First, Nehemiah possesses all four personal characteristics including: 1) Extreme high levels of self-confidence, which is reflected in his extreme confidence in God. 2) The need to dominate subordinates, which is represented in this context through Nehemiah treating his enemies as subordinates. 3) Strong convictions to his beliefs and morals. 4) An unfaltering urge to influence others.[170] Next, Nehemiah exhibits all five of House's list of behaviors: 1) being a role model for the values expected in his followers, 2) having the appearance of being knowledgeable, skilled, and capable of leading, 3) expressing ideological goals that provide a baseline for his followers (or enemies), 4) possessing high expectations for followers (or enemies) that motivates action, and 5) giving task-relevant incentives, or in this case, consequences based on the leader's goal.[171] Finally, House shows nine specific outcomes due to charismatic leadership that Nehemiah finds successful in his followers and in his

---

[165] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma*, xxiii.

[166] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* x-xx.

[167] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.

[168] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

[169] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.

[170] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.

[171] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.

enemies. Nehemiah procures follower trust, follower resonance with his beliefs, unquestionable acceptance of his leadership role by his followers, emotional connection with his followers, follower obedience, follower personal and professional identification with him, follower emotional involvement with his goals, increased goal production for followers, and increased confidence with followers.[172] Also, Nehemiah produces the opposite outcomes with his opposition. This negatively creates enemies, but in doing so, Nehemiah has charismatically created an in-group that is highly motivated and an out-group that becomes a source to place blame and from which to rally support.[173] The use of enemy works as a source of "other" that provides the source of the crisis, to which a charismatic leader can use to gain follower allegiance, motivation, and support.[174]

This idea will become a constant in Nehemiah's leadership when it comes to interacting with opposition (Neh 2.20; 4. 4-21; 5.7-12; 6.1-14; 13). Likewise, the constant presence of opposition will form the backdrop of Nehemiah's charismatic leadership through the first half of the text.[175] For without a crisis, or an opponent to place the blame upon, charismatic leadership may decrease.[176] In the case of Nehemiah, he has both crisis and opposition, allowing charismatic leadership to be successfully deployed.

Phase 4 — Building the Wall

The fourth phase of Nehemiah's leadership includes the entire building project of the wall around Jerusalem spanning at least fifty-two days (Neh 6.15) and encompassing Neh 3 through to the beginning of Neh 7 of the biblical text. The characters portrayed include Nehemiah, all the people who help build or protect the wall, the opponents of Nehemiah, the Jews being oppressed in Yehud, and the people oppressing their brothers and sisters. It includes the tactical and practical aspects of leadership that Nehemiah uses to successfully complete the building, while also providing insight into Nehemiah's social, political, and military leadership as

---

[172] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[173] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* x-xx.
[174] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[175] Throntveit, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 60.
[176] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

he interacts with his peers, his opposition, and internal issues of society. We gain significant insight into Nehemiah's leadership during this phase due to its variety of situations. Six specific contexts are involved in the phase spanning a third of the overall text of Nehemiah. During this phase, we see a continuation of Nehemiah's use of charismatic leadership, but we also see aspects of servant leadership, transformational leadership, path-goal leadership, and authentic leadership played out. The chief aim for Nehemiah in this phase is to secure the physical capital of Yehud through building and fortifying a wall, and then to recreate a sense of community within Yehud. This requires morale building, responding to direct threats, mediating internal struggles, and directly serving his people.[177]

Context 8 — Nehemiah Organizes the Work & Assigns Tasks to Allies — Neh 3.1–3.32

The eighth context shows Nehemiah starting the building project and assigning specific sections of the wall to specific individuals or groups. While the entirety of this context is spent outlining the building project and constitutes a long list of names and assignments, the sheer volume of participation, and the description of the different individuals or groups speaks to the book's interest in demonstrating Nehemiah's ability to organize, motivate, and accomplish his goals.[178] It is important to recognize Nehemiah's use of leadership designations for several individuals within this context. This list includes people from all areas of the community, including the priesthood (Neh 3.1, 17, 22, 28), top ranking officials, governors, and leaders (Neh 3.9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19), as well as everyday merchants (Neh 3.8, 31, 32), day-laborers (Neh 3.22), and everyone else who built part of the wall but was not given a title. Nehemiah intentionally includes Eliashib the high priest (Neh 3.2), first showing that every man, even the most prominent, is willing to get their hands dirty to work together for the betterment of the Jewish people (Neh 3.1).

Nehemiah also refers to the Tekoite nobles by using the word אַדִּיר indicating a prominent person charged to be a shepherd to the people of Israel (Neh 3.5; Judg 5.17; Nah

---

[177] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 106.
[178] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 77.

3.18; Jer 14.3).[179] Even though they chose to abstain from working with the people, Nehemiah designates a high position of leadership potential, nonetheless. This shows several aspects of leadership. First, it charismatically calls a particular group out publicly, confirming to the people of Yehud, and readers of this text, that people or groups who do not aid the people of God will not go unmissed. This shows Nehemiah's need to dominate, his strong convictions, and his ability to build affiliation by showing the shortcomings of a few that bolster effort and obedience in the many.[180] Also, Nehemiah specifically addressed the nobles of the Tekoites. This seems to be a precursor to context 10 where Nehemiah must address Jewish nobles who are extorting their own people. In charismatic fashion, Nehemiah shows that public humiliation is a tool that he uses to motivate the whole to obedience and proper morality as Nehemiah believes.

Additionally, שַׂר is used eight times in this context to show that Nehemiah was able to enlist other leaders in Yehud (Neh 3.9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19). We also recognize Nehemiah's ability to coordinate and unify the whole of Yehud even though it included a variety of individuals interacting in social, political, and religious roles who had differing views on how Yehud should operate. For instance, Eliashib, who was put in charge of reconstructing the Sheep Gate, would later be ridiculed and chastised by Nehemiah himself (Neh 3.1; 13.7).[181]

Nehemiah skillfully organized this campaign, bringing most of the inhabitants of Yehud together to build a fortified wall at record pace (Neh 3.1-32; 6.15). One specific aspect of his leadership prowess came in Nehemiah assigning areas of the wall to those who had the greatest vested interest in that area.[182] In many cases, the section of the wall that was being repaired was near that individual's home (Neh 3.28, 29, 30). This proximity instantly increased the individual's desire to rebuild that section quickly as he would have no doubt wished to avert any possible threat of attack from the opposition.[183] Another important point to note in

---

[179] Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 2 vols., trans. and ed. M.E.J. Richardson (Leiden, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 2001), 14. And Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 12.

[180] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.

[181] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 202.

[182] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 212.

[183] Grabbe, *Ezra-Nehemiah,* 44.

Nehemiah's leadership is his desire to delegate leadership and share responsibility and credit with others. This list shows Nehemiah's, or the writer of the text's description of Nehemiah's, intention in expressing shared responsibility, and therefore shared credit to rebuilding success. Nehemiah does not even see the need to include himself in the success as he gives credit to the Jewish people through naming them individually (Neh 3.1-32).[184]

The assignments of work show blended adaption of leadership styles. Charismatic, path-goal, and transformational leadership can be inferred within the context. From a charismatic standpoint, Nehemiah transforms societies, creates radical solutions, needs followers, needs validation,[185] has an extreme urge to influence, appears knowledgeable, skilled, and capable, gives high expectations, aspires followers to grow, builds affiliation, increases goal production,[186] and alters the status quo.[187] Nehemiah instills a shared vision through a collective endeavor, directly meeting the needs of the whole population of Yehud.[188] With a shared vision intact, the building process instills confidence and produces high self-esteem in others which further unifies the group and provides energy for Nehemiah's leadership and vision.[189] Using Conger and Kanungo's (2003) model of charismatic leadership, we see Nehemiah moving through all four stages of charismatic leader development in this context. First, Nehemiah is sensitive to the environmental context as he recognizes the motivating effect that placing people in specific locations will accomplish. Next, his established vision and goals are developed causing his followers to gain trust and motivation to perform the work. Finally, as we will see in future contexts, the work is completed, and his goals are achieved.[190]

However, while charismatic leadership is prominently shown in this context, path-goal and transformational leadership styles are also seen. Due to the complex nature of administration on the part of Nehemiah, he would have to adapt his leadership style towards the many different situations and issues that arose during the building project. Ultimately, this

---

[184] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 137.
[185] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* x-xx.
[186] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[187] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.
[188] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[189] Shamir, et al., "The Motivational Effects," 577-594.
[190] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.

context is centered on the goal of starting the building project by assigning workers. This aligns with the path-goal leadership style that interacts with characteristics including the ability to motivate followers, communicating high expectations, providing value, indirectly providing compensation,[191] recognizing follower needs, removing obstacles, increasing opportunities, facilitating a path,[192] developing schedules, providing guidance, supporting followers, increasing follower autonomy, increasing follower motivation, organizes, promotes team collaboration, and provides resources.[193] Nehemiah recognizes that he cannot build the wall alone and requires others to become successful. A center point to the path-goal theory is that leaders choose a style of leadership that fits the needs of followers and the work they are accomplishing.[194]

Vroom's (1995) model provides an excellent analysis of Nehemiah's path-goal leadership. Nehemiah is first keen on expectancy where he continually expresses the need for the workers to increase their work effort to gain the necessary and vital reward of a fortified wall that will provide safety and a better quality of life for the workers and their families (Neh 3). Nehemiah, stressing the necessity of the reward, causes an increase in work motivation, effort, and efficiency. Nehemiah next uses instrumentality in providing clear and high expectations towards the building project. There are specific instructions for the building of the wall (Neh 3) and there are continued adaptive instructions as certain threats present themselves that are clearly given (Neh 4.13-23). These expectations are understood by the workers, and they recognize that achieving those expectations provide them with security and a fortified Yehud that can prosper. Finally, Nehemiah uses valence to increase the value of the reward that then motivates his followers. He uses his interaction with his adversaries and the threat that is imposed upon the building of the wall to increase the value of a completed wall. This further motivates his followers to work harder because the stakes are so high.[195]

House and Mitchell's (1974) model helps us see aspects of path-goal leadership in Nehemiah in this context. Nehemiah 1) recognizes the need for followers and motivates them

---

[191] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 18-20.
[192] House and Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," 1-5.
[193] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.
[194] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 121.
[195] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 18-20.

to desired outcomes by assigning them specific locations to work, and by mentioning their names on the list (Neh 3). 2) Nehemiah increases personal payoffs to satisfy needs by specifically placing the workers near their homes and boosting follower support (Neh 4.13-14). 3) Nehemiah makes the path easier for followers to obtain their goals by once again placing them in an opportune location (Neh 3; 4.13-14, 16-23). 4) Expectations have already been clarified, but Nehemiah continues to clarify expectations as the building project continues (Neh 4.12-23). 5) Nehemiah reduces follower frustration by, once again, locating the workers close to their homes and strategically assigning work (Neh 3). 6) Nehemiah increases opportunities for personal growth through assigning these specific individuals jobs to complete (Neh 3; 4.16-23).[196] However, Nehemiah also positively provides satisfaction through validating the work completed in naming them on the list. He also negatively promotes personal growth by calling out those who did not do the work and shaming them which would affect their reputation.

Additionally, Nehemiah exhibits transformational leadership characteristics in this context including possessing charisma, inspiring his followers, motivating his followers, considering individuals, giving consequences,[197] organizing, giving clear expectations, empowering others, creating focus, enticing followers, developing internal motivation, managing meaning, clearly communicating, being involved,[198] enabling action, and encouraging others.[199] Again, he requires allies to accomplish his goal, and through sharing his vision with others, his hope is to transform the people of Yehud into a better representation of his idea of a good, obedient Jew, while also attempting to transform the people into good and efficient workers to build the wall. Transformation is required as it can be assumed that the people are not well organized or motivated as their wall had fallen into ruin (Neh 1.3).

We can use Bass and Avolio's (1994) full-range leadership model to describe Nehemiah's transformational leadership. Nehemiah, in a rare occasion, does not possess much charisma in this context. However, the writer of this context shows a bit of charisma in his efforts to highlight specific individuals to gain support and affiliation with his vision and leadership.

---

[196] House and Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," 1-5.
[197] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.
[198] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders*, 24-72.
[199] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.

Nehemiah shows a bit of inspirational motivation as he organizes the building operation and selects specific areas for individuals or groups to build. There is not much intellectual stimulation present in this context as we are not given examples of direct interaction between Nehemiah and his followers. Typically, Nehemiah does not express individualized consideration in the biblical text and rarely does Nehemiah concern himself with the individual, but instead, focuses on the group or whole. In this context, however, Nehemiah is especially concerned with each individual or group and is keen on naming them for record and motivation. Additionally, Nehemiah acts transactionally as the building process must be completed. There is a work force available who needs to be managed to accomplish the goal. This creates outcomes in Bass and Avolio's model. Nehemiah increases follower consciousness of the value of goal creation through giving out orders that helps the workers recognize the value of their work. Also, it helps followers transcend personal self-interest for the betterment of the organization. Their work will not only cause personal gain, but it will also benefit the whole of Yehud. And third, Nehemiah's actions in this context aids followers to address higher-order needs that are beyond self-interest alone.[200]

Overall, it is the blend of these three leadership styles that helps Nehemiah successfully assign and begin the necessary work of rebuilding the wall. Success is found in the text in that every group, except for the Tekoite nobles (Neh 3.5), begins their work and continues to work on the area that they are assigned.[201] Without this goal accomplished, Nehemiah would be unable to achieve any other goal and therefore, this context is paramount in his leadership.

Context 9 — Nehemiah Interacts with Adversaries While Building — Neh 4.1–4.23

Now that the people of Yehud have begun rebuilding the wall, their actions attract attention from Nehemiah's adversaries who continually increase their threats towards the builders. The ninth context of Nehemiah's leadership is reflected in Neh 4 and deals with

---

[200] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.
[201] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary,* 204.

building the wall while at the same time interacting with Sanballat and his collection of opponents against Nehemiah.

This context begins with the anger of Sanballat and Tobiah and their subsequent taunts meant to belittle and discourage the builders (Neh 4.1-3).[202] Mere ridicule quickly turns to threats of force once the adversaries realize that their taunts are ineffective (Neh 4.7-8, 11; 6.6-7). What is important is that Nehemiah sees this threat as real, evidenced by him setting up precautions against potential attacks (Neh 4.9, 16-20).[203] We also witness a stark contrast between the leadership of Sanballat and that of Nehemiah. Sanballat recognizes that by establishing a wall around the city, the Jews can fully invest their lives into Nehemiah's social and religious vision without worry or fear from outside influence. Sanballat's mockery, shown as weak by the writer (Neh 4.4-5), is met with a mature response from Nehemiah showing the absolute inclusion of the divine, leaning on divine understanding, not his own (Neh 4.4-6).[204]

Additionally, we see Nehemiah challenging a verbal insult with a divine response.[205] This shows great reserve from a man of action who instead of retaliating physically, or even verbally, towards his oppressors, brings his verbal response to God in prayer.[206] His prayer is purposeful as it mimics the words of Jeremiah as he pleads for God to act, turning the oppressors words back on themselves, leaving them unforgiven for the words that they cast against God, not just God's people (Jer 4.1-2; 15.9).[207] With these words, we see Nehemiah having vigorous faith with virtuous prudence, something that Levering (2007) sees as the hallmark of Nehemiah's leadership.[208] Therefore, we see a leader in Nehemiah who controls his emotions and his actions, allowing God to take vengeance (Neh 4.4-5, 9, 14). This insight into Nehemiah's leadership is needed as there will be times in the text where his emotions are anything but even-tempered (Neh 5.6; 13.4-30). However, here, Nehemiah inspires the people around him

---

[202] It is understood that the MT differs from English translations at this point. I will be using the order and descriptions of chapter and verse from the English translation in this instance and in any instance where the English differs from MT.

[203] Batten, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 224.

[204] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 216.

[205] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 85.

[206] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 217.

[207] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 62.

[208] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 151.

to act in a controlled manner when presented with verbal threats. This short prayer presents the people with their true leader and asks them not to rely on their own strength, but of the strength of the divine who can and will easily prevail against their enemies (Neh 4.4).[209]

Nehemiah's prayer finds success as the people of Yehud continue to progress in their building endeavor causing Sanballat to muster more support, now including Arabs, Ammonites, and Ashdodites, moving one step closer towards a physical confrontation (Neh 4.7). Nehemiah finds balance between trust and prayer in God and dutiful action by setting his military guard to protect the people (Neh 4.9, 13). He once again gives credit to the hard work of the people that allows for success (Neh 4.13, 16-18).[210] But as the adversaries to the wall project become more aggressive, Nehemiah decisions and actions become the make-or-break moments of his overall leadership. Morale begins to wane, and spirits begin to fall (Neh 4.10). The pressure of continued threat begins to weigh heavy on the laborers and Nehemiah is required to step into his charismatic role to revive the people. Nehemiah responds by empowering the people to actively take part in their own defense.[211] With swords, spears, and bows in one hand and their tools in the other (Neh 4.17), Nehemiah invites the people of Yehud to stand together and actively take part in the defense of their city, their way of life, and their God.[212]

Therefore, in the face of potential mass desertion due to fear and exhaustion, Nehemiah invigorates his workforce and establishes a military force that causes Sanballat and his sympathizers to think twice before attacking, allowing the work to continue. His battle cry is reminiscent of the ancient conscript army as his motivating speech mimics the invocation of "holy war" upon the enemies of God.[213] Here, in Neh 4.14 specifically, the *niphal* form יִלָּחֵם indicates that the subject of the sentence is fighting for something or someone by engaging in battle (Exod 14.14; Deut 1.30; Judg 9.17).[214] Thus, Nehemiah is telling his followers, like their

---

[209] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 444-445.

[210] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 63.

[211] Jay A. Conger and Rabindra N. Kanungo, "The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice," *Adad Manage Rev* 13, no. 3 (1988): 474.

[212] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 377.

[213] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 226.

[214] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 535.

ancestors before them, to fight for God, for their land, and for each other as if they are about to go to war.

Nehemiah's preparation and organization pays off as the people are already grouped by families and clans (Neh 4.13), allowing them to stand by their kin and their homes. This allows the people to take in the words of Nehemiah to "fight for your kin, your sons, your daughters, your wives, and your homes" in a deeper way as they are within eyesight of that which they are being called to fight for (Neh 4.14).[215] Moreover, this battle cry for his people produces comradery, collective vision, and a unified voice bringing Nehemiah to the front of leadership, empowering his vision and his success.[216] Workers continue their job, being prepared in a moment's notice to take up arms, with Nehemiah's military guard protecting their backs (Neh 4. 16-17). Nehemiah concludes this context with a description of his direct involvement in the work showing that he too, with his household, does not choose comfort and safety, but instead, choses to be directly involved in the work (Neh 4.19-23). This act of service further validates his leadership, allowing buy-in from his followers.

Nehemiah's leadership is highly charismatic within this context. We see an increasingly acute crisis providing further fuel for the charismatic leader to gain influence, cast vision, and provide the solution to the people's problems.[217] The text is purposeful as the level of crisis rises as the story continues, focusing on a specific band of oppressors who are the source of the people of Yehud's distress, disgrace, and demise (Neh 4.7, 15). The erosion of the peoples' morale is not due to the people's lack of care, their work ethic, or their abilities, but instead the source of the problem is in the alleged threat of violence.[218] The presence of the "other" provides the necessary tension required for Nehemiah to deliver his motivating cry for holy war that rallies the troops and gives them the stamina and courage to push through any challenge that might befall them (Neh 4.20).[219]

---

[215] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 448.
[216] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 51-55.
[217] Sverre Spoelstra, Nick Butler, and Helen Delaney, "Never Let an Academic Crisis Go to Waste: Leadership Studies in the Wake of Journal Retractions," *Leadership* 12, no. 4 (2016): 386.
[218] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 63.
[219] Grabbe, *Ezra-Nehemiah,* 44.

Nehemiah shows every charismatic characteristic from Weber's point of view including having extraordinary talents, continuing along a specific vision, working in crisis, transforming society, being desired by followers, creating radical solutions, needing followers, and needing validation.[220] Additionally, Nehemiah is charismatic in that he portrays extreme self-confidence, a need to dominate, keeping strong convictions, having high morals, having an extreme urge to influence, being a role model, appearing knowledgeable, skilled, and capable, expressing ideological goals, giving high expectations, aspiring followers to grow, instilling confidence in his followers, building affiliation with his followers, gaining power, gaining esteem, instilling follower trust, gaining unquestionable follower acceptance, emotionally connecting with his followers, gaining follower obedience, increasing goal production,[221] identifying with followers, modeling the vision he set,[222] being sensitive to the environment, altering the status quo, adapting to the situation, disrupting normal pathways, being attractive, building trust, modeling self-sacrifice, taking risks, performing unconventionally, generating mystique, achieving his goals and empowering his followers.[223] Nehemiah acts in nearly every charismatic characteristic that is found in Weber and the three models used. Using House's (1976) model we see him personify all four personal characteristics, representing each of the five leader behaviors that procures all nine outcomes in which Nehemiah desired.[224]

Along with charismatic leadership, there are hints of transformational and servant leadership as well. We see in Neh 4.9 that it is no longer Nehemiah praying to God, but the collective. This shows the transformational process occurring as the people are taking it upon themselves to also pray to God as they have been trained by their leader.[225] Kouzes and Posner's (2017) model shows Nehemiah's action here. The people see him pray, and, therefore, Nehemiah models the posture he desires in his followers (Neh 4.4). He inspires a shared vision of prayer as an important act and at the center of leadership action (Neh 4.4-5). Nehemiah challenges the process of prayer by testing it directly in the conflict that is occurring (Neh 4. 9).

---

[220] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* x-xx.
[221] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[222] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[223] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.
[224] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[225] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 63.

This process then allows Nehemiah's followers to act in prayer themselves (Neh 4.9). And finally, Nehemiah focuses on the collective heart of his followers and prays to God so that their burden may be lifted, and their lives preserved (Neh 4.4-5). We see the beginning of transformation as Nehemiah's followers transform into prayerful people in future contexts (Neh 8.6, 8.18, 9.5-37).

We also see servant leadership as Nehemiah chooses to directly engage with the work and is willing to sacrifice his own protection and comfort for the protection and needs of the people.[226] Nehemiah exhibits most of Spear's (1998) list of servant characteristics in this context. We seen Nehemiah using servant leader qualities such as listening to his adversaries, being empathetic towards his followers, healing the peoples' fears, being aware of the situation, persuading his followers to trust him, conceptualizing the situation, having foresight of potential problems and dangers, being committed to the building of the wall and his people, and continuing to build community when it seemed as if it would fail.[227] However, there are key aspects of the models of servant leadership theory presented that Nehemiah does not express in this context. We do not see Sendjaya et al.'s (2008) dimension of voluntary subordination in Nehemiah in this context.[228] He wants to lead first, not serve first. The context is not very primed for servant leadership,[229] but instead, due to crisis, it is primed for charismatic leadership. Therefore, Nehemiah expresses certain aspects of servant leadership, but uses charismatic leadership most as the environment requires (Neh 4.21-23).

Context 10 — Nehemiah Interacts with Jews Oppressing Their Own — Neh 5.1–5.13

The tenth context does not concern the construction of the wall and external threats but rather concerns Nehemiah's leadership with his own people and fellow countrymen. An internal problem occurs where the building situation causes some of the Jews to fall on difficult times as many are unable to afford basic necessities (Neh 5.1-5). Instead of their neighbors

---

[226] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[227] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[228] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.
[229] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.

reaching out and aiding them in their troubles, they instead charge interest on their loans and are demanding payment by means of money, property, or person (Neh 5.7). Nehemiah's leadership style continues to show an interesting blend between charismatic and servant leadership styles. As before, Nehemiah acts in a charismatic leadership style towards his enemies and those who oppose him but acts in a servant leadership style towards his people and his constituency. However, what is different in this context is that Nehemiah's opposition is not an external threat, but instead comes internally from those who are extorting their own people.

We first notice that Nehemiah chooses not to consult any other leaders or gain counsel from others, but instead, makes an individual decision to change how business is being conducted for the good of those less fortunate (Neh 5.6).[230] This is more of a charismatic leadership action that works with emotion and impulse to effectively change the outcome in the best interest of those involved, according to the leader.[231] House (1976) describes participative leaders as those who consult their subordinates and rely on the advice of others.[232] However, achievement-oriented leaders tend to give high expectations to their followers and trust that they will achieve their goals, but tend to make decisions without counsel and give instruction to their followers for them to carry out.[233]

Nehemiah recognizes that the overall mission is to unify the people through rebuilding Jerusalem, but instead, the people have done the opposite by oppressing their neighbor.[234] This angers Nehemiah (Neh 5.6), but we see him reflect (Neh 5.7), and then restrain his emotions as he chooses not to lash out at any specific individual, but instead, brings this concern into an open forum where accountability can occur for correction to ensue.[235] He is also frustrated at the situation because it is the leaders of the community who are causing the problem (Neh 5. 9-10).

---

[230] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 238.
[231] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[232] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[233] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[234] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 155.
[235] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 239.

His approach is to shame them publicly for their actions, forcing them to agree with his stance and comply to his demands.[236] Nehemiah uses his leadership ability by owning his guilt and stopping his infraction. Then through modeling, he requires the nobles to stop the oppression of the people of the community as well (Neh 5.10). This is met with obvious approval because the nobility had no other choice but to comply (Neh 5.12). Otherwise, they would be seen in the public forum as unloving and unpatriotic. Nehemiah addresses this situation with precision and finishes off his leadership masterpiece by requiring an oath that confirms the decision, uniting the people under the religious banner.[237] The word וָאַשְׁבִּיעֵם is translated in the NRSV as "took an oath" (Neh 5.13). In this context, BDB (2010) indicates the *hiphil* version of שָׁבַע showing the individual taking the oath was forced or required to do so regardless of their desire or opinion (Ezra 10.5; Gen 24.3; 1 Kgs 2.42).[238] This is in line with Nehemiah's charismatic leadership strategy to craft a situation where the people have no choice but to comply with his wishes and regardless of their personal opinions, the environment forces their compliance. Characteristics such as creating radical solutions,[239] having a need to dominate, expresses ideological goals, aspires followers to grow, builds affiliation, gains power, gains follower obedience,[240] altering the status quo, disrupts normal pathways, performs unconventionally, and achieves goals[241] are indicative of his charismatic leadership in this context as he uses his charisma to get what he wants to accomplish.

However, while the motive and the structure in which Nehemiah acted is charismatic in nature, the desire of Nehemiah in this context is for him to serve the marginalized of his community. This process of leadership has a servant leadership heart with a charismatic action. Nehemiah shows servant leadership through looking out for the less fortunate of the people and admitting his own blame in the situation. Nehemiah is servant in nature due to him listening, inspiring service in others, changing communities, being humble, being self-sacrificial, increasing follower growth, serving the less privileged, being intrinsically motivated, increasing

---

[236] Grabbe, *Ezra-Nehemiah,* 46.
[237] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 68-69.
[238] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 989.
[239] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* x-xx.
[240] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[241] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.

follower well-being,[242] being empathetic, healing others, aware of the situation, being persuasive, having foresight, being a steward, committed to the growth of his followers,[243] having the mindset of a servant, performing acts of service, being authentic, having integrity, being accountable, possessing radical equality, having concern for others, being available to his followers, promoting equity, restoring wholeness, modeling service,[244] creating value, and improving societies.[245]

Liden et al.'s (2014) model of servant leadership shows a context where service can occur, the leader expresses attributes indicative of service, and the followers, at least those marginalized in this situation, are receptive to servant acts.[246] This provides the proper antecedents for Nehemiah to behave as a servant leader by understanding the complexities of the group, emotionally heal those marginalized, put his followers first, help all his followers grow in different ways, behave ethically, empower others (especially those who are less fortunate), and create value for the entire community.[247] Due to these servant behaviors, Nehemiah allows his followers to perform better, the people in this situation to benefit, and the people of Yehud as a whole to benefit as well.

I agree with Thomas et al.'s (2015) understanding that Neh 5 shows mostly servant leadership qualities.[248] However, their separation of contexts places Neh 5 in the same analysis of Neh 4, 6, and 7. Therefore, there is far too much context and information to ascertain what aspects are servant in nature. They use Spear's (1998) list of servant characteristics[249] as their basis for coding terms and find that Nehemiah listens once, is empathetic once, persuades once, has foresight once, is a steward twice, shows commitment three times, and builds community once for a total of ten actions.[250] However, we cannot discern which of these characteristics occurred in Neh 5 as Nehemiah interacts with those who have been

---

[242] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27-32.

[243] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.

[244] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.

[245] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.

[246] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.

[247] Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.

[248] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 105.

[249] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.

[250] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 105.

economically oppressed. Also, Thomas et al. show four acts of authentic leadership and five acts of transformational leadership in this same context.[251] Once again, because they section out such a large context, it is not discernable as to when these acts of leadership occur. Also, Thomas et al. provides no expression of charismatic leadership theory, to which I see as a vital miss in their analysis of Nehemiah's leadership.

It is important to analyze why the debt crisis in this context became a problem in the first place. In Nehemiah's haste to build the wall at breakneck speeds, it also produced an economic challenge for those who left their farms and their villages to work for free in building the wall.[252] The wall was finished on the twenty-fifth of Elul (Neh 6.15), indicating that the work began on the fourth day of Ab. Ab is the time of year where grapes and figs are harvested; Elul is when grapes and olives are harvested, and Tishri will come when farmers must sow their grains.[253] Therefore, the men who left their farms would no longer be able to accomplish these necessary tasks that provide for a large percentage of their yearly income.[254]

Therefore, while Nehemiah's vision is set and he is focused on his goal, he does not foresee economic challenges. Therefore, he is forced to adapt to the situation at hand, change his leadership style to fit the situation, and correct the mistake made. We even see Nehemiah confessing his error (Neh 5.10). Here we see something important in Nehemiah's leadership — imperfection. He is a man that is imperfect in his leadership. Once we recognize that Nehemiah has faults and can learn from his mistakes, we can then learn more about his leadership and apply it to leadership in a modern connotation. This is certainly true for Nehemiah as we will see in the next context his attempt to describe his benevolent actions for the people and his desire to serve and not be served (Neh 5.14-19).

This context reflects a delicate balance of servant and charismatic leadership. For the first time we see empathy and direct care for the more marginalized of Yehud's society (Neh 5.7-12). We can easily see these servant characteristics when Nehemiah directly interacts with his own people in need (Neh 5.6-12; 7.70-73; 12.44-47; 13.30-31). This context shows that

---

[251] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 105.
[252] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 89.
[253] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 455.
[254] Batten, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 237.

when Nehemiah sees someone in need he expresses emotion, concern, compassion, and a desire to help immediately.[255] We see Nehemiah angry when he sees his people in pain and in need and there is overall concern for the humanitarian needs of the people.[256] This context paints Nehemiah in the noblest of postures as his generosity for the poor and needy is clear. This portrayal contributes to the complex nature of Nehemiah's leadership, the complexity of him as a person, and the complexity of leadership in general when his approach here is compared to other leadership actions where the modern reader might see him as a bigot and harsh (Neh 13).[257]

However, we also see Nehemiah as a charismatic leader in his reaction to servant needs. While Nehemiah initially acts in a servant posture, he quickly switches into a charismatic mode when it is time to make a decision (Neh 5.9-13). His orchestration of support from the nobles to cancel debts and return property, goods, and those enslaved came from a charismatic mindset.[258] The precision of his words, the charisma of persuasion, and his setting of the stage for success, allowed him to rally support, speak eloquently, and obtain the goals his servant nature desired. Overall, we see Nehemiah using two styles of leadership interchangeably based on the needs of the situation and the group of people he is addressing. When empathy and direct care are needed, we see Nehemiah in a posture of servant leadership.[259] When Nehemiah needs to change the status quo and persuade his audience to align with his vision, we see Nehemiah invoke a charismatic leadership style.[260] And it is his ability to switch and adapt his styles of leadership to the situation that allows him to achieve success in this context.

Context 11 — Nehemiah's Acts as Governor Versus Others in the Past — Neh 5.14–5.19

The eleventh context of Nehemiah's leadership concerns the generosity of Nehemiah to justify his actions and authenticate his servant nature as a good and upstanding leader.

---

[255] Liden, et al., "Servant Leadership, 360.
[256] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 240.
[257] Grabbe, *Ezra-Nehemiah,* 47.
[258] Shamir, et al., "The Motivational Effects," 577-594.,
[259] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[260] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.

Showing how Nehemiah entertains and feeds a large group of individuals out of his own pocket provides the ethical and moral example that persuades the creditors to also pay out of their pocket to help the needy (Neh 5.14-19).[261] This could be seen as an act of bragging in a modern connotation, however, Nehemiah is also having to defend himself against allegations of profiteering shown in his admittance in context 10 (Neh 5.10). However, many scholars do not address this aspect of Nehemiah's leadership or the reasons why it is placed in the text. Myers (2010) sees Nehemiah's act as one of formidable self-sacrifice.[262] Levering (2007) does not even mention this section in his commentary.[263] Shepherd (2018) accurately shows the purpose of describing Nehemiah's benevolence as a way to separate him from the greed of his predecessors and showing the just leadership that Nehemiah portrays to all of those in Yehud, regardless of wealth.[264] Here, we see a discussion of Nehemiah using this context as a means for an *apologia* where he 1) looks back on the actions of the previous context, 2) reflects on the people's actions, as well as his own, 3) recognizes the consequences that have occurred, and 4) repents of his deeds through justifying himself through the mitigated act of sacrificing his own wealth for the good of the people.[265]

I also see this context as necessary commentary offering insight into Nehemiah's character and leadership. We are told for the first time that Nehemiah is in fact the governor of Yehud (Neh 5.14). While we have concluded that this has been the fact all along, we are provided his official title confirming his leadership status.[266] The term פֶּחָה can indicate a wide variety of officials including governor, lord of a district, captain, or satrap.[267] The word is translated as governor in the NRSV and Williamson (2018) shows that uses of the word in the text of Nehemiah denote a person of a high rank of governor, or more appropriately for that time, satrap (Neh 2.7, 9; 3.7; 5.14, 15, 18; 12.26).[268] We see a leader, the governor, attempting

---

[261] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 91.
[262] Myers, *Ezra Nehemiah*, 133.
[263] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 155-159.
[264] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 70-71.
[265] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 70-71.
[266] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 242.
[267] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 808.
[268] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 242. We see פֶּחָה also used in 1 Kgs 10.15; 20:24; 2 Chr 9.14; Ezra 8.36; Esth 3.12; 8.9; 9.3; Isa 36.9; Jer 51.23, 28, 57; Ezek 23.6, 12, 23; Hag 1.1, 14; 2.2, 21; and Mal 1.8.

to act contrary to the leadership before, and come as a servant, not an overlord (Neh 5.15).[269] There is purposeful description of Nehemiah's leadership rooted in service to the people providing an example of leadership different in spirit than that of his opponent Sanballat. As Sanballat was the governor of Samaria, he would have previously held control over Yehud.[270] But as Yehud was left in ruins, Nehemiah is presenting a style of leadership which will bring the people prosperity and will be contrary to the unempathetic and unsuccessful leadership of his opponents.[271] Nehemiah is so disgusted with the actions of his predecessors that he disavowals the practice of greed and personal gain and instead, ushers in a posture of generosity and service to the people of Yehud.[272]

This claim of servant leadership is substantiated by four acts of Nehemiah. The first is the refusal of the food allowance of the governor (Neh 5.14). The second act of servant leadership commits himself and his servants to physical work on the wall and not to lead from afar (Neh 5.16a). The third act of service is that he does not gain any profit, whether by payment or by land, during his entire reign as governor (Neh 5.16b). And fourth, Nehemiah opens his table and feeds 150 people daily from his own means (Neh 5.17-18). All these acts show the benevolence of Nehemiah as well as his unselfish posture to care for the people of Yehud first. This helps the reader understand the servant leadership Nehemiah is hoping to express. This act also aids Nehemiah's interaction with the social and political environment present as it allows him to gain a wider and more loyal constituency.

This context finds Nehemiah as a servant leader and correlates with servant characteristics including acting as a servant first, inspiring service, changing communities, being humble, being self-sacrificial, serving the less privileged, being intrinsically motivated, increasing follower well-being,[273] being empathetic, healing his followers, having foresight, being a steward, committing to the growth of the people,[274] having the mindset of a servant,

---

[269] Gordon F. Davies, *Berit Olam Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry: Ezra and Nehemiah*, ed. David W. Cotter (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 102.
[270] Myers, *Ezra Nehemiah*, 133.
[271] Myers, *Ezra Nehemiah*, 133.
[272] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 70-71.
[273] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27-32.
[274] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.

performing acts of service, being authentic, being accountable, accepting everyone, possessing

radical equality, having concern for others, being available to followers, promoting equity,

restoring wholeness, modeling service,[275] creating value, and improving societies.[276] Nehemiah

chooses to go beyond the normal call of duty to serve his fellow man, an act indicative of

Greenleaf's (2002) depiction of a servant leader.[277] He especially focuses on the marginalized of

the population which is yet another criterion of Greenleaf's (2002) definition.[278] These acts of

service lead to his success in justifying his leadership position, further inspiring the support of

his followers, empowering others to perform acts of service themselves, and to ultimately

achieve the goal of unifying the people, moving them towards a prosperous future.[279]

Nehemiah's servant leadership can be evaluated using Sendjaya et al.'s (2008) model of

servant leadership. In analyzing their six dimensions of servant leadership we see that

Nehemiah subordinates himself and takes on the posture of a true servant.[280] This is one of

only a few times where we witness Nehemiah not choosing to lead out ahead, but to act as a

servant first. Nehemiah shows his authentic self in his humility and integrity as he chooses to be

accountable to his actions and desires to correct any wrongs that he may have committed.[281]

We see aspects of transcendental spiritualism as Nehemiah accepts everyone as he promotes

equality with the whole of Yehud.[282] While Nehemiah does not create individual covenantal

relationships in this, or any context, he does show the desire to create a covenantal relationship

with his followers as a people.[283] Nehemiah always shows responsible morality and we witness

his sense of mission as he is quick to show his service and benevolence to his people in the

wake of recognizing the suffering of the marginalized people of Yehud.[284] And lastly, we see

Nehemiah have a transforming influence through his service by physically aiding those in need,

---

275 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.
276 Liden, "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
277 Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership,* 27.
278 Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership,* 27.
279 Dirk van Dierendonck and I. Nuijten, "The Servant Leadership Survey: Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Measure," *J Bus Psychol* 26 (2011): 249-267.
280 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.
281 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.
282 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.
283 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.
284 Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.

but also transforming his working force to experience renewed vigor and motivation to continue the work in the midst of difficulty, threat, and high expectations.[285] Nehemiah's ability to adapt to a servant leadership style to show his servant nature provided the avenue for leadership success.

Context 12 — Nehemiah Interacts with Further Plots from Adversaries — Neh 6.1–6.14

This context brings us back to the initial goal of Nehemiah rebuilding the wall. The wall is now mostly built (Neh 6.1) and once again Nehemiah's adversaries attempt to thwart his actions and to tarnish his reputation as a leader (Neh 6.2). Their first attempt is to delay and distract Nehemiah by attempting to persuade him to meet (Neh 6.2). Once that proves unsuccessful, Sanballat attempts to gain the attention of Nehemiah and the people by accusing them of rebelling against the king, going as far as claiming that the king knows of the report that they are intending to rebel (Neh 6.6-7). And finally, we are presented with an encounter between Nehemiah and Shemaiah where Shemaiah warns Nehemiah of a murderous plot and advises Nehemiah to flee to the Temple (Neh 6.10-13).

These examples once again provide Nehemiah with an "other" to prove once again that he is the leader that the people need and that his vision is correct to God. However, we see a different posture of leadership here. This context does not show Nehemiah as a charismatic leader who is bolstering the crowd with motivating speeches (Neh 2.17-18). We are not shown direct interaction with the needs of the people as Nehemiah comes as the humble servant (Neh 5). Instead, we are shown another style of leadership, authentic leadership, that Nehemiah demonstrates through resiliency (Neh 6.3, 8, 10, 12), indifference to his opponents (Neh 6.3), and remaining resolute in his morals and visions (Neh 6.11).[286] We see Nehemiah dismiss the calls of Sanballat and his other opponents and in the face of a report of rebellion that may have been heard by the king, he holds to his truth and insists straightforwardly that these accusations hold no weight (Neh 6.8). Nehemiah recognizes that treaty and conversation with

---

[285] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.
[286] Bruce J. Avolio, W.L. Gardner, and F.O. Walumbwa, *Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ)* (Palo Alto, CA: Mindgarden, 2007).

these adversaries could imply an admission of guilt, and therefore, he chooses to deny the accusation outright and move on to more important actions that will achieve his goals.[287] Nehemiah shows authentic leadership as he is confident in who he is as a leader, secure in his morals and his actions, and recognizes that the truth will surely set him free.[288] We also recognize Nehemiah's trust in king Artaxerxes' dismissal of any rumor of rebellion based on Nehemiah's thoughtful development of his relationship with the king (Neh 2.1-8). This may be assumed as we are never told of any inquiry into possible rebellion by the king and Nehemiah's leadership is allowed to continue, even to continue into a second term in the future (Neh 13.6-7).

Again, Nehemiah's authenticity is further shown through his interaction with Shemaiah as he quickly recognizes that Shemaiah's counsel is not from God but is based in deceit (Neh 6.12-13). Nehemiah knows his position and knows the law of the land. Not only does he know that a man of his status is not allowed to enter the Temple (2 Chr 23.6), but he also recognizes that he certainly would not be permitted to construct a military bunker in the Temple. In the end, Nehemiah recognizes that he has nothing to fear in the first place for God is on his side.[289] Nehemiah acknowledges that the path that Shemaiah is advising would be one consumed with fear, and would cause Nehemiah to enter into a sin that Deut 18.22 warns against in fearing a false prophet.[290] Instead, Nehemiah follows his internal moral standing and trusts his confidence in God over the advice of men and in doing so finds success in retaining his authenticity, allowing him to continue to gain the support of the people as their leader.[291]

Here, we see yet another shift in leadership style of Nehemiah to that of authentic leadership, showing another way that Nehemiah deals with adversity. Instead of lashing out with emotion or action, we see an intrapersonal perspective as Nehemiah turns inward, relying on his character to produce genuine leadership.[292] Nehemiah is unaffected by outside

---

[287] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 257.
[288] F.O. Walumbwa, Bruce J. Avolio, W.L. Gardner, T.S. Wernsing, and S.J. Peterson, "Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure," *J Manage* 34, no. 1 (2008): 89-126.
[289] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 258.
[290] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 76.
[291] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 466.
[292] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 196.

influence, he is resolved in his vision and purpose, he is disciplined and acts on his values, and resists relationships with those who are inauthentic.[293] Therefore, we see his disapproval and dismissal of Sanballat, the other opponents, and Shemaiah due to their lack of authenticity.[294] This also further distinguishes his leadership, showing Nehemiah as the good and needed leader and his opponents as "other" representing bad or unwanted leadership.

Specifically using the three models of authentic leadership theory chosen in this thesis, we see Nehemiah as authentic, transparent, identifying with followers, promoting group identification, instilling pride in his followers, increasing moral value, being honest, having high levels of integrity, being direct and open, committed to the success of followers, willing to acknowledge his own limitations, being accountable, instilling hope, trust, optimism, and positive emotions, produces higher commitment in his followers, instilling meaningfulness, producing higher work effort, decreasing follower withdrawal,[295] being confident, hopeful, and resilient, trusting in himself, showing high levels of character, being emotionally contagious, models positive behavior, creates positive social changes,[296] and creates respect with followers.[297] This long list of authentic leader characteristics shows the level of authenticity found in Nehemiah in this context. This is supported by using Avolio et al.'s (2004) model of authentic leadership. First, we see the effect that Nehemiah has on the identities of his followers. Just a few contexts before, the people of Yehud are in dismay, worried that they will be attacked (Neh 4.10). The people are also being physically oppressed and many in difficult situations where they are attempting to survive (Neh 5). However, Nehemiah revitalizes the identities of the people of Yehud, not through a charismatic speech, but instead, by showing his true self that allows his followers to witness authenticity in which they can identify with personally and socially to continue working towards the vision set forth.[298] This identification with Nehemiah then leads to Avolio et al.'s (2004) four states of being in instilling hope, trust,

---

[293] Walumbwa, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 89-126.

[294] Avolio, et al., *Authentic Leadership Questionnaire*. We would see Nehemiah's opponents showing the opposite of Avolio, et al.'s characteristics of authentic leadership.

[295] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 802-808.

[296] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.

[297] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 83-88.

[298] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 802-808.

optimism, and positive emotions that lift the people up, creates higher commitment, higher job satisfaction, meaningfulness in their work, and higher engagement with the leader.[299]

Nehemiah's ability to shift to an authentic leadership style in this context allows him to successfully navigate the situation at hand and thwart, once again, a plot to derail the people of Yehud. While there are hints of transformational, servant, and charismatic leadership styles in this context, they are all governed by authentic leadership.

Context 13 — Nehemiah Completing the Wall — Neh 6.15–7.4

The last context in this phase finds the people of Yehud seeing the success that their hard work has achieved with a constructed wall and their enemies in fear and having low self-esteem. However, the sense of crisis is unabated as supporters of Tobiah continue to correspond with him and show their support for the Ammonite (Neh 6.17). Nonetheless, Nehemiah presses on and begins the process of appointing leaders for the protection of Jerusalem and instituting laws that will ensure both the safety of the inhabitants and the way of life that Nehemiah sees fit for God's people. Again, there is a shift in leadership style in Nehemiah as he gains success in his first endeavor of building the wall and now desires to achieve his next goal of bringing the people of God back to the lifestyle that Nehemiah sees as necessary for Yehud to prosper and avoid future punishment from God.

Most of Nehemiah's leadership in this context is established in the opening verses of Neh 7. He assumes a governing role as a political figure and begins to appoint members of the community to necessary roles in everyday life (Neh 7.1-3). Specifically, he gives Hanani and Hananiah וָאֲצַוֶּה ("charge") over Jerusalem. BDB (2010) shows this as appointing responsibility for a specific task or job.[300] Therefore, Nehemiah is still in authority, but he is delegating responsibility. Nehemiah chooses trusted allies who have proven their faith in God and their devotion to Nehemiah's cause (Neh 7.1-3). We see Nehemiah selecting those who proved loyal to him, and in a very charismatic act, rewards them for their loyalty based on their

---

[299] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 802-808.
[300] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 845.

performance.[301] This further protects Nehemiah as a leader and the vision which he continues to cast by placing key personnel around him in leadership roles.[302] Once those officials are in place, Nehemiah begins the process of reforming the ways of Yehud (Neh 7.3; 8). We see at the first opportunity, Nehemiah's use of the constructed wall to control information and travel within Jerusalem. Nehemiah sees the continued external threat from his opponents not only as physical threat, but also as cultural and economic threats, putting at risk the loyalty of the Jewish people to their God.[303] Therefore, Nehemiah desires to control the flow of commerce and conversation and wants to be informed of who was traveling in and out of Jerusalem (Neh 7.3). We see that Nehemiah orders the doors to be open only during the hours during which trusted guards are stationed at the gates (Neh 7.3).[304] This allows Nehemiah to know who is moving in and out of Jerusalem and can be told by those guards of the general conversation and mood that is occurring.

Nehemiah's leadership now addresses the social order and the renewal of the Jewish way of life. We see the continual presence of crisis, albeit less severe, but present, nonetheless. This provides an opportunity for continued charismatic leadership as Nehemiah rallies his supporters around a common enemy that is no longer a threat to the building of the wall, but now presents as a threat to Nehemiah's idea of the Jewish way of life. Appointing trusted officials who are loyal to his cause is another act that validates a charismatic leader's position through reward and keeping supporters close.[305] Here, Nehemiah is in the third phase of Jacobsen and House's (2001) phases of charismatic leadership. Nehemiah continues to model his vision and now inspires a core group of followers who begin to emulate the leader's behavior by becoming leaders themselves in valued positions. They are committed to the leader's vision and are trusted supporters who will defend Nehemiah's vision.[306]

The appointment of others also shows transformational leadership qualities as there is a desire from Nehemiah to pass along his leadership abilities to others and provide avenues

---

[301] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 79.
[302] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 79.
[303] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 171-172.
[304] Grabbe, *Ezra-Nehemiah,* 50.
[305] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[306] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

where they can gain leadership experience and achieve success as Nehemiah shares leadership responsibility.[307] Bennis and Nanus's (2007) four common strategies help us see aspects of transformational leadership in Nehemiah. His clearly expressed vision of a built wall now moves to a clearly expressed vision of reform.[308] Nehemiah clearly communicates that vision to his followers and appoints specific individuals who will carry that vision to further transform the people of Yehud (Neh 7.1-3).[309] This engenders trust with his followers and allows the people to see the authentic transformational desires of Nehemiah.[310] However, we do not see Bennis and Nanus's fourth strategy of the leader personally and professionally developing himself. We are not given information that Nehemiah continually improves. However, overall, there are aspects that show Nehemiah's desire to transform his followers into leaders and those who will continue to build his vision. [311]

Additionally, Nehemiah also shows path-goal leadership processes through protecting a fortified city and performing the necessary governing tasks of ensuring law and order within the walls of Jerusalem to benefit the people of God. There are times when transactional acts are necessary to achieve certain goals. Nehemiah has a desire for certain goals to be achieved that requires organization, systems to be put in place, and leaders to fulfill roles to achieve success. We see a successful wall built due to the organizational structures and systems Nehemiah installs (Neh 3). In this context, Nehemiah organizes the labor to install the gates and supervisory systems put in place to not only guard the wall but to also produce a system of communication where Nehemiah can gain information of conversations and actions occurring in Jerusalem (Neh 7.1-3). Using Vroom's (1995) model of expectancy theory of motivation, we see that expectancy is achieved in Nehemiah where an increased effort from the followers of Nehemiah has created a collective, and in many cases, a personal increase in reward.[312] Also, instrumentality has shown beneficial as Nehemiah's followers have performed to specific and high expectations which has gained them the reward of a fortified city, and for some, a

---

[307] Kotter, "Winning at Change," 27-33.
[308] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.
[309] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.
[310] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.
[311] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.
[312] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 18-20.

promotion of status.[313] Finally, Nehemiah has shown valence as he has presented a high value on the work that his followers have performed that motivates his followers to work harder to accomplish the goals set forth.[314]

Therefore, in this context we see Nehemiah operating in a blended form of leadership, using various leadership styles when appropriate. He is an astute learner of situation and environment and one who keenly recognizes the role which he must play to gain further success and accomplish his goals. Transformational and charismatic leadership are the primary styles used in this context with path-goal and even servant leadership appearing in some instances.[315]

Phase 5 – Census of Citizens by Genealogy After the Wall is Rebuilt

The fifth phase includes two contexts concerned with the organization of government. In context 14, Nehemiah takes a census (Neh 7.5-69) and then in context 15, Nehemiah donates to the treasury to help with the building fund (Neh 7.70-73). This phase occurs in the text in Jerusalem after the wall was rebuilt but before Ezra begins to instruct the people of Yehud on the law of God. Therefore, it sits as its own phase taking up most of Neh 7 of the biblical text. The characters involved include Nehemiah, the nobles, rulers, and the "people" that were registered including named persons such as Zerubbabel, Jeshua, and the others that repopulated Yehud after Cyrus' decree. We see primarily charismatic and servant leadership behaviors within this phase.

Context 14 — Nehemiah Organizes the Government by a Census — Neh 7.5–7.69

Nehemiah introduces this context by stating that God inspired him to take a census of the population by genealogy (Neh 7.4-5). The remainder of the context is spent listing the families who first returned to the land following the captivity (Neh 7.6-69). The word translated

---

[313] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 18-20.
[314] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 18-20.
[315] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.

"registered" in the NRSV is the *hithpael* form לְהִתְיַחֵשׂ, which means being enrolled by genealogy (Ezra 2.62; 1 Chr 5.17; 2 Chr 12.15).[316] Only those who could prove their genealogy are allowed to be members of the community, and in some instances, we find that certain families cannot prove their genealogical claim and are not included as people of Israel (Neh 7.61). There are several small insights into Nehemiah's leadership that can be gleaned from this context. First, Nehemiah still relies on God's direction to dictate his actions (Neh 7.5). The first remark in this context is that God put it into Nehemiah's heart to act (Neh 7.5).[317] This shows to the reader that Nehemiah is a charismatic leader who listens to the authority of the divine which provides the grounds for Nehemiah's leadership and his leadership decisions.[318] According to Weber (2012), charismatic leaders are "treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers and qualities…not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader."[319] Here, Nehemiah acts as the example of a leader who follows the instructions of the divine providing him authority from his followers.

Second, there is a basic theological implication for the census that is rooted in the needs of people over the need for a brick-and-mortar structure.[320] A census is understandable as Nehemiah shifts his focus to the social well-being of Yehud which includes the repopulation of Jerusalem as its center (Neh 11.1-24). Therefore, the future goal requires an understanding of the current population of Yehud. Additionally, the list of returnees provides a reminder of the sacrifice that those individuals made in returning to a decimated Yehud. Moreover, it speaks of Nehemiah's sacrifice to leave the prestige and comfort of his position to come lead the rebuilding of Jerusalem (Neh 1.5). And finally, it speaks of the future sacrifice that will be required of repopulating Jerusalem with those who will have to leave their lands, their homes, and their prosperity for Jerusalem and the people of God to prosper (Neh 11.1).[321] From an

---

[316] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 405.
[317] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 98.
[318] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 22-23.
[319] Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, ed. Talcott Parsons, trans. A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino Publishing, 2012), 358-359.
[320] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 274.
[321] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 80.

economic standpoint, the census and future population of Jerusalem will also provide a crucial tax base. This works within a charismatic leadership style of ascertaining one's support through polling and documentation that instills loyalty, influence, and helps to clarify vision.[322] Nehemiah's charisma is likened here to that of Solomon (1 Kgs 3.4-15) who no longer has to worry about war and violence, and who moves into a different form of charismatic leadership including the establishment of social and political institutions and to "establish and maintain the state apparatus and the vital functions of state life, such as diplomatic relationships with neighboring states, centralization, [and] the control of society and taxation."[323]

Nehemiah uses charisma not only to convince his population to sacrifice for what Nehemiah saw as the greater good, he also has to be charismatic to sustain central power and hold the way of life he saw fit.[324] We also see the beginnings of routinization here, which is where all charismatic leadership eventually leads. Using Jacobsen and House's (2001) phases of charismatic leadership, the fourth phase sees the leader having to begin to systematize his or her leadership as the threat or crisis begins to subside.[325] Followers become disenchanted with the leader, and routine leadership is required for the organization to continue.[326] The crisis shifts and lessens in intensity and the time has come where "normal" life can begin to exist. In this context, Jacobsen and House's fourth phase is seen in the use of a census as it acts as a forerunner to systemization and routinization. The people have yet to become disenchanted, but we will see that occur soon. This introduction to system and routine marks a charismatic environment based on the path of leadership that Nehemiah takes. His leadership starts with grand speeches and inspiring words. As charismatic leadership begins to become unnecessary, Nehemiah routinizes into more organizational practices.

Third, we see the notion of exclusion resurface once again in Nehemiah's leadership. Originally, the exclusion was seen in Nehemiah restricting outsiders and non-Jews from a share in God's work, provision, and blessing (Ezra 4.1-5; Neh 2.19). While xenophobic in nature, it is

---

[322] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[323] Tamas Czovek, "Three Charismatic Leaders: Part Three: Solomon," Transformation 19, no. 4 (2002): 249.
[324] Michel Foucault, "Afterword: The Subject and Power," in Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics, eds. H. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow, 208-228 (Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press, 1983), 220.
[325] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[326] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

also understandable as these individuals were directly opposed to the governor's vision. However, now we reach a deeper level of exclusion as certain returnees are not permitted to be in the family of Israel due to their inability to evidence their genealogy (Neh 7.61-65). Many of these excluded were most likely Jews, but due to their records getting lost or their inability to provide the correct documentation, they are left out. Charismatic leadership is shown here because Nehemiah acts on principle, gains loyalty with those whom he deems the "in" group, produces affiliation with those in his inner circle, and unifies the people by differentiating them from an "other" with which to compare.[327] Sectioning out a small group of individuals who cannot confirm their claim unifies the masses, while creating very little protest due to the small number of people and lack of power of those left out.[328] This action can also be viewed as authentic leadership as there is an underlying ideal that only those who are authentic can be included in the house of God.[329] There is an internalized moral perspective that one must be authentic not only in their actions, but also authentic in their identity.[330] This understanding underlines the message that only God's true people have a place in Yehud.

What is interesting in this context is a hint of servant leadership. There are characteristics within this context of building community and valuing people.[331] However, Nehemiah's actions do not serve or value all the people due to the exclusion of certain families (Neh 7.61-65). Nehemiah is serving the people of Yehud and is focused on their well-being; however, he is selective in who he serves. Therefore, we see Nehemiah's servant heart at work here, but we are also shown a side of Nehemiah that excludes his own people in addition to his enemies. Nehemiah does not show a high level of tolerance for all people, something that Greenleaf sees as an important quality in servant leaders.[332] Just as Nehemiah excludes Sanballat and those who oppose him, so to does Nehemiah exclude those who do not have genealogical claim on the land and he identifies them as "other." Therefore, Nehemiah acts in a

---

[327] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[328] Breuer, "Particularity and Pluralism," 281. Nash, *The Cauldron of Ethnicity,* 9.
[329] Knoppers, "Nehemiah and Sanballat," 308.
[330] Avolio, et al., *Authentic Leadership Questionnaire.*
[331] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 30, 49-50.
[332] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 315.

servant manner towards his followers and is more charismatic with his adversaries or those who are not his followers.

There are also aspects of transactional leadership working in this context as we recognize that Nehemiah's service is not meant for everyone. In some instances his methods are transactional with the goal of compliance regardless of approval or loyalty.[333]We cannot even deem these actions involving path-goal relationships, because in path-goal leadership the leader is still attempting to build positive physical and emotional situations for the follower.[334] It seems in this situation, Nehemiah does nothing to help those who cannot claim their genealogy and only tells them to wait (Neh 7.65).[335] With relationship or emotions aside, if someone had the correct documentation, they were accepted, if not, they were ostracized. Overall, the census provides an avenue for success in repopulating the city with people that Nehemiah deems acceptable (Neh 11.1) which brings Nehemiah one step closer to achieving his overall goal of reinstituting the law of God and creating an obedient Yehud (Neh 8).

Context 15 — Nehemiah Contributes to the Building Fund — Neh 7.70–7.73

The fifteenth context of Nehemiah's leadership provides a short reference that Nehemiah provides funds for the rebuilding process. Nehemiah also indicates that other heads of houses contributed as well perhaps in proportion to their wealth. This reflects servant leadership by creating value, being accountable, having integrity, putting followers first, being self-sacrificial, being a servant, sharing, and being a steward.[336] Nehemiah is not forced to help or required to serve, but the text indicates that he contributed through physical labor (Neh 4.6), providing the use of his servants and those under his command (Neh 4.16), his refusal of pay for his entire leadership term (Neh 5.14-19), and now his generosity and care for others (Neh 7.70-73). This latter act of servant leadership is undoubtedly intended to encourage his acceptance

---

[333] Schriesheim and Neider, "Path-Goal Leadership Theory," 317.
[334] Ellis, "Contrasting Jesus' Leadership Style," 77-78.
[335] Ellis, "Contrasting Jesus' Leadership Style," 77-78.
[336] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.

as the leader of Yehud both in action towards the people of that day, as well as the reader who can sympathize towards his cause.

Phase 6 – Reinstitution of Social, Political, & Religious Law in Yehud

Life in Yehud continues to be defined and ordered by Nehemiah in this phase. However, this phase is unique as three of the six contexts finds Nehemiah only mentioned as a bystander as Ezra and other social and religious leaders take center stage. It would be presumed that if Nehemiah was not directly leading, then we would not be able to learn anything about his leadership. However, that is not the case. The first three contexts in this phase deal with the reinstitution of the Mosaic law, or at least the version that is available. Ezra takes up the leadership mantle for this task as the primary teacher of the law. Nehemiah is not absent, but is present, as befitting a leader who has delegated responsibility to others. We will find as we analyze each of the first three contexts in this phase that there are unique aspects of Nehemiah's leadership that can be better understood. The nineteenth context finds the people casting lots for who will move into the city of Jerusalem (Neh 11.1). Once again, Nehemiah is not mentioned, but only assumed to be the commanding leader who ordered Jerusalem to be filled with inhabitants. The remaining two contexts bring Nehemiah back as the primary leader as the wall is dedicated to God (Neh 12.27-43) and Nehemiah appoints further personnel to the government (Neh 12.44-47).

This phase is unique in its analysis due to Nehemiah's location behind the scenes. Therefore, in contexts where Nehemiah is only mentioned as being present, we will take two approaches in analyzing Nehemiah's leadership. First, we will analyze the leadership characteristics that allow Nehemiah to take a step back and allow others to take the lead as this reflects important leadership qualities for certain leadership styles. Second, we will look at the overall events portrayed in the context as ones that Nehemiah condones. This allows us to still analyze the contexts and glean information about Nehemiah's leadership.

Context 16 — Day 1 of Reading the Law to the People — Neh 8.1–8.12

We see a shift in leadership in this context as Ezra, along with other teachers of the law, spend an entire day reading and teaching the law of God (Neh 8.1-3).[337] Along with a shift of leadership comes a shift in focus. With the wall built and secure (Neh 6.15-19), and with the political arena organized (Neh 7), the focus now moves to specific religious reforms based in the law, uniting the people of Yehud under one banner.[338] While the spotlight is on Ezra, we cannot forget that Nehemiah is still in charge here and his vision is still driving the scene. Nehemiah includes Ezra to show that Israelite society, including its social, political, and religious aspects, all meet in YHWH's law.[339] As we will see, while Ezra is speaking, Nehemiah is still leading. Nehemiah is adding religious understanding and unity to his masterpiece plan, completing his vision of a unified and prosperous Yehud who is secure in the commandments of God and who will not stray again.

Even though Nehemiah is mentioned in only a cursory statement in Neh 8.9, we can still see key characteristics of leadership being displayed by Nehemiah. The text indicates that all the people came together on this first day of celebration to read the law (Neh 8.1). The word עַם is used which generally indicates a grouped people usually relating to kinship.[340] Furthermore, the word כֹּל, "all," is found in Neh 8.1, indicating that the people as a whole were gathered.[341] As Shepherd and Wright (2018) note, this includes men, women, and children from all levels and areas of Yehudite society.[342] A second important implication is that the text indicates that "they," meaning the general population, desired Ezra to bring the book of the law and teach it to them.[343] This was not a directive given by Nehemiah, nor was it an opportunity for the religious leaders to assert influence or power. The scene seemingly shows Nehemiah standing

---

[337] I am aware of the debate concerning the translation of תּוֹרָה as "Law," "Instruction," or other meanings and whether the Torah (i.e. the Pentateuch) is a Persian-period law code. This debate is not addressed in this thesis, but I mention it here so that the reader is aware that I recognize the controversy surrounding the word.
[338] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 173.
[339] Davies, *Berit Olam Studies*, 113.
[340] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 766.
[341] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 481.
[342] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 81-82.
[343] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 82.

in the back behind Ezra, seeing his vision come to fruition as Ezra takes on the mantle of leadership, as the people express a desire to know the law of God. A third important aspect that needs to be recognized is that the law was not simply spoken so that the crowd could hear it, but it was spoken and then taught to the crowd (Neh 8.7-9). The word translated in the NRSV as "taught" in Neh 8.9 is the *hiphil* active participle מְבִינִים from the root word בִּין which refers to observation and discernment (Ps 119.130; Job 32.8; Isa 40.14).[344] Therefore, the action shows the teachers of the law bestowing information and wisdom to the people.[345] Shepherd and Wright emphasize a shift in attention from liturgy, a ceremonial reading of the text, to pedagogy, an active instruction that produces the true people of God (Neh 8.13-18).[346] Now that the people have read the law and understand it, they can now act on the law. Before, the law was not understood, making it ceremonial at best, and obsolete at worst. The pedagogical purpose can now be accomplished as they understand the commandments of God.[347] Therefore, the use of religious teachers to explain the law to the people shows Nehemiah's vision clearly.

Once the law is read, we see Nehemiah briefly step in with Ezra, the priests, and the Levites to explain what the people should do based on this reading (Neh 8.9). Nehemiah recognizes the power of emotions and its effect on unity and resolve.[348] He tells them to go and enjoy, to feast and to celebrate (Neh 8.10). The leadership implications here are palpable as Nehemiah rallies his people through festival and ensures that the crisis of a decimated Yehud physically, socially, and now religiously has found resolution under his leadership.[349]

From a leadership style perspective, we see mostly transformational leadership in this context. The people are now taking the initiative and Nehemiah is allowing that to occur.[350] The greatest desire of a transformational leader is that through training, the leader works himself

---

[344] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 107.
[345] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 107.
[346] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 82-83.
[347] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 82-83.
[348] Jon Billsberry, "Teaching Leadership from a Social Constructionist Perspective," *J Manag Organ* 19, no. 6 (2013): 680-681.
[349] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[350] Srdjan Nikezic, Suzana Doljanica, and Dragan Bataveljic, "Charismatic and Transformational Leadership: Approaches for Effective Change," *Annals of the Oradea University* 2 (2013): 181.

out of a job. Nehemiah recognizes that the emotions, values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals of the people have begun to transform and align with his vision.[351] Nehemiah can now delegate and allow the people to continue his legacy. We see transformational leadership characteristics such as inspiring others to lead, motivating others to take charge, stimulating intellect,[352] giving a clear vision, organizing, creating and giving trust, giving clear expectations, building follower self-respect, empowering others, developing internal motivation in followers, managing meaning, clearly communicating, standing by his beliefs,[353] modeling the right attitude, being involved, modeling leadership, enabling action, and encouraging others to participate.[354] Kouzes and Posner's (2017) five practices of transformational leadership occurs in this context.[355] Nehemiah models the way which creates transformation in his followers where they take the initiative to lead the congregation.[356] Nehemiah inspires a shared vision that others now take and continue to express.[357] Nehemiah challenges the process and creates a structure where his followers can challenge the people.[358] He allows others to act, taking the mantle of transformational leadership.[359] And finally, Nehemiah is attentive to the hearts of his followers as he tells them to celebrate and take care of themselves.[360]

There are still aspects of charismatic leadership present in this context as Nehemiah is not willing to relinquish all his control. He still steers the population in the correct direction towards his vision and still controls the overall flow of events to ensure compliance and devotion to his vision (Neh 8.9).[361] Additionally, his decree to feast and celebrate underlines his charismatic claim of leadership as it shows his vision accomplished as the threat of outside influence is defeated.[362] We see continuing steps of routinization here as Nehemiah starts to organize and systematize the different spheres of society bringing together the populace in a

---

[351] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 161.
[352] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness*, 2.
[353] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.
[354] Kouzes and Posner, *The Leadership Challenge*, 11-19.
[355] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.
[356] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.
[357] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.
[358] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.
[359] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.
[360] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.
[361] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[362] Shamir, et al., "The Motivational Effects," 577-594.

more organized manner.[363] But, overall, he leads from a less charismatic stance as he takes a step back from the limelight, allowing his transformed populace to take more control.

Context 17 — Day 2 of Reading the Law to the People — Neh 8.13–8.18

The seventeenth context of Nehemiah's leadership takes place directly after the previous context. As the text says וּבַיּוֹם הַשֵּׁנִי ("on the second day") we see that the momentum from the previous day is reflected in a continual desire to understand Torah (Neh 8.13). However, there are also differences that need to be pointed out that speak both to the societal structure of Yehud and Nehemiah's leadership. Nehemiah is not even mentioned in this context, but as before, we see his leadership still present, albeit in the background. It is important to recognize that the group present in this context is not the same as it was in the previous context. The Hebrew now specifies a specific group — the רָאשֵׁי הָאָבוֹת ("chiefs of the fathers"). Most of the people of Yehud have been dismissed and what remains is a select group of the heads of the ancestral houses, the priests, the Levites, and Ezra gathered to study the law together.[364] The *hiphil* word וּלְהַשְׂכִּיל translates as "study" in the NRSV and means to understand, see, make wise, have success, and act with insight or devotion.[365] This indicates that the people of God must consider carefully God's deeds and his ways for their lives to prosper (Neh 8.13).[366]

Nehemiah continues to cast his vision through using leadership skills in a methodical process of bringing others to his vision.[367] With the entire populace now having a basic understanding of the law, he takes the leadership of the people and allows them to further understand the law to secure further buy-in to the religion which will foster unity and devotion

---

[363] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* 54-55.

[364] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 84.

[365] Terence E. Fretheim, "8505 שָׂכַל," in *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis*, vol. 3, ed. Willem A. VanGemeren (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1997), 1243. Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 968.

[366] Fretheim, "8505," 1243. Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 968.

[367] Edward J. Shelton, *Transformational Leadership: Trust, Motivation and Engagement* (Bloomington, IN: Trafford Publishing, 2012), 8-9.

as a collective people.[368] It should be noted that the text does not say that Nehemiah caused this meeting to occur, and it is possible that the leaders took it upon themselves to delve deeper into the law (Neh 8.13). But in looking at Nehemiah's past leadership examples, it is not unreasonable to conclude that he had influence over this event (Neh 2.11-15, 17-18; 4. 13-14, 20; 5.6-13, 14, 16-17; 10.1; 12.31; 13.8-13). The text focuses on the Festival of Sukkot in the law and reinstituting its practice. Again, the people take it upon themselves to enact the ritual, but it must be understood that the leaders of the ancestral houses first learned of the ritual and then went out and taught it to their families (Neh 8.13-14).

There is difficulty in ascribing different leadership styles to Nehemiah due to his lack of presence and direct leading in this context. However, certain leadership qualities from several leadership theories can be gleaned that speak to his leadership. First, Nehemiah is transformational as, once again, he did not have to directly instruct or order the people of Yehud to act. The people of Yehud take a posture of leadership and are now actualizing the transformative nature that Nehemiah bestows upon his leaders, who in turn are facilitating that transformation amongst the people.[369] The people act due to their training, their acceptance of Nehemiah's vision, and their devotion to God. Kouzes and Posner's (2017) five practices of transformational leadership show this path as Nehemiah models the way, inspires a shared vision, challenges the people to reconnect with the law which then allows the people to act on Nehemiah's vision so that they can be transformed into leaders themselves.[370]

Also, the leadership of Nehemiah shows aspects of charismatic leadership primarily due to the relegation of Nehemiah to the background as the organized leadership begins to take over. As Jacobsen and House (2001) show, routinization has begun as systems and processes now take over where crisis, unconventional leadership, and extraordinary charisma once led.[371] There are still aspects of mystique and excitement occurring as the people of God explore Torah and find new wonders and practices that they resurrect. The shared vision of Nehemiah is now being instilled, which empowers the people to lead themselves and have confidence in

---

[368] Nicholas W. Twigg and Satyanarayana Parayitam, "Spirituality as a Determinant of Transformational Leadership: Moderating Effects of Religious Orientation," *J Manag Spiritual Relig* 4, no. 3 (2007): 331-335
[369] Bass and Riggio, *Transformational Leadership*, 6.
[370] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.
[371] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

themselves, in their God, and in their religion.[372] Nehemiah is still charismatically influencing the scene as he directs the people to align with his vision.[373]

While the text does not show Nehemiah directly leading, what is shown is that the people of God feel empowered by Nehemiah's leadership and pursues the study of Torah to deepen their understanding of God's word with the intention of following the commandments of God (Neh 8.13-18). All of this aligns with Nehemiah's vision and therefore, Nehemiah achieves success in his leadership in this context.

Context 18 — National Confession & the People Sign the Covenant — Neh 9.1–10.39

The next context of Nehemiah's leadership consolidates and caps off the last two contexts, as the people of God celebrate the learning of God's law and the practice of Sukkot. The people, isolated from any foreigners, now gather on their final day of Sukkot to confess the sins and iniquities of both their ancestors and themselves (Neh 9.1). Ezra comes once again to lead the people in a national confession in a multi-part declaration of Israel's past, an honoring of God, and a call for God to come once again and bless His people (Neh 9.2-5). Once the prayer is concluded, the people enter into a covenant indicating that the people of Yehud will now obey the commandments of God and will live lives worthy of him (Neh 10). As Nehemiah is the first to sign the covenant, we can conclude that he is still leading in this context and condones all of the actions taking place (Neh 10.1).

There are facets of the national address that have leadership implications. The nature of what is discussed brings the people of God, both past and present, into the folds of a continual and unifying story. While the purpose is to corporately confess the people's sin to God, we can also see Nehemiah using the opportunity to further the unification of the people, reminding them they are a people who have been in existence since Abraham (Gen 15).[374] There are

---

[372] António Sacavém, Luis F. Martinez, João Vieira Da Cunha, Ana Maria Abreu, and Stefanie K. Johnson, "Charismatic Leadership: A Study on Delivery Styles, Mood, and Performance," *J Leadersh Stud* 11, no. 3 (2017): 23.
[373] Sefa Hayibor, Bradley R. Agle, Greg J. Sears, Jeffrey A. Sonnenfeld, and Andrew Ward, "Value Congruence and Charismatic Leadership in CEO-Top Manager Relationships: An Empirical Investigation," *J Bus Ethics* 102, no. 2 (2011): 239.
[374] Zvi, "Othering, Selfing, 'Boundarying' and 'Cross-Boundarying,'" 20.

references in Ezra's address to Israel's exodus and God's heroic rescue of his people from the Egyptians (Neh 9.9-11; Exod 7-14). The repeated use of the term "our fathers" (אֲבֹתֵינוּ) speaks to the connection that the current people of Yehud have with their past ancestors (Neh 9.2,9, 16, 23, 32, 34, 36). And because of that connection, the people of Yehud must now obey the commandments of God given to their ancestors if they are to be blessed and properly guided (Neh 9.38). We also see restrictions imposed by Nehemiah weaving intricately into this confession. The observance of Sabbath (Neh 9.14), the ties and ownership of the land (Neh 9.15, 22, 23, 24, 26, 30, 35, 36), Israel's propensity towards rebellion (Neh 9.17), and the need to be a people set apart (Neh 9.7, 29) speak not only to a people of long ago, but also speak directly to the people living in that day. This confession is not only for God's ears, but also reminds the people of Nehemiah's decrees as a path towards prosperity and communion with God.[375]

The confession of the people of God culminates in the people, with Nehemiah leading the way, drafting a covenant with God vowing to obey God's commandments as it is provided in the law of Moses (Neh 10.28-39). Specifically, the people of Yehud will not allow the marriage of their sons or daughters to foreigners (Neh 10.30), they will keep the Sabbath and not engage in commerce on the Sabbath (Neh 10.31), they will reinstitute the year of rest for crops and the cancellation of debt (Neh 10.31), and will once again support the Temple through taxation (Neh 10.32-33). These are all statutes that Nehemiah explicitly discusses and are the core tenants of his reform.[376] It is not by mistake that these ordinances are clearly established in this covenant as the people and Nehemiah have verifiable proof that these acts are now deemed necessary by vow (Gen 28.20; Lev 27.2; Judg 11.30; 1 Sam 1.11). Nehemiah seals his vision for societal reform through this covenant as it will be forever a record for the people of Yehud to remind themselves of their duty and obligation to God, to the Temple, and to each other.[377] Nehemiah, in both a customary nature and a symbolic act, is the first to sign the covenant indicating that he is prepared to model the proper actions befitting any Jew.[378]

---

[375] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 87-89.
[376] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 115-117.
[377] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 92-93.
[378] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 557.

Nehemiah switches back primarily to a charismatic leadership style in this context. The act of proclaiming a national confession that all must hear and obey, and then to cement that event with a covenant bound by threat of curse, once again reflects charismatic leadership. We see the dualistic nature of Nehemiah creating trust, instilling confidence, and empowering others through collective agreement,[379] but at the same time Nehemiah gains loyalty, produces affiliation, inspires a shared vision, and unifies the people by requiring compliance.[380] To secure allegiance to his vision, the charismatic leader in Nehemiah sets an example by being the first to sign the covenant indicating that he is the first to step into the covenant and obey its tenets.[381] Conger and Kanungo's (2003) four stages of charismatic leader development help us understand the importance of the leader crafting his or her vision to fit the environmental context present to develop that vision and establish follower trust to achieve the goals set forth.[382]

Nehemiah has a desire to bring lasting reform to the people of God and sees the environment ripe for obedience and compliance. The people of God have just experienced a revival of their religious practice that produced a fervent excitement and renewed energy to obey the commandments of God. Nehemiah's understanding of the context allows him to quickly seal the people's enthusiasm and energy into a vow and a signed covenant that helps secure Nehemiah's vision of reform. These acts show charismatic leadership as Nehemiah portrays House's (1976) model of charismatic leadership by expressing high levels of self-confidence, still having a need to dominate through requiring the people to sign a covenant, continuing to hold to his strong moral convictions and beliefs, and continuing to express an unfaltering urge to influence others.[383] Additionally, Nehemiah shows House's (1976) list of behaviors in being a role model by signing the covenant first, being capable to fulfill the covenant and lead the people to compliance, expressing his ideological goals that forms a baseline for obedience to a set of values, placing high expectations upon his followers that

---

[379] Bass, *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook*, 189-192.

[380] R.G. Tucker, "The Theory of Charismatic Leadership," in *Philosophers and Kings: Studies in Leadership*, ed. D.A. Rustow, 69-94 (New York, NY: Braziller, 1970), 81.

[381] Antonakis and House, "The Full-Range Leadership Theory," 9.

[382] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.

[383] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.

bolster their confidence and self-esteem, and showing his followers the incentives that would occur when they obey the commandments of God.[384] These charismatic behaviors produce House's (1976) nine outcomes where Nehemiah's followers trust him, resonate with his beliefs, accept Nehemiah's role, emotionally connect to him, obey his decrees, identify with Nehemiah, and find an increased confidence allowing them to achieve, albeit for a short time, their goals.[385] These outcomes are evidenced by them signing the covenant (Neh 10.1-27) and finding success in following the decrees of the covenant for a short time (Neh 11-12).

There are servant leader qualities also present here helping to secure the peoples' compliance. Aspects such as building community, nurturing values, and invoking spirituality further brings Yehud society together through servant leadership.[386] We see Nehemiah exhibiting many of Spear's (1998) characteristics of servant leadership including listening, having empathy, healing the people through mutually obeying the commandments of God, being aware of the people's need to obey, persuading the people to follow these statutes, being committed to the growth of the people, and ultimately building community through mutual agreeance to sign the covenant.[387] These acts of Nehemiah were not done in direct service to the people, but the intentions behind Nehemiah's act show the desire to serve his people by persuading them that obeying these decrees are in their best interest. His ability to adapt leadership styles secures him a covenant signed, a corporate confession sealed, and Yehud united once again in covenant with God.

Context 19 — Casting Lots to Decide Where People Should Live — Neh 11.1–12.26

Context nineteen finds no mention of Nehemiah or any act of leadership on his part. The context is a series of lists of people living in Jerusalem during Nehemiah's time as governor. The context includes only two actions. The first consists of the people of Yehud drawing lots where one out of every ten individuals moves into Jerusalem to repopulate the city (Neh 11.1).

---

384 House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
385 House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
386 Cunningham, et al., "Communication and Leadership 2020," 7.
387 Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.

The second action is that the people bless those who willingly offer to live in Jerusalem (Neh 11.2). Shepherd and Wright (2018) provide a very accurate portrayal of the theology behind these actions.[388] In the previous context the people of Yehud recommit themselves to the law of God and provide the firstfruits and tithes for the Temple. Now, in this context they offer themselves as a tithe to the Lord where one out of ten sacrifice his holdings and future for the betterment of God's people.[389]

From a leadership perspective, we see that for Nehemiah to be a successful leader he must have followers to lead. This is especially true of a charismatic leader who "cannot be said to be charismatic unless his or her claim to charisma has been validated by others."[390] Charismatic leaders must have loyal followers due to the leader's constant need for reaffirmation of his or her position due to the means by which the leader gains leadership, which is not from traditional or rational means, but on the grounds of allowance from followers.[391] While previous internal and external opposition has seemingly disappeared from the text, the challenge of ensuring the viability of Jerusalem is still there. Nehemiah needs to reaffirm his constituency and keep them loyal. We see him do this behind the scenes by bringing those devoted into Jerusalem to create a loyal base of support (Neh 11.1; 12.1).

From the beginning, Nehemiah's vision focuses on the prosperity of the people of God (Neh 1.3; 2.5) and centers on the refortification of both Israel's land and its people (Neh 2.17; 8). Nehemiah desires to restore the people by restoring the land first, through building a wall of protection around it (Neh 2.17), and then by restoring the social, political, and religious life of the Jewish people (Neh 5; 7; 8). This cannot be sustained if there are not enough people located at the center of Judaism in Jerusalem.

With Nehemiah's likely motive better understood, we can come to some conclusions regarding Nehemiah's style of leadership in this context. There are qualities of transformational leadership in this context including inspiring a clear vision, organizing the people, giving clear expectations, creating focus in followers, empowering others to lead, enticing followers to

---

[388] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah, 9*5.
[389] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah, 9*5.
[390] Bryman, *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations*, 50.
[391] Bryman, *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations*, 23-24.

act,[392] and enabling others to take the lead.[393] The people follow Nehemiah's vision and take

the initiative in the effort to repopulate Jerusalem. Nehemiah's transformational influence

extends ever further because in many cases, the people move and carry out the vision and

purpose of Nehemiah voluntarily.[394] This shows transformation within the people, that

Nehemiah's message has been received and digested, and is now being acted upon in

alignment with Nehemiah's vision.[395]

Nehemiah also expresses adaptive leadership in this context as he encourages change

and adaption in his followers as he regulates stress, while at the same time protects the vital

asset that Jerusalem represents that is necessary for Nehemiah to become successful.[396] The

marker of an adaptive leader is not that the leader adapts, but instead, that the leader helps his

or her followers adapt. Heifetz's (1994) model of adaptive leadership helps us see the adaptive

leadership in Nehemiah.[397] First, there are technical and adaptive challenges present that allow

for adaptive leadership to be present. Nehemiah and his followers see and resolve the technical

issues that are present in an empty capital and the technical needs of populating the city so

that Yehud can prosper.[398] However, there are also adaptive challenges including: the process

of populating Jerusalem and the many challenges that will arise for those moving, how

economy and commerce will occur, how the leaders of Jerusalem will regulate order in the city,

and how the laws of God will be upheld and enforced. To prepare his followers to adapt,

Nehemiah portrays Heifetz's (1994) six leader behaviors. First, he "gets on the balcony" by

taking the time to step back from his leadership to evaluate the situation and the environment.

This is evidenced by his lack of direct leadership portrayed in the text and his allowance for

others to take the lead. Second, Nehemiah identifies the adaptive challenges, especially

recognizing the pattern of gaps between the people's espoused values and their actual

behavior. [399] This culminates in a signed covenant reducing those gaps between values and

---

[392] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 1-2.
[393] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.
[394] Bass and Riggio, *Transformational Leadership*, 6.
[395] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 162.
[396] Lichtenstein, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 3.
[397] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[398] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[399] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.

actions.[400] Third, Nehemiah regulates distress by providing an environment where normalcy and consistency can occur in an understood path of obedience to the laws of God and providing direction, protection, and a system of productive norms where Jerusalem can be repopulated. Fourth, Nehemiah provides an environment where his followers can maintain disciplined attention as they follow his vision and remain resolute and focused on repopulating Jerusalem and securing their future.[401] Fifth, Nehemiah gives the work back to the people as the tasks, instruction, and process are completed by Nehemiah's followers. As Nehemiah is not mentioned being in a leadership role in this context, it can be inferred that he delegates this responsibility to his followers. This process provides the authority for Nehemiah's followers to lead that then protects their leadership voices from below.[402] Nehemiah has not taken a servant role per se, but he is protecting his followers' voices and authority by allowing them to lead and make decisions. Nehemiah's adaptive leadership is evidenced by the people's leadership in this context. They experience an environment where they can adapt and create change and feel confident in voicing their opinions and decisions as they work towards a solution to repopulating Jerusalem.[403]

Ultimately, Nehemiah continues to show charismatic leadership as he continues to gain influence and inspire a shared vision through unifying the people and meeting their needs both individually, but in this case collectively, looking out for the best interests of Yehud as a whole.[404] Nehemiah's leadership continues in Jacobsen and House's (2001) fifth phase of charismatic leadership where the leader manages followers through defined tasks and specific job descriptions to produce efficiency and effectiveness for the organization.[405] This is shown in his followers creating a system to repopulate Jerusalem, moving further away from crisis and more into a routine behavior.[406]

---

[400] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[401] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[402] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[403] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[404] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 48.
[405] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[406] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

Context 20 — Nehemiah Dedicates the Wall to God — Neh 12.27–12.43

This context sees the return of Nehemiah's first-person account as Nehemiah steps into a direct leadership position once again. Jerusalem is once again used as the epicenter of celebration as Levites and others are invited into the restored city to officially dedicate the city wall (חוֹמָה). There is a massive celebration with singing, dancing, and purification as the people enter the city through the rebuilt gates (Neh 12.27). Sacrifices are made and rejoicing is so intense that it can be heard far away (Neh 12.43). Nehemiah brings a selection of the Jewish leaders and religious leaders up onto the wall where they divide into two companies to offer prayers of thanksgiving and songs to God as they walk along the wall (Neh 12.31-42). The celebration is meant to honor God but is also a powerful reminder to the people of the hard work and sacrifice that made the refortification of Jerusalem and the prosperity of Yehud possible.[407]

Nehemiah's motive is to unify the people once again under the banner of celebration to instill collective achievement for what has been done and collective hope moving into the future.[408] The trials and crisis that required his leadership have ended and he has succeeded in bringing physical, social, and spiritual prosperity to the people of Yehud.[409] Jacobsen and House (2001) would see Nehemiah in their fifth stage of charismatic leadership with a vision achieved and the process of routinization in full effect.[410] The positioning of Nehemiah is important here as the text describes Nehemiah walking at the back of the second company (Neh 12.38). Nehemiah is not out in front as we saw in earlier contexts (Neh 2.17; 4.19-21; 5.7; 6.10; 8.9; 10.1). Instead, he has performed his duty and his leadership has produced the success he was seeking. He now relegates himself to the background to enjoy the moment and allows others to bask in the glory that success has brought.

This context shows some expression of charismatic leadership, but more as a product of his leadership from the previous contexts leading up to this point. His charisma now carries

---

[407] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 376.
[408] Helland and Winston, "Towards a Deeper Understanding," 45.
[409] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 51-55.
[410] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 51-55.

with him in a routinized state.[411] Nehemiah's charismatic presence speaks for itself as he walks

humbly in the back, amongst his flock, as a shepherd who has trained his sheep not needing to

lead out front (Ezek 34.12). This context marks the full expression of charismatic routinization

as the crisis is quelled and his influence continues to transition.[412] Eisenstadt (1968) describes

Weber's idea of routinization by saying, "Weber's definition of charism stresses the duality of

its nature – on the one hand, its tendency to innovation, but, on the other hand, the

dependence of the permanence of the innovation on the routinization of charisma."[413] It is

important to recognize that for charismatic leadership to find continued success there must be

a continuance of crisis requiring the direct actions of a charismatic leader, or the leadership

structure must change to an organized and systematized form of leadership.[414]

As Weber describes charismatic authority as "outside the realm of every-day routine

and the prophane sphere" we recognize that its longevity cannot be sustained in a peaceful and

routine environment.[415] Therefore, if the ideals and vison of the charismatic leader are to

remain, routinization must take place. Weber describes this necessity by saying:

> If [charismatic authority] is not to remain a purely transitory phenomenon, but to take
>
> on the character of a permanent relationship forming a stable community of disciples or
>
> a band of followers or a party organization or any sort of political or hierocratic
>
> organization, it is necessary for the character of charismatic authority to become
>
> radically changed.[416]

This change occurs by transitioning leadership from an unconventional, non-relegated,

extraordinary form of charismatic leadership that is not constrained by organizational structure

or boundaries into a "form of fiscal organization to provide for the needs of the group and

hence to the economic conditions necessary."[417] It is this process that we have witnessed over

the last few contexts as Nehemiah has deconstructed his charismatic leadership and began to

---

[411] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 51-55.
[412] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[413] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* 44.
[414] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* 52.
[415] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* 50.
[416] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* 54.
[417] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* 60.

1) delegate systematized authority and responsibility to other leaders (Neh 7.2-3), 2) take a census to begin the process of organizing the people of Yehud (Neh 7.5), 3) assign responsibilities to Ezra and other leaders to teach the law to the people (Neh 8), 4) work in a supervisory role as his extraordinary leadership routinizes into legal precedence as the people confess their sins and sign a covenant (Neh 9-10), and in this context and the next, 5) relinquish all control into the hands of his leadership, begin the process of succession, and prepare to leave Yehud (Neh 12.27-47). From Nehemiah's vantage point in the moment of this context, his work is now complete. His goals have been met and he can now leave entrusting Yehud to his followers.

There are markers of Sendjaya et al.'s (2008) model of servant leadership in this context. First, Nehemiah is in a position of voluntary subordination. He chooses to take a back seat to the festivities and allows his followers to enjoy the center of attention. Second, Nehemiah still is authentic to his identity, but does so with humility, choosing to be in the back of the procession and being secure in the leadership that he will soon leave. Third, Nehemiah shows transcendental spiritualism as he looks to serve the whole person, physically, emotionally, and spiritually. He is available to his followers, he is promoting equality as everyone gets to enjoy the celebration, and we see him collaborating with those on the wall to dedicate their work to God. Fourth, Nehemiah has been bonded together with his people in covenant (Neh 10.1) and in this context we see the fruit of that covenantal relationship between Nehemiah and his followers. While we do not witness individual relationships, Nehemiah is seen to be in relationship with all the people as they are all in relationship with God. Fifth, Nehemiah's morality is a staple of his leadership, and we see Sendjaya et al.'s (2008) understanding of morality as Nehemiah engages with the religion, is interconnected with his followers, and finds wholeness. And finally, the sixth dimension of transforming influence is seen as the people have been transformed into obedient followers of God due to Nehemiah mentoring and leadership.

Context 21 — Nehemiah Appoints Temple Personnel — Neh 12.44–12.47

The sixth phase concludes with a final context that provides an exit for Nehemiah to return to Susa and to the Persian king. This context shows the appointing of individuals to maintain the Temple and the religious practice (Neh 12.44). The text does not say that it is Nehemiah who appoints the leaders, in fact, it does not say who oversaw appointing leaders in this context at all. Whether it is Nehemiah or someone else, it is inferred that Nehemiah's leadership influences this act. This is due to Neh 12.47 stating that the daily needs of the singers and gate keepers are met during Nehemiah's leadership and that Neh 13.1-3 discusses the people of Yehud continuing Nehemiah's reforms against interacting with foreigners. As Nehemiah's reforms will soon dissolve (Neh 13.4-28) in the proceeding contexts, his statutes are still in place in this context which indicates that the leadership he left in place has continued his desires for the time being allowing us to analyze parts of Nehemiah's leadership.

Yehud has now, according to the text, returned to the days of David and Asaph (1 Chr 16.5) and even further back to the days of Aaron (Exod 40.13). Everything is in order and Yehud is secure physically (Neh 6.15-19), socially (Neh 5.12), politically (Neh 7), and spiritually (Neh 8). It would seem from the text that all enemies have been contended with (Neh 6.16), all obstacles overturned (Neh 6.15), and all goals accomplished (Neh 8; 9; 10; 11.1). Nehemiah's prayers for God to remember him have been heard (Neh 1.5-11; 4.4; 5.19; 6.9, 14), the people are at peace (Neh 12.43), and prosperity is promised (Neh 12.47). What remains is to appoint specific leaders to key responsibilities, ensuring that Nehemiah's ideals and statues are upheld and survive (Neh 12.44-47).

This context sees the final steps of routinization take place as the leadership structure changes from a dynamic form of charismatic leadership to a delegated and routinized management structure.[418] The charismatic leader of Nehemiah is no longer needed, and the final act of routinization occurs in the appointing of leaders to take over the running of the social, political, and religious life of Yehud (Neh 12.44-47). There is not a need to display strong

---

[418] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 27. Bryman, *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations,* 76.

transformational leadership as his followers are now poised to be future leaders. While transformational leadership does not have a set of stages of leadership development, Bass (1999) shows that the culmination of transformational leadership ends with the self-actualization of the follower.[419] Therefore, Nehemiah has achieved success in transforming his citizens as they can now be self-sufficient. The path has been walked and the goal accomplished, no longer requiring Nehemiah's path-goal leadership. Nehemiah's followers have recognized the benefit for reaching their goals and they have benefited from Nehemiah both physically and emotionally.[420] Nehemiah served his people first and therefore the mantle of servant leadership can now be passed to the next leader or group of leaders.[421]

The appointed leaders continue to express Nehemiah's vision (Neh 12.44-47).[422] His direction continues to improve the lives of those in Yehud by empowering others to now take on the job.[423] His intuition leads him to involve others to consider the needs of the individual, to meet those needs, and to carry on the vision that Nehemiah has birthed and developed.[424] This last context in this phase of Nehemiah's leadership shows the adaptive nature of Nehemiah and his ability to alter his leadership style to fit the needs of the situation to gain the success that he now has secured. As for Nehemiah, we assume his story is now at a close and his work is completed. We see him putting the final actions in order with the intention of leaving his post as a successful leader who has accomplished the tasks he was charged to complete.

Phase 7 — The People Separate Foreigners from the Land

The seventh phase represents a single context (Neh 13.1-13.3) where Nehemiah has left Yehud to return to Susa and has not yet returned for his second campaign as governor in Yehud. Therefore, as the text reads, the setting is Jerusalem sometime after the dedication of

---

[419] Bernard M. Bass, "Two Decades of Research and Development in Transformational Leadership," *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 8, no. 1 (1999): 12.

[420] Schriesheim and Neider, "Path-Goal Leadership Theory," 317.

[421] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27.

[422] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.

[423] Conger and Kanungo, "The Empowerment Process," 474.

[424] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 32-33.

the wall and Nehemiah's departure from Yehud. Those appointed by Nehemiah to be in charge have taken leadership responsibility and are continuing Nehemiah's tradition of upholding the law of God and continuing to study the law. Nehemiah is not present in this context, and the characters in this phase include the people of Yehud, the leaders of Yehud, and God.

Context 22 — The People Separate Foreigners from the Land — Neh 13.1–13.3

This context deals with the people of Israel separating themselves from foreigners in the land. Nehemiah is not present, however, what we witness is the continuation of his leadership and his leadership style into the next generation of leaders in Yehud. As they were studying the law, they found a decree that Ammonites or Moabites should never enter the assembly of God due to their past actions against the Israelites (Deut 23.4). The word "assembly" here is translated in the MT from the word קָהָל which describes the contingent of Jews in Yehud who belong to God.[425] There is a stark delineation between the assembly of God and the "other" who are not welcomed. The "other" is the word עֵרֶב indicating the "mixed multitude" who are foreign individuals in post-exilic Yehud.[426] Koehler and Baumgartner (2001) specifically associate this use of עֵרֶב in the situation at hand with a mixture of different kinds of people.[427] Other uses of the word indicate a weaving process for making clothes or baskets suggesting here that there is a weaving or intertwining of ethnicity that should not be done (Exod 12.38; Jer 25.20).[428] Therefore, anyone with such foreign decent is not included within the assembly of God. The people immediately act on what they find and separate themselves from anyone who was not Jewish according to this definition (Neh 13.3). This shows that the leadership of Nehemiah carries on in his absence and his goals are continuing to be realized. While we do not know how much time has passed, we do see that Nehemiah's legacy, for a period, continues to be respected, remembered, and practiced.[429] The leaders take Nehemiah's leadership to heart by going beyond the decrees of the law by separating themselves from all foreigners, not just

---

[425] Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon*, 1079-1080.
[426] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver- Briggs*, 786.
[427] Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon*, 878.
[428] Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon*, 878.
[429] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 602-603.

Ammonites and Moabites (Neh 13.3). This portrays an extreme dedication to the statutes that Nehemiah instilled.

Nehemiah's leadership is shown through his ability to pass on his vision to the leaders he puts in place and therefore, his leadership legacy can be analyzed. We see his followers acting on principle, being adaptive, avoiding group pressure, challenging the status quo, taking initiative, inspiring a shared vision, having an internalized moral perspective, and having morals. We can see that once the people discovered themselves at odds with their understanding of Torah, they desired to be authentic to Nehemiah's instruction.

Therefore, we can see several styles of leadership portrayed in Nehemiah's followers that speak to the level of leadership that Nehemiah had in Yehud while he was governor. First, we see a desire for the followers of Nehemiah to be authentic to God's commandments and authentic to Nehemiah's vision (Neh 13.3). As Kernis (2003) explains, an authentic leader desires above else for their followers to be the purest version of themselves.[430] Ilies et al.'s (2005) model of authentic leadership helps us evaluate the followers of Nehemiah and their leadership, which then represents the leadership of Nehemiah.[431] Nehemiah's followers are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, have high levels of morality, are future oriented, and have been developed into leaders by Nehemiah (Neh 13.1-3).[432] These qualities have allowed Nehemiah's followers to be self-aware, show unbiases processing to the point where all people have to obey the commandments of God, they recognize the need to be authentic, and they show relational orientation where those who are not authentic must be separated from the group (Neh 13.1-3).[433] We see the leadership of Nehemiah producing authentic leaders in that his influence provided 1) personal and organizational identification with his vision and his leadership, 2) an experience with his emotion and drive that is now producing those same emotions in his followers, 3) a model of positive behaviors that are now being expressed in his followers, 4) self-determination in his followers who are now making leadership decisions that align with his vision, and 5) positive social exchanges where the people in Yehud can recognize

---

[430] Kernis, "Towards a Conceptualization," 1-26.
[431] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[432] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[433] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.

the correct path of God and make decisions to provide a more godly environment, according to Nehemiah's vision, in Yehud.[434]

Additionally, the fact that the people of Yehud are continuing Nehemiah's leadership patterns show their transformation into leaders themselves (Neh 13.1-3).[435] Nehemiah models the way, inspires a shared vision that his followers enact, and challenges past processes that his followers now use to challenge the process before them in how they deal with foreigners. He also enables his followers to act and there is a focus on the follower which allows his followers to concentrate on the people of Yehud who they are leading.[436]

There are aspects of charismatic leadership shown in this context as we see the charismatic value that Nehemiah possesses as a leader who continues to gain loyalty and affiliation even when physically removed from the situation.[437] His charismatic leadership has routinized into an organizational structure of systems and laws and the current followers are using those systems to enact the visions and goals of Nehemiah.[438]

Lastly, we see the idea of adaption occurring in Nehemiah's followers as they realize an error in their actions and adapt their leadership to correct the error and continue to obey the commandments of God. Therefore, the leaders in Yehud have success in adapting their leadership to meet the needs of God. This shows Nehemiah as an adaptive leader as he has aided in providing an environment where his followers can learn to adapt. Glover, Friedman, and Jones's (2002) model shows this as the current leadership in Yehud moves away from maladaptive culture traps at the beginning of Nehemiah's leadership where there is low assimilation and low accommodation.[439] As Nehemiah entered Yehud, the people of Yehud did not know what information was needed, nor the internal change of beliefs that was required.[440] However, as Nehemiah began to lead, there was a shift to a serendipitous form of leadership where the people of Yehud adapted and accommodated to new experiences and mindsets, but

---

[434] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[435] Bass and Riggio, *Transformational Leadership*, 6.
[436] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-22.
[437] Kim, et al., "Extending the Concept," 156.
[438] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* 54-61.
[439] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.
[440] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.

still lacked the assimilation of information needed to lead well.[441] However, as Nehemiah departs Yehud we see a leadership that is expressing its maximum adaptive potential as the people have assimilated the Torah, have the information needed, and have also high levels of accommodation where they understand the beliefs that are required to fulfill the vision of Nehemiah.[442]

Overall, this context demonstrates the survival of Nehemiah's vision once he left. The people have taken his ideas and practices and have continued to implement his vision into the social, political, and religious environments in Yehud. However, as the next phase will show, success would not last.

Phase 8 – Nehemiah's Return to Jerusalem & Continued Reform

There seems to be a natural conclusion to the book of Nehemiah at the end of Neh 12. Everything is right in Yehud with Nehemiah's goals accomplished, his mission now at an end, and the people of Yehud obeying the commandments of God and experiencing the fruit of that obedience. Therefore, the occurrence of Neh 13 acts almost as an appendix or an afterthought as we learn that all is not right in Yehud after all.[443] Looking at context 22, we can quickly see that Nehemiah left on a positive note. There are two possibilities for why Nehemiah left Yehud. The first reason for his departure is that his time in Yehud has a prescribed limit set forth by Nehemiah (Neh 2.6) and his time has expired and it is time to return. The text says that Nehemiah prescribes the time to Artaxerxes, not the other way around, therefore, this could be a general timeframe that the king agreed to.

The second reason for Nehemiah's departure is that his goals and vision are now realized, and with his mission complete, Nehemiah recognizes that it is time to return to the king. Batten (1913) likens Nehemiah's return to a required timeline set by Artaxerxes,[444] and I tend to agree with him. While Nehemiah's goals have been achieved, it does not make sense

---

[441] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.
[442] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.
[443] Grabbe, *Ezra-Nehemiah,* 66.
[444] Batten, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 290.

that a leader who has worked for over a decade on rebuilding his homeland, who has made a home and community for himself in Yehud, would immediately leave because the task is done. I suggest that it would be Nehemiah's desire to remain with his people to adequately support the transition of his new leaders. However, we do not see that represented in the text. Nehemiah left relatively soon after the dedication of the wall and his appointment of temple personnel. His hasty departure prevents his vision to become engrained in the next generation of leaders in Yehud which is the primary cause for Nehemiah's return.

Nevertheless, the fact that all was not well in Yehud should not come as a surprise. Internal strife still existed in Yehud all the way up to the dedication of the wall and the issues encountered by Nehemiah on his return had arisen earlier.[445] These issues included intermarriage (Neh 13.23; 10.30), improper economic dealings with fellow Jews (Neh 5), disobeying specific laws of Sabbath (Neh 13.15-22; 10.31), forgetting taxes (Neh 13.10-12; 10.32), issues with Temple support (Neh 13.10-13; 10.33-35), and disagreements regarding when and with whom one can do business (Neh 13.15-20). We must remind ourselves that we are only presented with one side of the story, that of Nehemiah, and that he does not afford commentary from opposing views.[446]

As Shepherd and Wright (2018) show, when news of Yehud's lapse in leadership and its return to disobedience reaches the ears of Nehemiah, we see him gain leave of the king once again and return to Yehud to lead once again.[447] This seems to acknowledge that if leadership is not properly routinized, its successes will not sustain. Nehemiah responds in a classic charismatic way by explaining Yehud's failure due to a lack of his presence (Neh 13.6-8).[448] It seems that the people of Yehud did not truly transform into Nehemiah's ideal citizen. Nehemiah then uses the most aggressive form of charismatic leadership yet to reinstitute the commandments of God and remind the people of Yehud the vows they took to obey the commandments of God.[449] Jacobsen and House (2001) would see Nehemiah in the sixth phase of charismatic leadership as routinization has fully set in and the effectiveness of the

---

[445] Wyk Jr. and Breytenbach, "The Nature of the Conflict," 1256.
[446] Wyk Jr. and Breytenbach, "The Nature of the Conflict," 1256-1257.
[447] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah, 103.*
[448] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 386.
[449] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

charismatic leader has waned. [450] This is the environment that the remaining four contexts interact with as Nehemiah returns to Yehud to attempt to correct the errors (from his perspective) that the people of Yehud and its leaders have fallen into.

In the last four contexts, Nehemiah contends with Temple concerns (Neh 13.8-14), concerns over Sabbath and other religious laws (Neh 13.15-22), the interaction of foreigners with Jews (Neh 13.16-28), and the effect of that interaction on Yehud's success (Neh 13.26-31). These concerns that Nehemiah faces in this phase reflects some of his chief concerns that he spent twelve years addressing in his first campaign. Therefore, each of these not only represents a lapse in obedience on the part of the leaders and people of Yehud, but they also represent an individual failure of leadership on the part of Nehemiah.[451] The way in which Nehemiah failed each of these commandments will be discussed in the subsequent contexts.

Nehemiah sought to reform Jerusalem in a lasting way.[452] However, as he returns to Jerusalem, he witnesses the exact opposite. We understand why three times in Neh 13 Nehemiah prays for God to remember him as he is faced with the realization that durable change is not an easy thing to create (Neh 13.14, 22, 29).[453] We must entertain the possibility that Nehemiah was not altogether successful in his campaign to bring sustainable prosperity to the people of Yehud. We must recognize that leaders fail, and that failure is not always a negative, but an opportunity to learn and try once again. Therefore, Nehemiah comes into Jerusalem with the revived desire to see his vision achieved, this time in a lasting way.

This last phase includes four contexts lasting for an unknown time as Nehemiah continues to lead the people in Yehud. Nehemiah, Eliashib, Artaxerxes, Tobiah, the Levites, Shelemiah, Zadok, Pedaiah, Hanan, the men of Tyre, merchants and sellers, foreign men and women, king Solomon, Joiada, Sanballat, and the people of Yehud are all characters in this phase spanning Nehemiah 13.4-31.

---

[450] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[451] Gary E. Schnittjer, "The Bad Ending of Ezra-Nehemiah," *BSac* 173 (2016): 40.
[452] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 139.
[453] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 196.

Context 23 — Nehemiah Expels Tobiah & Provides Priestly Support — Neh 13.4–13.14

This context begins with Nehemiah, in the first person, providing an explanation of what has occurred since his departure from Yehud (Neh 13.4-6). We learn that Eliashib allowed Tobiah to live in the Temple (Neh 13.7). This is one of Nehemiah's chief enemies, the very person he desires God to forget and to not forgive (Neh 2.20; 6.14). Nehemiah also tells us that the Levites had not been taken care of and returned to their own lands to make a living (Neh 13.10). What seems like a simple case of neglect runs much deeper in a case of rivalry as we see Eliashib, who was integral in the building of the wall (Neh 3.1), now in league with Tobiah (Neh 6.17-19), who conveniently is helping Eliashib prosper.[454]

Nehemiah resumes his earlier style of leadership by acting without consulting the established leadership he put in place upon his departure.[455] The charismatic leader comes out and acts with authority regardless of other opinion, and immediately throws out Tobiah and his personal effects unceremoniously into the street (Neh 13.8). The phrase "grieved me bitterly," וַיֵּרַע לִי מְאֹד, in Neh 13.8 conveys emotions of anger and rage as the two words combine.[456] The word רָעַע is shown by Koehler and Baumgartner (2001) as having a quivering apprehension which reflects Nehemiah's temperament as we can see him quivering with anger and rage.[457] The word מְאֹד as an adverb shows an intensifying nature of the quivering and anger that Nehemiah is feeling which makes the picture even more intense as Nehemiah shows emotion against Tobiah.[458] While seeming harsh to a modern reader, Nehemiah evidently wanted to make it very clear that the things that are God's are holy and should never be intended for personal gain (Num 20.11-12; Exod 32.3-10).[459] We see Nehemiah continue to exercise his leadership by gathering the leaders and asking a very poignant question, "Why is the house of

---

[454] Grabbe, *Ezra-Nehemiah,* 65.

[455] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 136.

[456] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 948 and 547

[457] Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon*, 440.

[458] Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon*, 538. The word choice here could be added by the writer to bring inflection and added emphasis on the emotions that were occurring. This would have aided the readers' understanding of Nehemiah's justification. However, as this thesis is taking the words written as what occurred, we can also understand that this emotion and response actually occurred as well.

[459] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 606-607.

God forsaken?" He goes directly to those whom he deems responsible and addresses the problem at the root.[460] Shepherd and Wright (2018) explain the purpose of Nehemiah's words, which was to remind the leaders of their previous vow to not neglect the house of God (Neh 10.39).[461] Nehemiah directly reminds them of their vow and holds them accountable for their actions. He then reorganizes the leadership structure establishing leaders who will obey his commands not only while he is present, but in the future as well.[462] This four-person commission would seemingly ensure that the house of God would never again be left unattended and that those who take care of the Temple would also be cared for.[463]

       Nehemiah's leadership style in this context is primarily charismatic. Nehemiah, once he begins leading, begins with strength and resolve. We see this in context six when Nehemiah first addresses the leaders of Yehud and charismatically inspires them to start rebuilding the wall (Neh 2.17-18). Here, Nehemiah once again asserts his charismatic authority against the actions that the leadership has taken since his departure in the hopes of reestablishing his vision. Nehemiah displays several charismatic leadership behaviors including holding a specific vision, working in a crisis, creating radical solutions, requiring followers, requiring validation,[464] showing extreme self-confidence, needing to dominate, having strong convictions, having high morals, having an extreme urge to influence, being a role model, appearing knowledgeable, skilled, and capable, expressing his ideological goals, giving high expectations, aspiring followers to grow, building affiliation, gaining power, gaining esteem, gaining unquestionable follower acceptance to those who obeyed, gaining follower obedience,[465] being sensitive to environments, altering the status quo, adapting, disrupting normal pathways, taking risks, performing unconventionally, generating mystique, being set apart, and achieving goals.[466]

       Several charismatic models can be used to describe Nehemiah's behavior. First, Jacobsen and House (2001) show that Nehemiah is in the sixth and final phase of charismatic

---

[460] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 388.
[461] Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 104.
[462] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 204.
[463] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 137.
[464] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* x-xx.
[465] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[466] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.

leadership where followers have alienated themselves from the leader's mission and depart the collective.[467] Routinization has taken place, however, that process has not secured Nehemiah's vision. Instead, apathy and other values have taken the place of Nehemiah's vision. Additionally, Conger and Kanungo's (2003) model of charismatic leadership helps us see the path that Nehemiah takes upon his return.[468] He is keen and sensitive to the environment and recognizes the position of the people as moving away from his initial vision.[469] This forces Nehemiah to reset his vision and reestablish the goals in which he aims to achieve in Yehud.[470] However, where Conger and Kanungo (2003) see the development of trust in Nehemiah's followers, I see Nehemiah gaining follower obedience out of fear.[471] The people see the actions of Nehemiah and due to the extreme nature of his actions, obey his commands. Nehemiah achieves his goals; however, his charisma is raw and emotional upon his return, which likens more to Weber's idea of an unrationalized and unorganized charisma.[472]

There are slight aspects of transformational leadership shown in this context as Nehemiah attempts to revolutionize his leadership structure and pass on his vision.[473] However, Nehemiah displays dominance and self-confidence in this context, which is not indicative of transformational leadership style, but instead represents strong charismatic leadership. We see a take charge, make the change, dominant leader in Nehemiah in this context.[474] That approach is warranted due to the opposition who is flaunting its presence in the holiest of environments seeing if Nehemiah will act (Neh 13.4-6). And in consistent manner, Nehemiah accepts the challenge and steps wholeheartedly into the situation using the leadership style best suited.

---

[467] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[468] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.
[469] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.
[470] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.
[471] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations,* 29-54.
[472] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* 50-51.
[473] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders,* 41.
[474] Shamir, et al., "The Motivational Effects," 577-594.

Context 24 — Nehemiah Institutes Sabbath Reform — Neh 13.15–13.22

Context twenty-four centers around Sabbath reform as Nehemiah witnesses people producing, transporting, and selling wares in and beyond Jerusalem on the Sabbath. A pattern begins to emerge showing the nobles as the offenders against God's law. This is a group who Nehemiah has contended with since the beginning of his leadership and he once again has to contend with them warning that their actions, focused on increasing their economic fortune, directly violate the commandments of God (Neh 2.16; 3.5; 4.14, 19; 5.7; 6.17; 10.29; 13.17).[475] Nehemiah reminds the people that these acts were precisely what started their sins against God in the first place (Neh 13.18, 26-27).[476] Here, Nehemiah once again talks to the people to place pressure upon the people as a whole and to then provide avenues of accountability to change their behaviors.[477] He reminds them of Jeremiah's quarrel with the Jewish people, their ancestors, and how their actions caused the destruction of the Temple and brought the people into captivity (Jer 17.21). He connects them back to their ancestors to remind and teach them of the path their ancestors took, encouraging them to not make the same mistake again.

Nehemiah not only creates an immediate solution to the problem of profaning the Sabbath, but he also needs to create a long-lasting strategy ensuring the Sabbath's protection in the future. The initial solution is a simple and effective measure — he closes the gates and forbids anyone to enter or exit on the Sabbath (Neh 13.19). What is important to recognize is that this solution is only possible due to the erected wall that was in place (Neh 6.15-19). And here we come full circle in Nehemiah's leadership. The vision of a constructed wall to protect the people of Yehud was never solely about physical protection. Moreover, the rebuilding of the wall and the reestablishment of its gates allowed the people of God to obey the will of God in Jerusalem.[478] The wall now facilitates a spiritual separation as the Jewish people are set apart as the people of God.[479] Nehemiah finds a temporary solution through closing the gates and further threatening the merchants loitering outside the gates (Neh 13.19-21). Nehemiah then

[475] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 206.
[476] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 396.
[477] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 137-138.
[478] Levering, *Ezra & Nehemiah*, 207.
[479] Williamson, *Word Biblical Commentary*, 396.

creates a more sustainable structure by placing Levitical guards at the gate who patrol the walls and regulate any entrance into Jerusalem (Neh 13.22).

Again, we see Nehemiah's leadership as mostly charismatic with hints of transformational leadership embedded. The same analysis is true of this context as the previous and, therefore, does not need repeating. However, it is important to recognize that Nehemiah invokes charismatic leadership when he is attempting to persuade others to agree and embrace (or reembrace) his vision (Neh 13.11, 15, 17, 21, 25).[480] We see that Nehemiah resorts to charismatic leadership when he is contending with an opponent or someone who is acting contrary to his desires. When this occurs, Nehemiah easily slips into a charismatic leadership style that in every instance in the text, brings him a successful outcome in the moment.

Context 25— Nehemiah Condemns Mixed Marriages — Neh 13.23–13.29

For the third context in a row, Nehemiah portrays mostly charismatic leadership to contend with an error in practice that the current leadership of Yehud has committed. We witness the severity of Nehemiah's anger and frustration at his own people in this context as some individuals have intermarried with foreigners making their children forget the language and statutes of God (Neh 13.23-29). Just as with profaning the Sabbath and other laws that Nehemiah establishes in Yehud, the people forget their vow to avoid foreign interaction and marriage and are once again disobeying the will of God (Neh 10.30).[481] Moreover, Nehemiah finds that the own high priest's grandson married a foreign woman (Neh 13.28). Nehemiah's patience and resolve ends as he understood that the original ordinance was too lenient. The high priest's grandson is expelled from the community, and Nehemiah goes to extremes in beating and pulling out the hair of some of those who did not obey the law against intermarrying (Neh 13.23-28). The word וָאַכֶּה that comes from the root נָכָה represents striking or smiting and ranges in use from God smiting the entire population at the flood (Gen 8.21) to Moses striking the waters to turn it into blood (Exod 7.20).[482] Here, it is interpreted as a violent

---

480 Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 14-16.
481 Shepherd and Wright, *Ezra and Nehemiah,* 105.
482 Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 645.

act of aggression.[483] The word וָאֶמְרְטֵם from the root מָרַט indicates making something bare or bald.[484] BDB (2010) shows that in this reference it is an act of violence and indicates the pulling out of hair from the beard or head.[485] This was an act of embarrassment for a Jew and served as a reminder to the public of that person's shame.[486] The use of public displays are consistent with Nehemiah's earlier leadership behaviors (Neh 5.9-12; 10.29; 11.1; 12.31); however, he had never gone to the lengths of beating and pulling out hair. Batten (1913) shows that this was a normal mode of punishment as it is recounted in the book of Isaiah (Isa 50.6).[487]

Nehemiah's passionate anger towards these individuals who have intermarried focuses on their children forgetting the language of the Hebrews which would not allow them to learn the word of God and continue to obey the commandments of God (Neh 13.23-24).[488] Nehemiah recognizes the immediate ramifications, but also sees a possible situation where the children of God will be once again in jeopardy of God's wrath. Therefore, Nehemiah again invokes the use of the Jewish ancestors, using Solomon as an example, who was led astray by foreign women (1 Kgs 11.1-9). Therefore, we see that once again social laws are enacted to allow the religious order to continue to be central in the people's lives, with the ultimate desire to keep the people within the will of God so that they may prosper and no longer be punished.

Nehemiah's use of charismatic leadership is reflected in his acting on principle, reasserting his vision, being determined, being dominant, having vision, and motivating others through his actions.[489] Nehemiah's actions are decisive, full of emotion, not reliant on approval, nor are they, as the text describes, taken with counsel.[490] However, his actions, at least in the text of Nehemiah, produce the desired effect of compliance of the masses as his point is made. Nehemiah feels justified in his actions because the people had previously sworn an oath with curse as consequence that they would not intermarry and that they would uphold the statues

---

[483] Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon*, 697-698.
[484] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 598.
[485] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 598.
[486] Klein, *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*, 138.
[487] Batten, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 300.
[488] Steinmann, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, 610.
[489] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[490] Conger and Kanungo, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations*, 17.

of God (Neh 10.30). The people have broken this oath and therefore must suffer the consequences of their actions.

Again, the leadership analysis of the previous two contexts holds true here as well. Nehemiah uses mostly charismatic leadership with some traces of transformational leadership. This context describes Nehemiah's second term as governor of Yehud. He embraces charismatic leadership as he takes it upon himself to rid the Jews of their spiritual recalcitrance. Like the preceding two contexts, we see Nehemiah use charismatic leadership to right wrongs and attempt to persuade the people to repentance and alignment with his vision.

Context 26 — Nehemiah Recounts His Actions & Pleas to God — Neh 13.30–13.31

The last context of Nehemiah's leadership offers a reminder to God of the acts that Nehemiah has performed in his second term as governor. He takes God and the reader through the acts that the past three contexts have centered on. It seems evident he is attempting to justify his stance and actions. He has cleansed the people once again, the *piel* perfect וְטִהַרְתִּים from the root טָהֵר suggests a pronouncement of physical cleansing of defiling blood.[491] Nehemiah is explaining to God that it was him, through his leadership, that brought cleansing to God's people. It might suggest that Nehemiah lacks confidence that his actions were just, or that his actions will produce the sustained effect he desires. He has just gone through a process of returning to see much of his work reversed and not obeyed, and it would be understandable that Nehemiah's confidence is shaken.

This concludes Nehemiah's account of his leadership, and we are not told of any further actions that he took, nor do we know when he returned to Susa. Nehemiah did not end on a high note. His leadership of his second term was much more forceful and had more desperation about it (Neh 13.25). Perhaps he recognized that his leadership had not produced sustainable results.[492] Maybe he saw himself as a failure due to his inability to quell the opposition to his wishes and vision. It is possible that he saw the routinization of his charismatic leadership

---

[491] Brown, et al., *Brown-Driver-Briggs*, 372. In other references it shows the cleaning of some ceremonial instrument of the Temple (Lev 16.19; Ezek 43.26; Num 8.6).
[492] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

making him obsolete, unwanted, and ineffective.[493] This is a common occurrence with charismatic leaders. Many avoid routinization altogether which brings about more abrupt transitions of leadership. It is possible that Nehemiah wished that he had never transitioned his leadership into a routinized state.

We can glean aspects of leadership from his final words. There is a great desire to be a servant in these last two verses. He hopes to be remembered as a leader who served his people and his God well.[494] However, the quintessential charismatic leader in Nehemiah seeks approval and recognition to his higher power.[495] And finally, the concluding context offers us the realization that Nehemiah had the extraordinary ability to adapt his style of leadership to the environment, situation, and context at hand. It was this adaptability that allowed him to lead and to gain success. He says, "Remember me, O my God, for good" (Neh 13.14). Nehemiah hopes that he will be remembered as a good leader. Not a perfect leader, one flawed in his execution, but as we see in Nehemiah's perseverance and continual attempts to lead the people, he was relentless in his pursuit of leadership and success.

And perhaps this imperfection lays the grounds for a conversation of how we evaluate effective leadership. It is necessary to discuss the difference between effective and ineffective leadership, between success and failure. Is it judged on the effort of the leader? Is it judged on leadership outcomes? And if so, how long must the success last to be claimed as a success? These are questions that will be discussed in the next chapter as we move from the commentary and analyze the overall leadership of Nehemiah and the various concepts of leadership that surround his leadership.

---

[493] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[494] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27.
[495] Harvey, "Questioning Leadership," 215.

Table 3: Condensed List of Contexts, Primary Themes, & Primary Leadership Styles

Phase & Context	Basic Description of Text	Primary Leadership Styles for Context
P1C1	Nehemiah hears news of his homeland	Blended: **Path-Goal,** Adaptive (complex), Transformational, Servant
P1C2	Nehemiah weeps & prays to God for his homeland	Blended: **Transformational,** Servant, Path-Goal, Charismatic, Adaptive
P1C3	Nehemiah makes requests of the king	**Transformational,** Charismatic, Servant
P2C4	Nehemiah interacts with governors, adversaries affected	Blended: **Path-Goal,** Adaptive (complex), Charismatic
P3C5	Nehemiah inspects the wall w/out communication	**Charismatic,** Adaptive (complex), Authentic
P3C6	Nehemiah gains support to rebuild	Highly **Charismatic**
P3C7	Nehemiah interacts with adversaries	Highly **Charismatic**
P4C8	Nehemiah organizes the work & assigns tasks to allies	Blended: **Charismatic,** Path-Goal, Transformational
P4C9	Nehemiah interacts with adversaries	Highly **Charismatic,** Adaptive
P4C10	Nehemiah deals with oppressing Jews	**Servant,** Charismatic, Adaptive
P4C11	Nehemiah's actions vs. others	Extremely **Servant**
P4C12	Nehemiah interacts with further plots & meetings from adversaries	Mostly **Authentic,** Some Transformational, Servant, Charismatic
P4C13	Nehemiah's posture & position upon completing the wall	Blended: **Transformational, Charismatic,** Path-Goal, Servant
P5C14	Nehemiah organizes the government by taking a census	Mostly **Charismatic,** Some Transformational, Authentic, Servant
P5C15	Nehemiah contributes to the building	Extremely **Servant**
P6C16	Day 1 - reading the Law to the people	Mostly **Transformational,** Some Charismatic
P6C17	Day 2 - reading the Law to the people	**Charismatic** and Transformational
P6C18	National confession & the people signing the covenant	Mostly **Charismatic,** Some Servant,
P6C19	Casting lots to decide where people should live	Blended: **Transformational**, Adaptive, Charismatic
P6C20	Nehemiah dedicates the wall to God	**Charismatic** and Servant
P6C21	Nehemiah appoints Temple personnel	Blended: **Servant,** Path-Goal, Charismatic, Transformational
P7C22	Nehemiah separates foreigners from the land	Blended: **Charismatic,** Authentic, Transformational, Adaptive
P7C23	Neh. helps priests & expels Tobiah	Mostly **Charismatic,** Some Transformational
P7C24	Nehemiah institutes Sabbath reform	Mostly **Charismatic,** Some Transformational
P7C25	Nehemiah condemns mixed marriages	Mostly **Charismatic,** Some Transformational
P7C26	Nehemiah recounts his actions & to God	Blended: **Servant,** Charismatic, Transformational

*Bold words indicate my assessment of the primary leadership style within the context

Chapter 3
Analysis of Nehemiah's Leadership & Styles Used

Anyone can hold the helm when the sea is calm.[1]

- Publius Syrus

<u>**Introduction**</u>

Nehemiah alters his style of leadership based on the context he faces. I have shown that the book of Nehemiah finds the leader in different environments, interacting with different individuals, having to make decisions to realize a vision and to accomplish the goals set forth. Nehemiah navigates the twenty-six different contexts across eight specific phases of his tenure due to his ability to use multiple styles of leadership. The constantly changing contexts of his leadership highlights the difficulty of his leadership and recognizes his accomplishment in completing his goals during his term. As I have shown, the constant variable within most leadership events, as is especially true in the case of Nehemiah, is context.[2]

The commentary uses six different leadership styles to analyze Nehemiah's leadership during his campaign. These six styles — path-goal leadership, transformational leadership, charismatic leadership, authentic leadership, servant leadership, and adaptive leadership — vary in use depending on the context. Through looking at the contexts, we see the path that Nehemiah takes as he navigates the situations in Susa, and then in Yehud, to accomplish his vision of a rejuvenated Yehud by creating physical, ethnic, and spiritual fortification to revitalize the post-exilic Jewish community.

I will focus my concluding analysis on these six leadership styles to summarize Nehemiah's leadership. In each leadership style, I chose three models that give a holistic understanding of the leadership theory. Together, the three models present a well-rounded analysis of Nehemiah's leadership and allows me to discern the level of use that Nehemiah used for each leadership theory. As stated before, I chose three leadership models for each theory because there is not one model that encompasses the whole of the theory. Therefore,

---

[1] D. Lyman, *The Moral Sayings of Publius Cyrus, a Roman Slave* (Cleveland, OH: L.E. Barnard & Company, 1856,) 37.
[2] Huizing, "Bringing Christ," 68.

using three models provides a way to fill in the gaps where one theory might lack in certain areas of the theory's development.

In this chapter, I will provide sections for each of the six leadership theories selected. In each, I will use each model to discuss the overall leadership of Nehemiah and how he represents each leadership style. Then, I will provide comments on Nehemiah's overall use of that leadership style. As I analyze Nehemiah's leadership through the lens of a particular leadership style and leadership theory, I will also reference which context in my commentary Nehemiah reflected that style or theory most clearly. Finally, I will provide concluding remarks regarding Nehemiah's overall leadership.

Nehemiah as a Path-Goal Leader

Model #1 – Vroom's Expectancy Theory of Motivation and Nehemiah

The first model of path-goal theory used to analyze Nehemiah's leadership is Vroom's (1995) expectancy theory of motivation. The overall concept is that followers will chose to work harder if they believe that their increased effort will increase their reward. Vroom (1995) used three concepts of 1) expectancy, where followers believe that if they raise their efforts in a task there will be an increase in rewards, 2) instrumentality, where followers believe that if they achieve the expectations set forth by the leader they will receive the agreed upon compensation, and 3) valence, where the higher the value placed on the reward the more work the follower will do to achieve it.[3]

Vroom's (1995) model provides a foundational look at Nehemiah's transactional leadership.[4] There are times in Nehemiah's leadership where basic transactions need to take place so that he can achieve his goals. However, Vroom's (1995) model looks specifically at the leader-follower relationship and does not interact with relationships between leader and customer or other outside interactions. For instance, in context 4 we see a transactional

---

[3] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 18-20.
[4] Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, 18-20.

interaction between Nehemiah and the governors Beyond the River. Vroom's (1995) model does not interact with this transaction. However, in context 8 as Nehemiah is assigning tasks towards the building project, Vroom's (1995) model provides an excellent analysis of Nehemiah's path-goal leadership as we see Nehemiah's use of expectancy, instrumentality, and valence to motivate his followers towards high work effort and efficiency due to the reward, which in this case interacts with their very survival and way of life.

Vroom's (1995) model provides a look at how Nehemiah interacts with his followers when he needs tasks performed and he is not directly serving his followers. Therefore, Nehemiah uses path-goal leadership, according to this model, when he does not persuade his followers with a charismatic speech, does not defend his people against his adversaries using charisma, or when he does not perform acts of service that show his servant leadership. Here, Nehemiah needs his followers to perform necessary tasks which will produce a direct reward and path-goal leadership is the best leadership style to use. This model is useful to analyze contexts 8, 13, and 21.

Model #2 – House and Mitchell's (1974) Model of Path-Goal Leadership and Nehemiah

House and Mitchell (1974) focus on how leader's influence their followers' perception of the goals they are charged to accomplish. Therefore, where Vroom (1995) analyzes basic transactional interactions and how rewards motivate followers, House and Mitchell analyze the actions of the leader and how he or she causes motivation and success for followers to move down the path the leader has created to achieve the goals set forth. This allows us to analyze the leadership of Nehemiah from a different perspective.

According to House and Mitchell (1974), leaders motivate follower success through six actions: 1) recognizing the needs of followers and motivating followers to desired outcomes, 2) increasing personal follower payoffs to satisfy follower needs, 3) making the path for followers to obtain those payoffs easier through coaching and direction, 4) helping followers clarify expectations, 5) reducing follower frustrations and barriers that they come into contact with in their professional and personal lives, and 6) increasing opportunities for personal growth and

satisfaction that is related to their effective performance.[5] Here, House and Mitchell (1974) show that path-goal leaders are focused on the overall needs and goals of their followers and then work to find ways of fulfilling those needs and goals in the easiest, most understood, and least cumbersome way possible that provides the highest reward, the most satisfying experience, and the most room for growth.[6]

Once again, we witness this model applying to Nehemiah in times where there is a direct need that requires specific tasks for followers to perform to achieve a specific goal. Nehemiah recognizes the needs of his followers and works to protect his people physically (contexts 1, 4, 8, 13, 21), socially and ethnically (contexts 13 & 21), and spiritually (contexts 13 & 21). The payoffs that Nehemiah provides are not monetary or individualized, but instead are rewards based either in survival as the achievement of the task presented provides physical safety from harm, or is based in the prosperity for the people of God as a whole as a path to a better way of life where the people of God are obeying the commandments of God, as Nehemiah interprets, and living in social, ethnic, and religious harmony. This model finally shows Nehemiah in path-goal roles as he attempts to provide an easier path for his followers achieving the goals necessary. Nehemiah attempts to make the building of the wall more efficient in the wake of added threat from his enemies (Neh 4.3, 7-8, 11-23), boosts follower moral when the work load increases and becomes unbearable (Neh 4.10), or appoints leaders in key positions to perform specific tasks that continued to achieve the goals of Nehemiah to restore the social, political, and religious spheres of Yehud to his understanding of God's law (Neh 7.2-3, 12.44-47).

Model #3 – House's (1996) Reformulated Model of Path-Goal Theory and Nehemiah

House (1996) created a path-goal theory that included eight classes of leadership behaviors including being 1) directive, 2) supportive, 3) participative, 4) achievement-orientated, 5) focused on work facilitation, 6) focused on group-orientated decision processes,

---

[5] House and Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," 5.
[6] House and Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," 1-5.

7) centered on work-group representation and networking, and 8) increasing value-based leadership behavior.[7] When looking at House's eight classes of a path-goal leader, several classes stand out as applying to Nehemiah.[8] Nehemiah is directive in his leadership by giving clear definitions, expectations, and boundaries for his followers to obey (contexts 4, 8, 13, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25).[9] We see this when Nehemiah obtains supplies for his journey (context 4), is efficient in rebuilding the wall (context 8), appoints key leadership personnel (context 13, 21), structures the collection of a census (context 14), and gives expectations to the people to obey the law of God and fulfill their oaths (context 16, 18, 23, 24, 25). Nehemiah participates in the work to show his ability to serve and his desire to accomplish his goals. To promote the most efficient pathway to success and motivate his followers, Nehemiah often moves into the work himself as he models correct behavior (contexts 5, 8, 9, 14, 16, 18).

Nehemiah is also achievement-oriented in that he sets high goals for his followers to achieve.[10] If they are successful, then the people are rewarded.[11] This once again occurs in the wall construction as the challenge is to build the wall before their adversaries have a chance to attack (contexts 8, 9, 12, 13). Nehemiah also uses achievement-oriented actions when he calls them to help their fellow man (context 10) and obey the commandments of God (contexts 16, 18, 23, 24, 25). For those who achieve the goals outlined by Nehemiay they are rewarded by being amongst the chosen people of God (contexts 8, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21). Nehemiah also is value-based as he interacts with his follower's identity as a collective people motivating them to work for their ethnicity (their people), for their culture, and for their way of life (contexts 6, 9, 10, 16, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25).

---

[7] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.
[8] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.
[9] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.
[10] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.
[11] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.

Overall Discussion of Nehemiah's Use of Path-Goal Leadership

Path-goal leadership theory focuses on how leaders motivate their followers to accomplish the goals set out for them.[12] Good path-goal leaders employ behaviors that complement or supplement the work environment.[13] We see Nehemiah using path-goal leadership in a substantial way in six contexts in the text of Nehemiah. We see this in the beginning of his leadership when he desired information about the state of his homeland (context 1) and when he gathered materials from the governors Beyond the River (context 4). In both instances, Nehemiah needs something and the need for relational development or persuasion is not warranted at that time. Therefore, Nehemiah uses a leadership style that is simple and to-the-point.[14] There is a goal and a path to reach that goal, and therefore Nehemiah takes the quickest and most direct route towards success.[15] While his leadership is not directed towards his followers, Nehemiah recognizes that a letter from the king and an accompanying garrison of soldiers provides proper motivation for the governors from Beyond the River to acquest to Nehemiah's request.

Therefore, Nehemiah uses path-goal tactics when the situation does not require further coaxing or extensive work to achieve the goals present in the context. Also, Nehemiah organizes and assigns tasks for the people to perform in building the wall to accomplish the goal set and to meet the needs of his followers by helping alleviate obstacles in their way to achieving goals (context 8). Nehemiah communicates the needs, provides clear expectations, shows the reward for a job well done, and then moves on to the next job assignment. Path-goal strategies are not enough for Nehemiah to achieve his overall goals, however, when the context does not require high levels of charisma, transformation, service, authenticity, or adaption, Nehemiah is able to move into a more direct transactional posture where his followers can accomplish the goals presented to them in an efficient and fast manner.

---

[12] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 115.
[13] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 115.
[14] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.
[15] House, "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership," 323-352.

Nehemiah as a Transformational Leader

Model #1 – Bass & Avolio's Full-Range Leadership Theory and Nehemiah

The first prominent transformational model came from Bass and Avolio (1994) in their full-range leadership theory (FRLT).[16] Here, four qualities of a transformational leader were found in idealized influence (charisma), inspirational leadership and motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.[17] To sum up the practices of these four qualities: 1) A transformational leader has a vision and persona that is attractive allowing followers to identify and bond with the leader.[18] 2) The leader articulates a clear vision and emotionally inspires individuals in the group to exceed their expectations for themselves.[19] 3) The leader spurs on conversation and intrigue by allowing the expression of new ideas through careful reasoning.[20] 4) The leader considers the needs for the individual as they listen intently to those around them.[21] Also, it is important to remember that Bass and Avolio's (1994) FRLT also includes transactional forms of leadership and laissez-faire leadership.[22]

Nehemiah exhibits transactional forms of leadership in instances where he chooses to use a path-goal leadership style that is focused on obtaining something that will help him reach his goal and only needs to compensate others for the work done or material given (contexts 4, 8, 19, 21). When the text describes Nehemiah directly leading the people of Yehud, he never represents laissez-faire leadership as there is never a time when Nehemiah chooses not to lead. In contexts where Nehemiah is not mentioned (contexts 17, 19, 21) or his presence is relegated to the background (contexts 16 &18), it could be assumed that Nehemiah is uninvolved with the leadership of the people. However, I disagree with this idea and see Nehemiah as delegating leadership with specific intention, allowing his transformed followers to take leadership positions, or recognizing the process of routinization taking place where he needs to

---

[16] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.
[17] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.
[18] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.
[19] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.
[20] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.
[21] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.
[22] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.

begin relinquishing control that will allow for an easier transition of power. Nehemiah invokes empowerment and support of his followers in every context where he is actively leading. Laissez-faire leaders do not typically choose when to be involved leaders and when to disassociate with their followers or organizations.[23] Instead, laissez-faire leaders are consistently uninvolved and it is a marker of their overall leadership, not specific leadership contexts.[24] Therefore, in contexts where Nehemiah is absent, his empowering ideal is present, and he never chooses to become uninvolved or to stop being a leader.

When analyzing the transformational leadership of Nehemiah, many of these transformative practices are present in Nehemiah's leadership. His vision and mission are undeniable and the confidence that he engenders and bestows on his followers is absolute (contexts 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 20). His ability to inspire and motivate his followers is shown time and time again (contexts 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20). It makes sense that the transformational qualities of vision and confidence (idealized influence) and motivation (inspirational leadership and motivation) interact with many of the contexts found in Nehemiah's charismatic leadership style as idealized influence is a synonym for charisma and inspiration is another key characteristic of charismatic leadership.[25]

However, when it comes to intellectual stimulation, we see Nehemiah acting more as a charismatic as he tends to make decisions on his own and does not encourage group collaboration. As the text reads, Ezra, Hanani, the other leaders, and the priests have direct interaction with Nehemiah and would have gleaned (and given) intellectual stimulation (Neh 1.2-3; 2.17-18; 7.1-3; 8; 9.3-5; 12.1-26, 44-47; 13.10-13). Therefore, transformational leadership occurs through intellectual stimulation when Nehemiah allows Ezra to take charge in teaching the law (contexts 16, 17), places Hanani and others in charge of Yehud (context 13), and occurs in Nehemiah appointing Temple personnel (context 21).[26] However, we do not see his immediate desire to bring others into the conversation surrounding decisions that need to be made (contexts 5, 10, 12, 14, 21, 23, 24, 25), and therefore, he does not exhibit

---

[23] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.
[24] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.
[25] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.
[26] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.

transformational leadership entirely.[27] Nehemiah is a recipient of intellectual stimulation as he takes instruction directly from God (contexts 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 14, 18, 23, 24, 25).[28] Nehemiah's lack of transformational leadership is also true of his interaction with individualized consideration as Nehemiah tends to look at the betterment of the whole over the betterment of the individual. We see a few examples of him protecting individual workers (contexts 9), looking out for the individual poor (context 10), and recognizing the needs of the priests (context 23). This further shows that transformational leadership is in fact a part of his overall leadership, but it does not fully define his leadership profile according to Bass and Avolio's FRLT.

Model #2 – Bennis & Nanus's Four Strategies of Transformational Leaders and Nehemiah

Bennis and Nanus (2007) created four strategies of transformational leaders: 1) A transformational leader expresses a clear vision. 2) The leader communicates to inspire others to that vision. 3) The leader acts on their vision to produce authenticity and trust within their followers. 4) The leader develops themselves professionally and personally.[29] If the ultimate desire is for followers to develop and transform into better versions of themselves, then this process must first begin with the leader.[30] Bennis and Nanus's (2007) theory is very leader-centered allowing us to use Nehemiah's account of his leadership to analyze the transformational qualities of his leadership.[31]

Again, we see parts of this theory naturally ascribing to Nehemiah. He is very proficient at expressing a clear vision and we see this occur in multiple contexts (contexts 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 16, 19, 21). Nehemiah also does a good job of communicating his vision, which he sees as imperative to achieving his goals (contexts 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 16). Additionally, we see Nehemiah recognizing that success is not only based on verbal communication, but also in modeling and action that will motivate and inspire his followers (contexts 7, 9, 10, 11, 12). However, what is lacking in Nehemiah from Bennis and Nanus's (2007) theory is the desire to see individuals

---

[27] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.
[28] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.
[29] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge*, 26-53.
[30] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge*, 26-53.
[31] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge*, 26-53.

improve.[32] We are not given specific actions that Nehemiah undertook to improve his leadership, nor are we told of any leadership actions that purposefully developed individuals. It is possible that he involved himself in personal development, but the text is not forthcoming. Instead, the author of the text chooses to show Nehemiah as a confident leader who is prepared, presents himself as empowered by God, given authority by a king, and equipped for the task at hand (contexts 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25). These characteristics align more with charismatic qualities that include Bennis and Nanus's (2007) discussion on vison and actualizing that vision than transformational concepts such as leader development and follower relationship building.

Model #3 – Kouzes & Posner's Five Practices of Transformational Leaders and Nehemiah

Kouzes and Posner (2017) developed their five practices of exemplary leadership that allows us to further analyze the leadership of Nehemiah.[33] These practices include 1) modeling the way, 2) inspiring a shared vision, 3) challenging the process, 4) enabling others to act, and 5) encouraging the heart.[34] According to Kouzes and Posner (2017), to be an effective transformational leader, there has to be direct action taken by the leader not only with the situation, but more importantly with the follower.[35] Leaders have to be intimately involved with the development of followers to create lasting, positive change.[36]

In analyzing Kouzes and Posner's (2017) model, there are definite interactions with the leadership of Nehemiah. There can be no doubt that Nehemiah modeled his vision and inspired others to accept and become affiliated with his vision (contexts 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22). No one can accuse Nehemiah of sitting back as a laissez-faire leader who ruled from afar.[37] Nehemiah was the exact opposite in most contexts choosing to directly

---

[32] Bennis and Nanus, *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge*, 26-53.
[33] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-19.
[34] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-19.
[35] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-19.
[36] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 13-19.
[37] Rene van Eeden, Frans Cilliers, and Vasi van Deventer, "Leadership Styles and Associated Personality Traits: Support for the Conceptualization of Transactional and Transformational Leadership," *S Afr J Psychol* 38, no. 2 (2008): 255.

involve himself in leadership amongst his followers (contexts 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25). And in the few contexts where he did not hold direct leadership, we see Nehemiah working in the background with the hopes that his leadership will transform his followers into leaders who agree with his ideals. Nehemiah also shows transformational characteristics that link with charismatic characteristics such as constantly challenging the status quo by directly facing the opposition (contexts 7, 9, 10, 12, 23, 23, 25), challenging the rule of the land (contexts 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25), and going against societal norms to produce the Yehud he envisions (contexts 3, 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25). Through this process, his actions encourage others to act, shown by the people's dedication to rebuilding the wall (context 6, 8), their seemingly immediate change to act on Nehemiah's decrees (context 10, 17, 22), and their willingness to sign a covenant with God ensuring their loyalty and obedience (context 18).

Nehemiah strays from Kouzes and Posner's (2017) list of practices in his encouragement of others. The text is not forthcoming of Nehemiah's desire to develop relationship with his followers. The text shows that there are people in whom Nehemiah trusts and most likely developed relationships with including Hanani (Neh 1.2; 7.2), Hananiah (Neh 7.2), Ezra (Neh 8; 12.27-43), the teachers who help instruct the people of the law (Neh 8.7), the teachers and Levites who lead the people in prayer (Neh 9.4-5), the people who seal the covenant (Neh 10.1-27), those who volunteer to move into Jerusalem (Neh 11.2), those who bless and consecrate the wall (Neh 12.27-43), and those who Nehemiah appoint as leaders in the Temple (Neh 12.44-47). However, we are not shown instances in the text where he develops these individuals to become strong leaders or thinks to enhance their leadership skills for when he might depart. He praises them and gives them honor and position, indicative of a true charismatic, however, we are never shown relational building occurring on a personal level which is indicative of a true transformational leader according to Kouzes and Posner.[38] Whether that is due to the fact that Nehemiah never built personal relationships or that the writer chooses not to divulge that information is a discussion that we cannot substantiate.

---

[38] Kouzes and Posner, *Leadership Challenge*, 16-19.

Overall Discussion of Nehemiah's Use of Transformational Leadership

Based on my analysis, the second most used leadership style in Nehemiah's repertoire is transformational leadership. From my leadership commentary and my analysis of the text, I found that Nehemiah used transformational leadership in some significant way in sixteen of the twenty-six contexts. This shows that while the style is not a dominant style of Nehemiah's leadership, it plays an integral role in his overall leadership. It is also important to realize that a primary component in Bass and Avolio's (1994) full-range leadership theory is idealize influence which centers on leaders using charisma.[39] Therefore, it is important to recognize that there are similarities between transformational and charismatic leadership styles which will cause the two to overlap at times when describing Nehemiah's leadership and determining if he is charismatic or transformational.

For example, my research shows that Neh 10, 11, and 13 include contexts that show primarily charismatic leadership. However, Thomas et al. (2015) see Nehemiah's leadership in these chapters as transformational because Nehemiah enhances follower's work ethic by using individualized consideration and inspiring his followers through empowerment.[40] They are correct in seeing the transformational markers at play in Nehemiah's leadership as leaders "focus on inspiring followers to see higher purpose of the task at hand while also empowering each person to fulfill their potential."[41] I would contend that Nehemiah does use transformational leadership characteristics in these contexts, however, his use of charismatic leadership dominates these chapters of the text due to the extreme nature in which he expresses these qualities. Therefore, it is idealized influence in Bass and Avolio's (1994) FRLT that is used by Nehemiah that correlates to his transformational leadership in specific instances. This shows a connection between charismatic and transformational leadership styles and helps us understand the overlap that occurs in the charismatic and transformational leadership styles of Nehemiah.

---

[39] Bass and Avolio, eds., *Improving Organizational Effectiveness,* 2.
[40] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 108.
[41] Cunningham, et al., "Communication and Leadership 2020," 7.

Nehemiah shows transformational attributes often in his leadership as he inspires a shared vision to motivate the people of Yehud to see how their work will build to the good of the entire people.[42] By building even one section of the wall, their individual task joins together to complete the entire wall (context 8). While the text does not offer examples of individual relationship building, Nehemiah does recognize individuals for their support of his vision as he lists them in the building project (context 8), lists them as a legitimate member of Yehud's community (context 14), lists them as those who sign the covenant (context 18), lists them as those who move into Jerusalem (context 19), lists who help dedicate the wall to God (context 20), and lists the priests and Levites who serve at the Temple (context 21). While Nehemiah shows interest in transforming individuals, Nehemiah is most interested in transforming the people as a whole.

Nehemiah concentrates his efforts on transforming the population of Yehud both in their point of view and their habit of mind. He first transforms their identity as he inspires them to recognize that they hold the power to change their situation through the building of a wall (contexts 6, 8, 13). He shows how their habits can change that will revolutionize the quality of life for themselves and those less fortunate (context 6, 10, 23, 24, 25). By showing them social reforms such as cancelling debts (context 10), upholding the Torah (contexts 16, 17), being in covenant with God (context 18), and obeying the Sabbath and marriage decrees (contexts 24, 25), life becomes better for all. This focus on change shows high connection with transformational leadership.

Overall evaluation of transformational leadership shows Nehemiah using the style when dealing with vision and modeling, but not when directly interacting with individual follower's physical needs, personal development, or relational needs. Therefore, it is concluded that Nehemiah uses a transformational style 1) when the transformational characteristics align closely with charismatic characteristics, 2) when Nehemiah is directly focused on transforming a group of people to accomplish his goals, 3) when Nehemiah is setting up his constituency for support and future leadership, or 4) when Nehemiah is not in a direct leadership role or in a

---

[42] Fitzsimons, "The Leadership Styles," 16.

direct crisis that allows him to step away from charismatic leadership and enter into a
leadership style that is more interactive and instructive.

Nehemiah as a Charismatic Leader

Discussion of Max Weber's Concept of Charismatic Leadership and Nehemiah

Nehemiah fits the profile of Weber's charismatic leader in almost every sense.
Charisma, and thus charismatic leaders, in Weber's own words, "may involve a subjective or
internal reorientation born out of suffering, conflicts or enthusiasm in times of psychic,
physical, economic, ethical, religious, [or] political distress."[43] The charismatic leader comes
onto the scene and "recrystallizes" the center of a society.[44] This individual is no ordinary man,
but is one who has thrown off the confines of a traditional life, rejecting all rational economic
conduct to accomplish their vision at all costs.[45] This individual is defined by Weber as one who
is "set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at
least specifically exceptional qualities."[46]

Using Weber's view, Nehemiah offers a nearly perfect example of the charismatic
leader. He enters Yehud in a time of crisis and psychological, physical, economic, ethical,
religious, and political turmoil (contexts 1, 7, 9, 10, 12, 23, 24, 25). He models a life outside the
norms (contexts 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 23, 24, 25) presenting himself as communing
with the divine and possessing supernatural ability to hear from God and act with divine
support (contexts 2, 7, 9, 14, 16, 18, 20, 26). His followers see him as possessing the exceptional
and superhuman ability to lead them out of crisis and into glory (contexts 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16,
18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25). Nehemiah's solutions, in many aspects, are extreme and radical as he
is uninterested in protocol, advise from others, or working along traditional or typical means of
problem solving (contexts 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25). We also see that while

---

[43] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma*, xxiii.
[44] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma*, xlv.
[45] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma*, 21.
[46] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma*, xviii.

Nehemiah is extremely self-confident and dedicated towards his goal, we also see Nehemiah's dependence on his followers to achieve his goals. Weber saw a need for charismatic leaders to have a dedicated followership who were attracted and connected to the leader.[47] Nehemiah's dedicated followers are those who validate his vision and actions and provide the necessary support for him to act in radical and extraordinary ways.[48]

While some see Nehemiah gaining support through his title of governor, I see Nehemiah rallying support through his charismatic personality and leadership style. He rallies a destitute and hopeless people to enthusiastically build the wall in record pace through his charismatic speech that inspires a vision and motivates his followers to action (context 6). He gains support of cancelling debts through his charismatic manipulation of exposing those guilty in a public arena (context 10). He forces obedience and adherence to the law by directly interacting with the guilty in extreme and charismatic action such as expelling Tobiah in dramatic fashion (context 23), by eliciting examples of sin and disaster of ancestors to frighten and bend the will of the people to stop profaning the sabbath (context 24), and cursing and pulling out the hair of those who married foreigners (context 25). These are not actions of a mere gubernatorial leader, but that of extreme action indicative of Weber's ideas of charismatic leadership.

Model #1 – House's 1976 Model of Charismatic Leadership and Nehemiah

Using House's (1976) list of characteristics of a charismatic leader, including being dominant, having a strong desire to influence others, being self-confident, and having strong moral values,[49] we see that Nehemiah's leadership profile aligns. He possesses extremely high levels of self-confidence, marked by his continual determination to push forward with tasks regardless of the challenges or difficulties (contexts 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 20, 23). He has a need to dominate his opponents in a sense that he uses his authority to govern with strictness and resolve (contexts 4, 7, 9, 10, 23, 24, 25). His strong commitments to his morals are evident in his constant referral back to the commandments of God and his expulsion of anyone who

---

[47] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* x-xx.
[48] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* x-xx.
[49] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.

disagrees with that code of ethics (contexts 1, 7, 9, 10, 12, 18, 23, 24, 25). Additionally,

Nehemiah shows an unfaltering desire to influence others. We see this from the beginning of

his leadership as he first influences the king of Persia (context 3), and then passionately

motivates the leaders of Yehud to rebuild the wall through sharing his vision (context 6), and

then subsequently sets an example by joining in the work himself (context 9).[50]

Also, in House's (1976) charismatic leadership theory, we see five specific behaviors

indicative of a charismatic leader with which Nehemiah aligns well.[51] 1) Nehemiah is a true role

model as he practices what he preaches.[52] His words are not mere ideas but are put into action

by him first. We see Nehemiah on the wall building with a shovel in one hand and a sword in

the other (contexts 8, 9). We see Nehemiah choose to forgive the debts and release the slaves

before asking others to comply (context 10). And we see Nehemiah being the first to sign the

covenant (context 18). 2) Nehemiah also behaves as a knowledgeable and skilled leader

commanding the loyalty of his followers due to his proven track record.[53] The wall was built in

record time providing him with the clout to then lead a societal reform (context 13). 3)

Nehemiah places his ideological goals at the very core of his leadership that brings the people

of Yehud back to God (context 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23,

24, 25, 26).[54] 4) Nehemiah has high expectations of his followers in a variety of ways including

the pace of building the wall (contexts 8, 13), the expectation of forgiving debt (context 10), the

adherence to stringent Sabbath laws (context 24), the expectations of who one will marry

(contexts 18, 25), and how one will raise their children (context 25).[55] 5) Nehemiah provides

task-related motives that inspire affiliation and esteem from the follower.[56] Nehemiah sets

obtainable goals which offer individual and collective rewards (contexts 6, 8, 13, 14, 18, 19, 21).

His placement of the workers near their homes increases motivation as they seek to protect

their family's lives (context 8).

---

[50] Hoffman, "Credible Leadership," 198.
[51] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[52] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[53] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[54] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[55] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.
[56] House, "A 1976 Theory," 189-207.

These charismatic characteristics and behaviors, in House's (1976) model, produce nine outcomes. His actions and attitudes collectively satisfy all nine of these outcomes including instilling trust in his followers, creating resonance with the leader's beliefs, creating unquestionable acceptance of the leader's role (at least for a time), producing an emotional connection with the leader, generating follower obedience, providing a way to identify with the leader, producing emotional involvement with the leader's goals, and producing goal production and confidence within followers. Nehemiah creates these outcomes when he gains support to rebuilt the wall (context 6), when he organizes the work to rebuild the wall (context 8), when he boosts morale due to the hard work and threat from their enemies (contexts 7, 9, 12), when he advocates for the marginalized (context 10), when he performs political and religious leadership acts that gain him influence and support (contexts 13, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21), and when he gains support from his direct constituency by attacking the disobedience of God's people (contexts 23, 24, 25). We see his ability to instill trust in Artaxerxes, his superior, as Artaxerxes has confidence in Nehemiah to restore Yehud in a way that would benefit Persia (context 3). Nehemiah models every characteristic and behavior and achieves every outcome of House's model of charismatic leadership.

Model #2 – Jacobsen & House's Steps of Charismatic Leaders and Nehemiah

Jacobsen and House (2001) provide a step-by-step process that they see in charismatic leadership that outlines the path that most charismatic leaders take in their leadership journey. When applied to the leadership of Nehemiah, we find an uncanny resemblance.

1) The first phase of charismatic leadership finds the leader introducing themselves to their followers and showcasing their charisma, their extraordinary abilities, and their ability to move an audience.[57] With Nehemiah, we see his entrance begin with allure in the darkness of night (context 5), but then coming with grand charisma as he motivates the downtrodden people with hope and resounding confidence that they collectively can build the wall (context 6).

---

[57] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

2) With his charisma set, Nehemiah moves to Jacobsen and House's (2001) second phase where charismatic leaders motivate their followers from passive behaviors to active ones that create change.[58] Once Nehemiah shared his vision of a unified and prosperous Yehud and outlined the necessary expectations to rid them of the crisis at hand we see the people immediately join in Nehemiah's vision and begin the work required (contexts 6, 8).

3) The third phase finds charismatic leaders modeling the vision they cast to further motivate their followers and bring even more followers to act.[59] Nehemiah, within the text, constantly models his vision in building the wall and securing the people's safety (contexts 8, 9, 12), speaking out against opposition (contexts 7, 9, 12, 23, 24, 25), and enacting and abiding by social regulations that produces more followership (contexts 10, 11, 14, 15, 18).

4) However, as Jacobsen and House (2001) point out, charismatic leadership is not a sustainable platform and eventually phase four occurs where followers become disenchanted with the leader as the crisis wanes and the leader is no longer needed.[60] We see Nehemiah departing Jerusalem on an understood high point of his leadership (Neh 12.27-47), only to have the people quickly disregard his reform and revert back to selfish ways that went against Nehemiah's interpretation of the commandments of God (Neh 13). The crisis is no longer present, and the people begin to move back into their old ways, forgetting the leadership of Nehemiah (contexts 23, 24, 25). We see constant disenchantment of those who Nehemiah call enemies, even though some of his adversaries are "people of God." However, we also see examples of his followers becoming disenchanted such as when the workers loses faith, albeit momentarily, in Nehemiah's ability to correct the crisis (context 9), when the people of Yehud extort and oppress their own (context 10), and especially upon his return as he sees his followers allowing Tobiah to live in a sacred place, the people grossly defying sabbath law, and God's people intermarrying with foreigners (contexts 23, 24, 25). Jacobsen and House recognize that disenchantment occurs throughout the charismatic leader's tenue as certain individuals expect their personal crisis to be resolved through the grand vision of the charismatic leader. [61]

---

[58] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[59] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[60] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[61] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 81.

When their crisis is not solved, they lose faith in the charismatic leader.[62] Also, Jacobsen and House show that not all followers will become disenchanted, but instead, there will come a point in the charismatic leader's duration of leadership where routinization will occur and the follower's energy, excitement, and support naturally wanes due to the calming of the crisis and the normalcy of the organizational system produced. This occurs as Nehemiah slowly succeeds in his goals of a constructed wall (context 13), his systematization and organization of Yehud's social structure (contexts 14, 19), his resurrection of the Torah and a collective religious education (contexts 16, 17, 18, 20), and through Nehemiah organizing and appointing different personnel for key organizational roles (contexts 13, 21).

5) Jacobsen and House (2001) show that once disenchantment or routinization occur, depersonalization is soon to come after.[63] Here, the leader attempts to hold on to their status with the organization by becoming more transactional in their leadership, making it less about relationships and more about rewards.[64] Nehemiah begins this process before his departure in rewarding faithful service with appointed positions of authority in the new political, social, and religious structure that is put in place to succeed Nehemiah's leadership (contexts 13, 16, 17, 20, 21). We also see a sense of depersonalization upon his return to Yehud as the people no longer see the vision that Nehemiah crafted, and Nehemiah is forced to take a more transactional approach to his leadership. He does this through negative reinforcement in expelling Tobiah (context 23), systematizing the priestly order to provide direct support and attempting to put loyal followers in key positions (context 23), reinstituting sabbath laws and reminding the people of their vow and contract that they are obligated to obey (context 24), and condemning and giving negative reinforcement to those involved in mix marriages (context 25).

6) The last stage of Jacobsen and House's (2001) model is full alienation of the leader from the organization.[65] The attempt to systematize is only a short-term solution and eventually the relationship will no longer work.[66] The charismatic leader has the option to

---

[62] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 81.
[63] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[64] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[65] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[66] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.

depart or retire, or members of the organization will require his or her departure.[67] We are not told of Nehemiah's story of his second departure, or when that departure occurred. This alienation is not necessarily an aggressive revolution against the leader. While that can occur, it can also show as the leader no longer being needed and interferes in the new leadership moving forward.[68] We do not see the people revolt against Nehemiah, nor do we see any example, besides the actions of Nehemiah's adversaries, where someone directly opposes or resigns as one of Nehemiah's followers. We see Nehemiah departing as his goals are achieved and routinization set in place. We also see Nehemiah return to attempt to assert his charismatic authority once again, but ultimately departing once more for good as a new leadership structure takes Nehemiah's place. Therefore, Jacobsen and House's description of alienation is more centered on moving on with a new leadership structure and new leaders in place due to the routinization of leadership.[69]

The use of Jacobsen and House's (2001) phases of charismatic leadership also provides an alternative view to Nehemiah's use of charismatic leadership and shows that all his endeavors were not necessarily successful. This is key in my evaluation as it shows that charismatic leadership is not fully sustainable and that relief from crisis, consistent performance, and follower morale and obedience cannot be expected to sustain forever. This does not mean that Nehemiah was a complete failure, instead, it shows that he was 1) a flawed leader, 2) one who was successful for a time, 3) one who did his best to lead, and 4) a charismatic leader who went through the typical process of most charismatic leaders.

Model #3 – Conger & Kanungo's Model of Charismatic Leadership and Nehemiah

The model of Conger and Kanungo (2003) provides us with yet another perspective of Nehemiah's charismatic leadership as their model focuses on followers and their perception and acceptance of the charismatic leader.[70] Four building stages of leadership development

---

[67] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[68] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[69] Jacobsen and House, "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership," 78-82.
[70] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 26-33.

form the basis of Conger and Kanungo's theory where a leader: 1) Is sensitive to the environmental context as he or she reads the situation at hand and acts accordingly. 2) Sets his or her vision to accomplish his or her goals. 3) Builds trust with the follower through relationship building and modeling. 4) Achieves the goals set forth and gains success.[71]

Nehemiah fits this stage model, especially in his first campaign. The first stage shows Nehemiah recognizing the changing environments and situations and recognizing the actions that are required to achieve his vision and goal. He does this when he hears of the distress of his people in Yehud (context 3), when the situation changes while constructing the wall (contexts 7, 8, 9, 12), when Jews are oppressing their brothers and sisters and economic reform is needed (context 10), and when he returns and needs to institute social and religious reforms (contexts 23, 24, 25). While adaption is a central theme to Nehemiah's overall leadership, it is also a central theme in charismatic leadership. Charismatic leaders can adapt to different situations and act in different ways that aid them in accomplishing their vision.[72]

Nehemiah is very sure of his vision and sets his vision with precision and determination (contexts 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25). As described earlier, the text does not show Nehemiah developing individual personal relationships with his followers. Therefore, Conger and Kanungo's (2003) third stage does not reflect Nehemiah building relationships with the people of Yehud.[73] However, Nehemiah does build a relationship with God, which would reflect Conger and Kanungo's third stage. Nehemiah also connects with their third stage when it comes to modeling for the purpose of developing trust (contexts 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18). Finally, Nehemiah shows Conger and Kanungo's fourth stage of achieving his goals through a successful wall built (context 13), the people of Yehud helping their neighbors and creating an ordered society (context 10), the people of Yehud conforming to the laws of God (contexts 16, 17), and the religious order instituted and effective (contexts 20, 21).[74]

---

[71] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 26-33.
[72] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 26-33.
[73] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 26-33.
[74] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 26-33.

Overall Discussion of Nehemiah's Use of Charismatic Leadership

Through an analysis of the text, we see Nehemiah display charismatic leadership in most of the contexts and used a variety of other styles both individually and in a blended form depending on the needs of the situation. There are only three contexts where charismatic leadership is not an influential style of leadership. Therefore, it is concluded that Nehemiah's preferred style of leadership is charismatic leadership. However, there are contexts where this style of leadership is not possible or not needed. And in other contexts, the situation calls for the use of other styles of leadership in greater amounts and charismatic leadership is a style that is shown more in the background of Nehemiah's leadership. In most situations, Nehemiah choses to act in a charismatic way as the best way to solidify his vision and accomplish his goals.

Conger and Kanungo's (2003) analysis of followership shows important aspects of Nehemiah's charismatic leadership.[75] Followers, having a sense of belonging and community, condone and support the charismatic leader.[76] This is also indicative of follower accommodation of the charismatic leader's action regardless of any negative feelings towards the charismatic leader.[77] This is true with Nehemiah as his supporters most likely disagreed with some, if not many, of his reforms and statutes (contexts 10, 14, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25). However, due to the results Nehemiah produces, his followers continue to support his leadership nonetheless (contexts 10, 14, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25). Charismatic leaders require constant support from their followers and must continually produce solutions for the crises of their followers. As Weber describes, if the charismatic leader fails to benefit his followers, his charismatic authority will quickly disappear.[78] While this may be true of most leaders, it is especially true with charismatic leaders because they lack legitimate cause for their appointment as leader.[79] While Nehemiah has legitimate authority given to him by the king of Persia, I stress that it is his charismatic authority that provides most of his approval, obedience,

---

[75] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 26-33.
[76] Conger, *The Charismatic Leader,* 26-33.
[77] Ken Parry, Michael Cohen, Sukanto Bhattacharya, Andrea North-Samardzic, and Gareth Edwards, "Charismatic Leadership: Beyond Love and Hate and Towards a Sense of Belonging," *J Manag Organ* 25, no. 3 (2019): 410.
[78] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* 50.
[79] Weber and Eisenstadt, *Max Weber on Charisma,* 46-47.

and support. His title as governor provides credibility and obedience to some extent, but we must recognize that his title and authority from the Persian crown does not prevent his adversaries from threating to kill him, destroy the people of Yehud, or to usurp his entire leadership campaign. Instead, it is Nehemiah's charismatic leadership that rallies support and provides Nehemiah with the necessary followership, power, and control to be successful.

As a charismatic leader, it was vital for Nehemiah to know his allies and his enemies.[80] Therefore, the use of the "other" becomes a staple to Nehemiah's charismatic leadership (contexts 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25). With such resolve to his ethical standards and divine vision, Nehemiah is unwilling to compromise with individuals or groups who disobey his interpretation of God's law creating a divide between those who are the true people of God and those who are not. Those relegated as the "other" are then ostracized from the group.[81] This fosters a leader-follower identity where followers feel connected in community as being in the "in-group" and an ally to the leader.[82] The rest are labeled "enemies" to which the charismatic leader places blame on and then focuses the follower's energy on unifying the group away from the others.[83] We see Nehemiah wasting no time in identifying his external and internal opponents as the "other" (contexts 4, 7). For example, his choice of words in his description of the adversaries at Ebir-Nari label them as opponents (context 4). Additionally, Nehemiah is quick to denounce the legitimacy of Sanballat and his party (context 7), quick to expel Tobiah from the Temple (context 23), and quick to expel the high priest's grandson from the congregation (context 25).[84] Therefore, Nehemiah's use of allies and enemies shows his charismatic nature and is a further testament to his use of charismatic leadership.[85]

Additionally, the concept of routinization is one that classically tells of a charismatic leader. As I have concluded, charismatic leadership is not a stable platform and once the

---

[80] Alred L. Ivry, "Nehemiah 6,10: Politics and the Temple," *JSJ* 3, no. 1 (1972): 36.
[81] Olyan, "Purity Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah," 2.
[82] Eatwell, "The Concept and Theory," 146.
[83] Eatwell, "The Concept and Theory," 146.
[84] Joseph Blenkinsopp, "The Mission of Udjahorresnet and Those of Ezra and Nehemiah," *JBL* 106, no. 3 (1987): 416.
[85] Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, 120.

presence of crisis is no longer found, it is only a matter of time when the charismatic leader begins to lose favor amongst his followers.[86] Therefore, if routinization is present in a leadership system that does not begin with systems and organized leadership structures, then there is a good chance that charismatic leadership is involved. Routinization begins before Nehemiah departs for the first time as structures and systems are put in place by Nehemiah before he leaves (contexts 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21). There is destabilization of Nehemiah's charismatic leadership as his followers lose momentum and choose to return to aspects of personal gain that go against what Nehemiah developed (contexts 23, 24, 25). Even though Nehemiah attempts to inject new charismatic energy upon his return to Yehud (context 23), the process of routinization has been established and the new organized leadership structure is in place. As Nehemiah brings new charismatic energy upon his return, it immediately fights against the new leadership structure present in Yehud. Therefore, while Nehemiah sees immediate success with the people obeying his ordinances, we do not see lasting success with Nehemiah's vision, but instead, we see the new leadership's vision take hold of Yehud into the future (Mal 1.2,6-14; 2.11, 17; 3.8, 13). The necessity to instill strong successors is vital to the success of charismatic leaders, and it is seen that Nehemiah did not do so due to the negative outcome, in Nehemiah's opinion, that ensued in Yehud, prompting Nehemiah's return, as well as after Nehemiah left for the second time.[87]

Overall, it is concluded that Nehemiah is in fact a charismatic leader. He possesses most of the charismatic leadership qualities and fits almost every charismatic theory outlined by the models discussed. There are many instances where he chooses not to act as a charismatic leader as he adapts his leadership style based on the context present. However, through analysis of Nehemiah's leadership, charismatic leadership qualities correlate with all contexts to some degree except for contexts 1, 11, and 15. This shows that charismatic leadership is a consistent leadership style used by Nehemiah and is almost always present as a style of leadership for Nehemiah.

---

[86] David C. Rapoport, "Moses, Charisma, and Covenant," *West Pol Q* 32, no. 2 (1979): 138.
[87] Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Leadership in the Hebrew Bible," *Rev Polit* 47, no. 2 (1985): 313.

Nehemiah as an Authentic Leader

Model #1 – Avolio & Et Al.'s 2004 Model of Authentic Leadership and Nehemiah

Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, and May (2004) created a model that rests on the principle that authentic leaders are "persons who have achieved high levels of authenticity in that they know who they are, what they believe and value, and they act upon those values and beliefs while transparently interacting with others."[88] Their model links authentic leadership to follower attitudes and behaviors by bringing in leader influences, and specific intervening variables. First, authentic leaders create opportunities for their followers to identify with them both personally and socially.[89] They do this by being direct, open, committed to the success of followers, willing to acknowledge limitations, transparent, accountable, rewarding honesty, and having integrity.[90] Once the follower identifies with the authentic leader, the follower begins to interact with four different states of being including hope, trust, optimism, and positive emotions. From those states of being, the follower experiences higher commitment to the job, higher job satisfaction, more meaningfulness in their life, and higher engagement with the leader and the organization.[91]

Using this model to look at the leadership of Nehemiah we see that there are some aspects that initially intersect, and others that are not witnessed in the text.[92] First, Nehemiah creates space for followers to identify with him as a leader. This occurs in the follower as the follower's definition of himself is engrained in his belief of Nehemiah and his ability to lead. Nehemiah's followers witness his actions in many different contexts and therefore, can identify with his personality, his vision, his morals and ethics, his relationship with God, and his leadership. This creates a situation where Nehemiah's followers acquire similar personalities, visions, morals and ethics, relationships with God, and leadership qualities that are comparable to Nehemiah. However, the text does not specifically describe a scenario were an individual

---

[88] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 802.
[89] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 806.
[90] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 807.
[91] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 807.
[92] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 807.

personally identifies and becomes more like Nehemiah. While we can assume that personal identification does occur, due to his followers' ability to witness Nehemiah's actions, we are not given specific examples.

The text does show the identification process occurring on a social level as Nehemiah's followers begin to associate with the group and community under Nehemiah's leadership. Nehemiah has a specific goal in creating social identification as he gains support for the building project by bringing the leaders of Yehud together under a common mission (context 6), and as he interacts with adversaries by showing them as "other" which then allows the "in-group" to identify as a collective people (contexts 7, 9, 11). The organization of work brings social identification as different groups of people all come together under a unified task to rebuild the wall (context 8). We also see social identification occur from religious experiences as the people gather to read the law (contexts 16, 17), as the people confess and sign the covenant together (context 18), and as Nehemiah dedicates the wall as the nation celebrates in unity (context 20).

When analyzing the different characteristics of an authentic leader that allow identification to occur, we must pause and consider that the text does not express all of these qualities. Nehemiah is certainly direct with his followers and with his adversaries.[93] We see him direct and to the point in his request to the king (context 3), as he gains support for the building project (context 6), in his conversations with his enemies (contexts 7, 9, 12), when he is interacting with his followers (contexts 10, 20, 23, 24, 25), and when he is talking with God (context 2, 7, 9, 12, 26). Additionally, we see Nehemiah committed to the success of followers, accountable to his actions, reward those who identify with him, and having high levels of integrity.[94] Nehemiah shows authenticity himself in these qualities as he never takes advantage of a situation, is always true to his own beliefs and morals, and models the attitudes and actions that he desires in his followers. However, Nehemiah is not necessarily open, willing to acknowledge his limitations, or transparent.[95] We see small examples of these, such as Nehemiah confessing that he too charged interests to his own people (context 10). Nehemiah is transparent with his enemies more than his followers as he is blunt and honest with his feelings

[93] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 807.
[94] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 807.
[95] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 807.

and thoughts towards his adversaries (contexts 7, 9, 12). Instead, we see Nehemiah being secretive in his plans until he understands the situation (context 5), and often we see Nehemiah telling his followers the plans and vision and not discussing his emotions, his faults, or his fears. However, we do see him open, willing to acknowledge his limitations, and transparent in his relationship with God. This is where we see the most authentic characteristics in Nehemiah. He opens his entire heart to God and exposes his full self to Him (contexts 1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26).

A way of evaluating Nehemiah's level of authentic leadership is to use this model to discern the level of hope, trust, optimism, and positive emotions that are produced in Nehemiah's followers.[96] Nehemiah is full of hope, optimism, and positive emotions as he relies completely on God for his strength and his success, shown by his consistent prayers to God (contexts 1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26). However, this model looks at the qualities found in the followers. There is a consistent increase of hope, optimism, and positive emotions throughout the text. The people of Yehud, at the beginning of Nehemiah's leadership, lack all of these qualities prompting Hanani to come to tell Nehemiah of the awful state of his homeland (context 1). The amount of hope, optimism, and positive emotions greatly increases as Nehemiah gains support for the building project (context 6). We see these states diminish due to threats and being overworked (context 9), but overall, we see Nehemiah's presence produce hope, optimism, and positive emotions in his followers. The same can be said of trust. Nehemiah's followers continue to trust in his leadership. Again, we see this build with his speech to gain community support in building the wall (context 6), increase as he interacts with his enemies (context 7, 9, 12), and continue to grow throughout his leadership campaign until his first departure.

However, on his return to Yehud, there is an interesting interaction between Nehemiah's authentic leadership and the people trusting Nehemiah. There is obedience that comes from Nehemiah leadership, but we witness compliance more than passionate obedience during Nehemiah's second stay (Neh 13.15-22). Also, we do not witness a celebration, a declaration, or any confessions signed. Instead, we are simply told that the people obeyed.

---

[96] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 807.

We also can use this model to look at the work attitudes of the followers to analyze the level of authentic leadership in Nehemiah.[97] We see a higher commitment to their job and to their God as we witness them rebuilding the wall in record time (context 8, 9, 13), pushing forward through adversity (context 7, 9, 12), passionately studying the law (context 16, 17), confessing their sins and signing a collective covenant (context 18), and sacrificing their homes and livelihoods to move into Jerusalem (context 19). In this same vein we see Nehemiah's followers increase in job satisfaction, meaningfulness, and higher engagement as they do not complain about the work, but are eager to fortify their physical environment, reestablish their cultural and religious identities, and abstain from sins that their forefathers committed. Therefore, Nehemiah exhibits many of the aspects of Avolio et al.'s (2004) model of authentic leadership.

Model #2 – Ilies Et Al.'s 2005 Model of Authentic Leadership and Nehemiah

Where Avolio et al.'s (2004) model was focused on follower experience as an indicator of authentic leadership, Ilies, Morgeson, and Nahrgang's (2005) model analyzes the authentic leader and provides a profile in which we can use to analyze Nehemiah.[98] Their model provides seven psychological capacities indicative of an authentic leader, four components of authentic leadership, and five influences that authentic leaders bestow upon their followers.[99] These components of an authentic leader produce leader well-being. Also, the components of authentic leadership combine with the leader's influential processes that create follower well-being.[100]

First, Nehemiah possesses the seven psychological capacities of confidence, hope, optimism, resilience, high moral reasoning, being future oriented, and prioritizing follower development in varying amounts.[101] His confidence is not matched by any other as he boldly makes decisions and pushes forward in his vision regardless of situation, danger, or potential

---

[97] Avolio, et al., "Unlocking the Mask," 807.
[98] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[99] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[100] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[101] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.

failure (contexts 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25). Nehemiah is fully optimistic and hopeful, once again due to his trust in God, as well as his trust in his abilities and the authority in which he brings (contexts 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 18, 20). Nehemiah is resilient, evidenced by his continual progress and success in the face of mockery, threat, hardship, and challenge (contexts 7, 9, 12, 23, 24, 25). Nehemiah also possesses high moral reasoning (contexts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26). His moral standards reach beyond human morality and interact with the divine moral code of God. We find his moral code not written by Nehemiah himself, but from the Torah, the commandments of God, and through direct conversation with God who procured Nehemiah's moral line. Nehemiah shows future orientation in areas where he is directly being authentic as he continues to push his vision forward towards the achievement of his goals. This occurs in his analysis of the broken walls (context 5), as Nehemiah recognizes the deceit and trap of his adversaries (context 12), in the future needs of his people as he organizes a census (context 14), and as Nehemiah desires a pure Yehud in the future by separating foreigners from the land (context 22). The last psychological capacity of prioritizing follower development is not necessarily represented in the text. There is an overall desire to develop his followership as he recognizes that his time is limited and that one day, they will have to lead themselves. But we only see hints of this quality later in his leadership (context 14, 16, 17).

With those prerequisites in hand, we now analyze Nehemiah's interaction with the four components of authentic leadership to see if he in fact acted as an authentic leader during specific points of his leadership.[102] Nehemiah is certainly self-aware.[103] He knows who he is and fully comprehends his strengths and weaknesses (contexts 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23,24, 25). His actions show his self-awareness as he leads decisively, is confident in his actions, and knows the legitimacy of his vision due to divine appointment.[104] His self-awareness is also driven by his confidence and understanding of God and the mission that God has given him to perform. A specific example of Nehemiah's self-awareness is found in context 12 where the wall has been built and Nehemiah's adversaries attempt to trap him by tempting

---

[102] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[103] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[104] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 200-204.

him to come meet them and as Shemaiah attempts to get him to sin by running to the Temple (Neh 6.1-14). Nehemiah knows exactly who he is, his capabilities, and his confidence in God and not man. He discerns that this temptation is not of God and would only lead to destruction and mistrust in God. Here, his authenticity helps him avoid potential sin and align with God's desires.

As we discussed above, Nehemiah was predisposed with high moral reasoning which then translates into a high internalized moral perspective.[105] The text is clear that no one influences the decisions of Nehemiah save God alone. The only examples where Nehemiah is swayed to change his mindset or his actions is when his own people are hurting and suffering. It is only here where Nehemiah alters his course and protects the marginalized (context 10). Nehemiah interacts with an external situation, immediately filters that situation through his internalized moral perspective, and then acts based on his moral center. We see this occurring when the poor are being oppressed by their own people (context 10), when Sanballat threatens and mocks the workers (contexts 7, 9, 12), when Tobiah is found living in the Temple (context 23), and when the people of God are disobeying the statutes laid forth to protect them from God's wrath (contexts 24, 25). In every instance, we see Nehemiah reacting to a situation out of his internal moral influence.

This moves into a conversation of the third component of authentic leadership, balanced processing.[106] In several instances, we see Nehemiah's reaction come out as strong, harsh, and in our modern opinion, as an overreaction (contexts 10, 23, 24, 25). His initial reaction to help the poor and end oppression could have had worse economic ramifications (context 10). In his anger towards those who disobey and allow their children to marry foreigners (context 25), we see Nehemiah lashing out and beating some and pulling out their hair. However, at other times we see Nehemiah calm and collected as he makes leadership decisions. When Sanballat taunts him hoping to evoke a crass reaction (context 12), we see Nehemiah calm and collective, choosing to ignore the worthless remarks. Therefore, there are examples where Nehemiah shows strong balanced processing and other examples where he

---

[105] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
[106] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.

does not. As expected, in contexts where there are examples of strong balanced processing, we also find use of authentic leadership (contexts 12, 14, 22, 23). Authentic leadership is especially found when Nehemiah interacts with his opponents and strategically circumvents their plots by relying on his authentic moral code (context 12). Nehemiah's authenticity is shown by his initial actions upon his return to Yehud by expelling Tobiah, reminding the people of their vows, and remarking on the leaders separating foreigners from the land (contexts 22, 23). Both contexts show balanced processing complementary of authentic leadership.

In the fourth component, relational transparency, Nehemiah shows the weakest connection to authentic leadership as he is unwilling to be relationally transparent.[107] Nehemiah chooses to work directly alongside his fellow man (contexts 8, 9, 10, 11, 18) and shows humility (contexts 10, 11, 12, 16, 18, 20), a strong work ethic (contexts 9, 11, 12), and induces loyalty through his interactions with the people (contexts 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21). However, none of those characteristics necessarily generates deep, individualized relationships, nor does it denote vulnerability and openness of Nehemiah's thoughts and emotions towards the people. It seems as if Nehemiah keeps his thoughts closes off and only divulges what is necessary. We see aspects of his opaque nature at the beginning of the text as Nehemiah keeps his emotions and feelings from the king for months as he methodically plans his interaction with Artaxerxes (contexts 2, 3). We see his secrecy and hesitation to share upon entering Jerusalem as he does not immediately interact with the leadership, but instead keeps his thoughts to himself until the appropriate time (context 5). There are no examples in the text where Nehemiah confides in anyone, save the king when Artaxerxes asks what is bothering him (context 3), or when he prays to God. Also, there are no examples where we are told of Nehemiah's weaknesses or shortcomings. This would seem to indicate that Nehemiah is not relationally transparent, but instead tends to be closed off when it comes to exposing his plans, his emotions, or his relational availability. This is contrasted with Nehemiah's complete openness towards his vision, his relationship with God, or his moral values.

---

[107] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.

To effect followers in a positive way, authentic leaders use their psychological capacities and their components of authentic leadership to influence their followers in specific ways.[108] First, authentic leaders influence their followers through personal and social identification. Ilies et al. (2005) express similar views as Avolio et al. (2004) on the role that identification plays in follower influence. Ilies et al. show that due to the authentic leader's high level of self-awareness, authentic behavior, and relational orientation, followers easily identify and experience higher levels of value-congruence with their leaders. This allows the follower to easily mimic the leader's actions and behaviors which cause an increase in leader and follower authenticity and well-being.[109] There are similar connections with Nehemiah's ability to identify with his followers that occur in Avolio et al.'s model and, therefore, the discussion will not be repeated.

Second, authentic leaders influence their followers by being emotionally contagious and third, they model positive behavior.[110] Followers feed off the leader's emotions and gain those emotions as well. Likewise, followers see the actions of Nehemiah, and mimic his behaviors. We see this process often in Nehemiah as he engages with a particular task, we see the morale and effort of the people increase. While we cannot surmise the actual emotions of Nehemiah, the text does provide some evidence to emotional reactions. We see the leadership become inspired, motivated, and energized when Nehemiah gains their support to build the wall (context 6). We see the morale increase and the work continue when Nehemiah interacts and staves off enemy threats and creates new processes to alleviate worker stress (context 7, 9, 12).

Fourth, Nehemiah provides opportunities for follower self-determination as he allows them to do the work themselves and, in some cases, make the decisions on their own.[111] We see this when he appoints specific jobs for the rebuilding project and then allows those individuals to do the work without any instruction (context 8). We see Nehemiah relinquish control as Ezra and his associates read and teach the law (context 16, 17). And we see the people in charge as they sign a national confession and cast lots for who will move into

---

108 Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 373-387.
109 Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 383.
110 Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 383.
111 Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 383.

Jerusalem (context 18, 19). These authentic acts correlate to contexts where Nehemiah is seen using authentic leadership. In contexts where Nehemiah uses other leadership styles and authentic leadership is not present, we see Nehemiah holding most of the power and controlling the situation.

The fifth and final way authentic leaders influence their followers is through positive social exchanges.[112] Here, leaders produce high quality relationships that foster follower well-being. Again, this is an area that the text does not divulge information as we do not see any personal relationships being forged between Nehemiah and one of his followers. The text is more centered on the people of God as a whole and how Nehemiah's actions effect the entire group.

Model #3 – Petkeviciute & Et Al's 2018 Model of Authentic Leadership and Nehemiah

The third model of authentic leadership from Petkeviciute, Barvydiene, and Surpikiene (2018) provides a model where four repeated steps further develop authentic relationships between the leader and the follower. To them, authentic leaders bring increased follower well-being through the development of high-quality relationships based on principles of social exchange where leader and follower reciprocate effort to produce a high-quality relationship.[113] First, authentic leaders accept the follower just as they are and attempt to understand the follower's true self.[114] This produces the second step where mutual respect is developed between the leader and follower.[115] Then, with respect developed, trust can be created in both the leader and follower.[116] Finally, once the leader and follower can trust one another, mutual support is possible where each can care for the physical, emotional, and professional needs of the other.[117]

---

[112] Ilies, et al., "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic," 383.
[113] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 87-88.
[114] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 87-88.
[115] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 87-88.
[116] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 87-88.
[117] Petkeviciute, et al., "Authentic Leadership," 87-88.

This model shows an area where Nehemiah does not have high levels of authentic leadership. This is due to either the text not focusing on individual relationships, or that Nehemiah chooses not to develop individual relationships. However, this model allows us to recognize that this was a shortcoming of Nehemiah's leadership as portrayed in the text. And therefore, we must evaluate the contexts where authentic leadership is expressed and recognize that there are areas of authentic leadership that Nehemiah does not represent.

Overall Discussion of Nehemiah's Use of Authentic Leadership

The core markers of authentic leadership theory include genuine, authentic leadership coming from internal conviction based on the leader's life experiences, creating a real leadership that followers can trust and believe in.[118] This easily correlates with Nehemiah's leadership as we see his internal convictions and vision driving every one of his actions. While many would disagree with his methods, it is very rare that a scholar would say that Nehemiah is fake or that his methods do not represent his values and vision. Authentic leadership is procured, however, through relational building between the leader and followers.[119] This interpersonal process is a bit vague in the relatively new leadership style, and therefore, is difficult to analyze when it comes to Nehemiah. As we have seen with other leadership styles, Nehemiah is entrenched with his followers as he works directly alongside the people (contexts 8, 9, 12) and he chooses to live a lifestyle of minimalism and give away his salary, comforts, and excess (context 11). There is a lot of direct connection with the governor and the people. However, what is not discussed is his direct interaction with interpersonal relationships with followers. We do not see Nehemiah cultivating individual relationships with specific people. Therefore, the relational aspects of authentic leadership are uncertain.

From a more gut reaction, one would quickly describe Nehemiah as authentic. And that is because Nehemiah is an authentic individual. We see his authenticity in every context as he is

---

[118] Boaz Shamir and G. Eilam, "What's Your Story? A Life-Stories Approach to Authentic Leadership Development," *Leadersh Q* 16 (2005): 395-417.

[119] A.H. Eagly, "Achieving Relational Authenticity in Leadership: Does Gender Matter?" *Leadersh Q* 16 (2005): 459-474.

true to his beliefs, morals, and vision and he holds to his integrity in every situation. However, just because Nehemiah is authentic, it does not mean that he uses authentic leadership in every context. Therefore, it is concluded that Nehemiah acts as an authentic leader at certain times. He possesses the necessary prerequisites for authentic leadership and conveys self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, and at times balanced processing. While he lacks relational transparency, it can be concluded that Nehemiah has authentic leader capabilities and is overall authentic. However, the commentary shows that other leadership styles take precedence in most contexts as authentic leadership behaviors work more in the background of his leadership. Specifically, Nehemiah uses authentic leadership in four contexts (contexts 5, 12, 14, 22).

Nehemiah as a Servant Leader

Discussion of Robert Greenleaf's Concept of Servant Leadership and Nehemiah

While servant leadership was coined by Robert Greenleaf (2002), he never specified a fully working theory. Instead, he laid the groundwork for others to come along and bring theory to his concepts. To him, servant leaders did not "exercise authoritarian power and control to further their own agenda, but instead lead by being a servant first."[120] Right away we see a divergence between Greenleaf's servant leadership and Nehemiah's leadership actions. Nehemiah often exerts his authority to control the situation and meet his agenda (contexts 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 18, 23, 24, 25). Even in situations where Nehemiah is serving others, he did so with the authority that he possesses, not necessarily with a pure desire to serve first (10, 12, 13, 14, 18, 21). Underneath, Nehemiah's motives are to serve his people; his methods, however, differ from the traditional examples of servant leadership. Therefore, Nehemiah at his heart had the desire to serve.[121] Nehemiah makes it his highest priority to meet the needs of those being

---

[120] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27.
[121] Mick Fryer, "A Review of the Leadership Literature," in *Ethics and Organizational Leadership: Developing a Normative Model*, 13-33 (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2011), 17.

served.[122] Regardless of the leadership style Nehemiah was implementing, his desire was to meet the needs of his followers. He never looked out for his own safety or needs, but instead, sacrificed himself and his well-being for the good of others (contexts 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18).

Greenleaf (2002) shows that the best test of servant leadership is to see if followers grow, become healthier, wiser, more free, more autonomous, and more likely to serve others. Using this list of characteristics in followers, not as individuals, but as a collective people, we can see that Nehemiah's followers grow in strength and fortification (contexts 8, 9, 13, 19), in health and well-being (contexts 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15), in wisdom and spiritual connectedness (contexts 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18), in freedom and autonomy (contexts 8, 10, 11, 20), and are more likely to serve others (contexts 6, 8, 10, 11, 15, 18, 21).

Also, Greenleaf (2002) explains that servant leaders focus on serving the marginalized of society. From the beginning, we see this notion in Nehemiah as he hears news from his homeland that everyone is marginalized and deprived (context 1). This causes him to sacrifice any comforts or position he had in Susa and take the risk of helping those in need (context 3). Additionally, we see Nehemiah helping the marginalized when dealing with those oppressed by their own (context 10), when he refuses the governor's provisions and opens his table to those in need (context 11), and when he contributes to the building fund (context 15). Based on Greenleaf's ideas of servant leadership, while Nehemiah did not lead in a purely servant nature, his motives and desires were to serve his people.

Model #1 – Spear's List of Characteristics of Servant Leadership and Nehemiah

One of the first scholars to theorize Greenleaf's (2002) servant leadership was Spears (1998) with his list of ten characteristics of a servant leader.[123] This list included listening, having empathy, healing, having awareness, being persuasive, being conceptual, having foresight, being a steward, committing to the growth of people, and building community.[124] When analyzing these ten characteristics it is obvious that many of these characteristics do not

---

[122] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27-32.
[123] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[124] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.

center on service alone, but are necessary qualities required for service to be possible.[125] This

allows us to see if Nehemiah possesses the qualities necessary to be servant natured. Spears

noted that servant leaders listen first as a learned behavior producing servant leadership.[126]

Nehemiah chooses times to listen first, and in other situations he chooses to act first or be the

one to do most of the speaking. As Nehemiah arrives in Jerusalem, he spends three days

listening and observing before acting (context 5). When citizens have quarrels and needs,

Nehemiah listens to their claims first (contexts 9, 10). We see Nehemiah listening to the

entirety of the law from Ezra before instituting any action (context 16). Therefore, we see that

Nehemiah can listen — however, he chooses when to use it.

The use of empathy is clear in Nehemiah's posture as he leads. He is always willing to

step into the shoes of his people and lower himself in stature to their position (contexts 2, 8, 9,

10, 11, 15, 16, 18). However, he shows little empathy to his opponents or anyone who might

disagree with his leadership (contexts 7, 9, 12, 23, 24, 25). Spear's (1998) characteristic of

healing also plays into Nehemiah's personality and desire to lead.[127] Spears sees healing as the

ability to make whole with a focus on making the followers whole once again.[128] Through

rebuilding the wall (context 13), reinstituting the law (context 16), and bringing the people back

into alignment with God's commandments and a unified social and religious structure (contexts

18, 19, 20), Nehemiah achieves wholeness with the Jewish people. Again, this is a collective

healing, as the text rarely focuses on individuals (context 10).

Additionally, Nehemiah fulfills Spear's (1998) needs for awareness as Nehemiah

understands the greater needs of the people through recognizing the greater context of the

situation (contexts 2, 5, 9, 1,0, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19).[129] He is a natural at persuasion and even

persuades through "gentle nonjudgmental argument" when it comes to interactions with his

own people (contexts 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 18).[130] Nehemiah possesses high conceptualization as he

sees the big picture, being able to respond to the complexity of issues that arise (contexts 2, 5,

---

[125] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[126] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[127] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[128] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[129] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[130] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.

8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21). Spears sees foresight, or the ability to know the future, as indicative of the servant leader.[131] Nehemiah shows the ability to create structures that safeguard his people ahead of confrontation or absolute necessity (contexts 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 21). Also, Nehemiah is a steward in his actions, always taking responsibility for his leadership and his decisions, while also using the resources given to him for the betterment of others (contexts 2, 8, 9, 11, 15). Through not taking a salary and opening his table to feed those in the community (context 11), and contributing to the building fund out of his own pocket (context 15), Nehemiah embraces the role of the steward. Lastly, Nehemiah also aligns with Spear's characteristics of possessing a commitment to grow the people and to build community.[132] Growth and building community are at the very heart of Nehemiah's agenda and work together in his goals. He desires to grow the physical structure and security of Yehud through a completed wall and a populated Jerusalem (contexts 8, 13, 19). Nehemiah also wants to bring the people of Yehud together under the law of God (contexts 16, 18). Ultimately his desire is to create a unified Yehud that acts as a loving community (context 20).

When using Spears' (1998) theory, Nehemiah aligns as a servant leader and expresses all ten characteristics of servant leadership.[133] Therefore, this shows that Nehemiah can act as a servant leader. What is helpful is that we can take Spear's list and find instances where Nehemiah shows some or all of these characteristics. Correlating this information into the corresponding contexts allows us to see if servant leadership is a dominant leadership style. What is found is that in each situation where most of Spear's characteristics are present in Nehemiah, the analysis shows strong use of servant leadership. For example, Nehemiah shows a servant nature as he expresses nearly all of Spear's characteristic as he desires to forgive the debts of the poor (context 10). Likewise, we see Nehemiah validating his servanthood by comparing his servant actions to that of his opponents (context 11). Yet another example is Nehemiah's contribution to the building effort (context 15). This is an obvious example of benevolence that connects with Spears's list.[134] However, we also see Nehemiah attempting to

---

[131] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[132] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[133] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.
[134] Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact," 3-6.

sway opinion to convince the people and readership of his servant nature and thus, his desire to convince the populace that his desire is to serve (contexts 6, 9, 11, 15, 20). This provides insight that Nehemiah wanted to be a servant leader, however, the context often prevents him from acting from this leadership style.

Model #2 – Sendjaya Et Al.'s Model of Servant Leadership and Nehemiah

Where other scholars, including Spears (1998) and Liden et al. (2014), tend to dismiss certain core aspects of Greenleaf's (2002) initial ideas of servant leadership, Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora (2008) specifically incorporate Greenleaf's concepts into their model of servant leadership.[135] This especially pertains to Greenleaf's concepts of spirituality and a servant's focus on the marginalized.[136] They find six different dimensions of servant leader behavior consisting of twenty-two servant leader characteristics.[137] Each dimension will be analyzed and discussed with Nehemiah in mind.

The first dimension in Sendjaya et al.'s (2008) model is voluntary subordination.[138] Here, the leader has a willingness to serve regardless of the situation or the type of people in need. This willingness comes from an innate desire and ability to serve first.[139] Nehemiah rarely possesses this attribute. His natural inclination is to lead and make leadership decisions. His intentions are towards serving his people, but his actions in many situations are not servant first but centers on leading for the benefit of the whole. Additionally, his service is contingent not only on the situation at hand, but the type of person he is asked to serve. He is quick to serve the "true" people of Yehud (contexts 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 21), however he is very antagonistic against anyone who opposes his vision (contexts 7, 9, 12, 23, 24, 25).

Sendjaya et al.'s (2008) second dimension interacts with the authentic self as the leader acts in a way that is consistent and authentic to his or her platform.[140] Here, Nehemiah shines

---

[135] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
[136] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27-30.
[137] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
[138] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
[139] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 406.
[140] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 407.

as a servant leader due to his authenticity in every aspect. He is true to his platform, executes leadership actions in direct connection with his morals, values, and goals, and is consistent across contexts in his authenticity (contexts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26).

The third dimension of servant leadership measurement comes in the servant leader's ability to make covenantal relationships.[141] Sendjaya et al. (2008) see servant leaders accepting others for who they are and do not bring emotion into the situation.[142] There is mutual trust created where the welfare of all parties included are sought out and affirmed.[143] Once again, we see Nehemiah faltering with this dimension as it pertains to his followers. Nehemiah brings emotion into most interactions and to most contexts. He sees individuals as either allies or enemies, as God's people or the "other." He rarely creates covenantal relationships with others, and only does so when their values and goals directly align with his.

However, what is interesting here is that Nehemiah does create a strong and vibrant covenantal relationship with God (contexts 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 26). In looking at Sendjaya et al.'s (2008) description of covenantal relationship, Nehemiah generates that form of relationship with God based in mutual trust, where both parties are looking for the best interests of the other, and where there is obedience and partnership lacking negative emotion.[144] It could be inferred that Nehemiah creates covenantal relationships in a socialized sense. The text shows that his relationships with individuals are few, or unimportant to the writer, however, his relationship with the people is bound inextricably in covenant. Nehemiah is in covenantal relationships with the whole of Yehud because they are all bound together in relationship with God as his people. Therefore, as Nehemiah desires the people of Yehud to be in relationship with God, this also allows the people to be in relationship with Nehemiah. Therefore, in this dimension, Nehemiah is not very servant natured based on his relationship with others, however, he is very servant natured in his relationship with God and in covenantal relationship with the people of Yehud as a whole.

---

[141] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
[142] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
[143] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 407.
[144] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.

The fourth dimension of Sendjaya et al.'s (2008) model is responsible morality.[145] Here, both the end results and the methods used to reach success are scrutinized by a strict moral center.[146] A servant leader must have the utmost morals and ideals showing a desire for the welfare of the follower first.[147] While Nehemiah employs a moral code that he believes in, we can see that this moral code comes from values set by God, not necessarily Nehemiah. He substantiates his code of morals through agreement with Torah, divine instruction, and cultural and historical bases providing legitimacy to his moral standards and showing them to be of the highest level. In every context, regardless of leadership style, Nehemiah is dedicated to leading with a high moral code. However, this code comes from his interpretation of Torah and God's will. Therefore, it does not necessarily conform to a modern moral code. For instance, as Nehemiah and the people separate foreigners from the land (context 22), as Nehemiah condemns mixed marriages and excommunicate's members of Yehud (context 25) and goes as far as beating people and pulling out their hair (context 25) modern readers typically find moral issue with Nehemiah's actions and leadership in these contacts. While most of Nehemiah's actions can be agreed upon by modern readers as morally correct, there are several that come into question. What can be said about these actions is that Nehemiah kept to his moral code and never wavered from it.

The fifth dimension, transcendental spirituality, is one that is unique to Sendjaya et al. (2008).[148] This dimension speaks directly with the core values of Greenleaf's (2002) as it interacts with spiritual values necessary for the servant leader.[149] As the servant leader is others focused, they are also other-minded as they interact with spiritual aspects as well.[150] The leader serves the spiritual values present that in turn serves the people indirectly.[151] Therefore, as Nehemiah serves the spiritual values specified by God, he then serves his people by focusing on God and his direction.[152] This is a cornerstone action in Nehemiah's leadership as we see him

---

[145] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
[146] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
[147] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 407.
[148] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
[149] Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 27-30.
[150] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.
[151] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 408.
[152] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 409.

often go to God in prayer for the purpose of gaining direction, and serving God first (contexts 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 26). If we are to take Sendjaya et al.'s (2008) claims as true, then we can conclude that through Nehemiah serving God first, and being attuned to the spiritual values that God presents, he acts as a servant leader to the people of Yehud.[153] Eight times in the text does Nehemiah give a short prayer either before, during, or right after a leadership event. Three of those prayers he asks God to remember him (Nehemiah) for something that he has done or accomplished (Neh 5.19, 13.14, 13.22). Twice he asks God to remember Nehemiah's adversaries and to not let them get away with their actions (Neh 6.14, 13.29). Three times Nehemiah asks God to strengthen (Neh 6.9), help (Neh 2.4), or hear (Neh 4.4-5) him and his people. These short prayers show the nature of transcendental spirituality that Nehemiah enacts in his leadership. In many of his leadership actions, he joins the physical and worldly process with a spiritual act that connects him with God. I believe that this is exactly how Nehemiah substantiates many of his leadership actions and where his servant nature originates. While he might act out in a more charismatic style, his heart and desire is to serve his fellow brothers and sisters, and ultimately to serve God.

The final dimension of Sendjaya et al.'s (2008) model is transforming influence. Sendjaya et al. agree with Greenleaf (2002) that "servant leadership is demonstrated whenever those served by servant leaders are positively transformed in multiple dimensions."[154] This includes physical, emotional, intellectual, social, and spiritual transformation.[155] This transformation occurs on a consistent basis and occurs collectively to the whole of the group.[156] We see aspects of positive transformation in all the dimensions offered to the people of Yehud. Their physical, emotional, intellectual, social, and spiritual lives are all transformed and improved through Nehemiah's leadership. Some aspects of transformation stay the course for some time. For instance, the people of Yehud have been transformed from a helpless, deprived remnant (contexts 1, 5, 6) into a self-functioning, prosperous society (context 13, 18, 20). The law has

---

[153] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 408.
[154] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 408.
[155] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 408.
[156] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 408.

been read and studied and carries with the people of Yehud to some extent into the future (contexts 16, 17, 18, 22).

However, this transformation, in many situations, is short lived. Economic aspects, customs, interaction with immigrants and foreigners, and certain laws of Torah that were transformed by Nehemiah fall by the wayside after his departure. Therefore, what is true transformation? Sendjaya et al.'s (2008) focus is that there is a transforming influence where followers are transformed in multiple dimensions.[157] This is not to say that every follower is transformed in every dimension. Sendjaya et al. (2008) say, "The personal transformation that servant leaders bring about in others occurs collectively and repeatedly, and in turn, stimulates positive changes in organizations and societies."[158] This helps us better understand the notion of transformation and its success. Transformation is not necessarily forever, but instead a process that can be repeated with the goal to produce positive change. In the case of Nehemiah, we see this aspect occur in his repeated attempts to transform the people of Yehud. In the end, the transformation in many aspects was not successful. However, it did produce positive societal change, and thus, can be deemed beneficial.

Another discrepancy occurs in Nehemiah's interpretation of the word "group." To him, it would include those who are the "true" people of God and who are following the statutes outlined by Nehemiah. This likens to the scribe asking Jesus, "And who is my neighbor" (Luke 10.29). The debate on who is neighbor is also alive during Nehemiah's time and we see Nehemiah defining neighbor as one who, in Nehemiah's opinion, obeys the commandments of God and lives a holy life (Exod 20; Lev 19; Ps 15.1-5; Ps 101.1-6; Jer 9.4-6; Isa 1.11-17; Zech 7.8-14). Therefore, Nehemiah can be a servant to his people and act contrary to service towards his enemies or those outside the "people of God."

---

[157] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.
[158] Sendjaya, et al., "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership," 401-408.

Model #3 – Liden Et Al.'s Model of Servant Leadership and Nehemiah

Liden, Meuser, Wayne, Dugan, Komives, Hu, and Panaccio (2014) proposed a three-phase framework for understanding the complex nature of leadership and servant leadership specifically.[159] The three phases are 1) antecedent conditions that must be present for servant leadership to occur, 2) servant leader behaviors that are expressed in most servant leaders, and 3) outcomes that tend to occur due to servant leader behaviors.[160] In the first phase, Liden et al. (2014) found three antecedent conditions of context and culture, leader attributes, and follower receptivity that provides the necessary conditions for servant leadership to be viable.[161] It is first necessary to have the right contextual conditions and the proper culture present for servant leadership to even be possible.[162] The second antecedent focuses on the leader possessing the necessary attributes conducive of service.[163] If the leader does not have the proper disposition and ideals for service then the chances of him or her becoming a servant leader diminished.[164] And the third antecedent requires the proper followership who can receive a servant leader and follow their process.[165]

In looking at Nehemiah's interaction with Liden et al.'s (2014) first phase, it became clear that the necessary antecedents are not present in several contexts, making servant leadership unlikely (contexts 23, 24, 25). However, Liden et al. do not show antecedents as a black and white structure, but instead show the presence of antecedents along a scale where some situations are more conducive to servant leadership whereas others are not. When Nehemiah's opposition is threatening war and mocking the people, Nehemiah does not have the opportunity to be a servant leader, instead, he must act in the defense and protection of his people (context 9). Also, in times where the people disobey God's commandments, Nehemiah chooses not to serve, but to charismatically lead due to the lack of follower receptivity

---

[159] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[160] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[161] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[162] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[163] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[164] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[165] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.

(contexts 23, 24, 25). Therefore, Liden et al.'s antecedents shed light on Nehemiah's actions, explaining the times when he can be a servant, and times when he is not.[166]

The second phase to Liden et al.'s (2014) model is a list of seven behaviors indicative of servant leaders.[167] These include conceptualizing, emotional healing, putting followers first, helping followers grow and succeed, behaving ethically, empowering, and creating value for the community.[168] We first must recognize that Nehemiah only has the option to use these behaviors when the antecedent factors are provided for.[169] Again, several of these behaviors are easily seen in Nehemiah and in the contexts where he uses servant leadership. Conceptualizing, helping followers grow and succeed, creating value for the community, and behaving ethically are all characteristics consistently present in Nehemiah (contexts 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21). Nehemiah's ability to heal emotional wounds is a bit circumspect as his ability to heal tends to be more physical or social and acts upon the general population rather than individually (contexts 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20). Additionally, Nehemiah finds specific situations where he empowers others to lead (contexts 8, 9, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20), but often he chooses to retain the primary voice and source of authority as he acts out of instinct. He empowers others after the wall is completed (context 13), as the law is read (context 16), when the covenant is signed (context 18), when dedicating the wall (context 20), and as well as in situations when Nehemiah delegates power as he prepares to leave Jerusalem (context 21). However, in most contexts, we see Nehemiah keeping the power to himself and working out of his power to achieve a collective vision for a better Yehud.

The third phase of Liden dt al.'s (2014) model provides outcomes as a method of assessing each behavior's level of success.[170] The servant leader is successful if followers begin to perform and grow, if the organization as a whole grows, and if there is a positive social impact.[171] In using these assessment markers, Nehemiah possesses servant leadership abilities and is in fact a servant leader in certain instances in his overall leadership. Individual followers

---

[166] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[167] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[168] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[169] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[170] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.
[171] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.

and the people both grow and develop during Nehemiah's reign (contexts 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18). Additionally, there is a significant societal impact due to Nehemiah's servant behaviors and Yehud as an entity prospers and advances (contexts 8, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21). It is important to recognize that Liden et al.'s (2014) meaning of outcomes must be relegated to the servant leader behaviors performed.[172] For this same outcome criteria can be true of transformational, charismatic, or even transactional methods as well. Also, we must recognize that successful outcomes to Liden et al. (2014) indicate growth and development, not necessarily perfection. Nehemiah can be successful in servant leader outcomes, while at the same time return to Yehud to correct the behaviors of those he led. Therefore, in looking at the specific servant leader behaviors listed by Liden et al. (2014), Nehemiah uses servant leader behaviors to produce positive outcomes in several contexts (contexts 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 21, 26).

Overall Discussion of Nehemiah's Use of Servant Leadership

Analysis finds that Nehemiah uses servant leadership in twelve of the twenty-six contexts (contexts 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 26) including three contexts where servant leadership is the primary leadership style used (contexts 10, 11, 15). Therefore, while not a dominant leadership style in Nehemiah's repertoire, it does find significant use that warrants discussion. When analyzing the text, we find Nehemiah instituting a servant leadership mindset in situations where he is compassionately speaking or acting for his constituency (contexts 2, 10, 11, 15, 21). We see hints of servant leadership in the first phase as Nehemiah is in fact working as a servant (Neh 1.11). There is compassion and a desire to serve his brothers and sisters who are being oppressed in his homeland (contexts 1, 2). We see his servant nature as the poor are being mistreated and Nehemiah has a desire to reach out and serve the least and show that he is a servant leader, unlike his predecessors (contexts 10, 11). Nehemiah is also shown as a servant leader as he contributes to the building fund from his own pocket (context 15). We also see high uses of servant leadership as Nehemiah appoints Temple

---

[172] Liden, et al. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents," 361-362.

personnel with a desire for the people to be served (context 21). Additionally, we see aspects of his servant nature mixed within several other contexts showing that Nehemiah has a desire to be a servant and acts upon those desires when the situation allows (contexts 1, 2, 5, 11, 12, 13, 18, 21, 26).

The situations he faces, however, prevents Nehemiah from acting in a more servant leadership style. Nehemiah encountered opposition (contexts 7, 9, 10, 12, 23, 24, 25), the threat of war (contexts 9, 12), a rigid timeline of building the wall (contexts 8, 13), and a stiff-necked and proud people that forces him to be more charismatic and less servant (contexts 9, 10, 12, 14, 18, 23, 24, 25). This once again shows validation to my premise that Nehemiah assesses the situation and adapts his leadership style to fit the needs of the environment, producing success towards his goals. Nehemiah's chief aim is to find protection — physically, psychologically, socially, and spiritually — for the people of Yehud. His mindset is centered on the people as a whole and not necessarily the individual. We see in many contexts certain requirements hampering his ability to be a transformational leader, and we see once again situations coming into play preventing him to show servant leadership to his fullest desire.

These models presented provide us with a strong vantage point to Nehemiah's leadership. They allow us to conclude that Nehemiah does in fact possess servant leadership qualities in his leadership. In fact, it may very well be that Nehemiah desires most to be a servant leader. It also exposes areas of Nehemiah's leadership that does not involve servant leadership and even situations where his leadership might be contrary to the servant posture. This further shows Nehemiah's using different leadership styles depending on the context presented instead of operating in a singular style of leadership. It also reminds us that Nehemiah is a flawed leader as he fails to act in a more servant nature in certain contexts where the leadership style is available. Overall, Nehemiah is a leader who uses servant leader qualities on occasion but cannot be deemed solely a servant leader.

Nehemiah as an Adaptive Leader

Model #1 – Heifetz's Model of Adaptive Leadership and Nehemiah

In Heifetz's (1994) model, situational challenges generate specific leader behaviors that promote adaptive work in followers.[173] The leader behaviors involved include 1) getting on the balcony, or stepping away from the problem and analyzing the situation, 2) identifying the adaptive challenges, 3) regulating distress, 4) maintaining disciplined attention, 5) delegating work back to the followers, and 6) protecting leadership voices from below.[174] When using this model to analyze Nehemiah's ability to promote adaption in his followers, concern arises as to whether or not Nehemiah leads and instructs others to adapt themselves or if he is more interested in their compliance. Nehemiah certainly has instances where he models and instructs others to adapt. When opposition is palpable while building the wall, Nehemiah models and instructs his workers to adapt their building process by placing a shovel in one hand and a sword in the other (context 9).

We see necessary adaptations throughout the text from a social, political, and religious front. Nehemiah requires the upper class to adapt and give back on loans provided (context 10). Members of Yehud must adapt to who they would marry (contexts 18, 25), how and when they would conduct business (contexts 18, 24), how they would spend their Sabbaths (contexts 18, 24), and the ultimate adaptation with the institution of the version of Torah they possessed becoming their way of life (context 16). Therefore, there are multiple instances of adaptation that Nehemiah requires of the people. However, what is not as clear is whether Nehemiah purposefully prepares the people for that adaptation and if there is a methodical education process that Nehemiah goes through for the people to succeed in their adaptation.[175]

Following Heifetz (1994) model of leadership behavior, Nehemiah does not step back and analyze the situation as a rule of his leadership, but instead tends to make decisions in the moment with the weight of his emotions placed heavily on the situation (context 9, 23, 24, 25).

---

[173] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[174] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[175] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.

The text does show him taking time for serious thought when dealing with oppressed Jews (context 10) as he identifies the adaptive problems that arose and regulated the distress amongst the people (contexts 9, 10, 11 12, 15, 16, 17, 20). Nehemiah crafts the necessary work and the necessary work plans to maintain the disciplined attention required for his workers to continue the work and succeed in their endeavors (contexts 8, 9, 12). There are a few situations where Nehemiah protects leadership voices from below. He does this when appointing successors, other leaders, and Temple personnel to specific roles (contexts 13, 21), and allowing Ezra and the priests to convey the law to the people (context 16, 17). Also, we see Nehemiah protecting the voices of those in dire need as they cannot provide for themselves and voice their needs to the elite and to Nehemiah (context 10). In these examples, we see Nehemiah allowing other voices to enter the leadership arena and present their voice.

However, in situations where there is opposition disobeying the law of God as Nehemiah saw it, we see the voices of the followers silenced and the only voice present being that of God spoken through Nehemiah (contexts 5, 7, 9, 12, 23, 24, 25). Therefore, looking at Heifetz's (1994) model, we see some places where Nehemiah acts as an adaptive leader and others where he does not. Nehemiah's adaptive leadership is shown when he departs for Susa and his followers continue to read the law of God and adapt to what it says and separate themselves from foreigners (context 22). Here, it is obvious that Nehemiah models and instructs them in adaptive behaviors as they alter their principles and change the status quo.[176] Overall, Nehemiah varies in his ability to use adaptive leadership. This once again strengthens the case that Nehemiah adapts his own leadership styles to the situation at hand and therefore used adaptive leadership sparingly when the situation demands it.

Model #2 – Glover Et Al.'s Model of Adaptive Leadership and Nehemiah

Glover, Friedman, and Jones (2002) created a model of adaptive leadership that desires to show how adaptive leaders can change and become more adaptive in their leadership.[177]

---

[176] Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers*, 13-28.
[177] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.

They recognize that "coping with change has become a constant challenge for contemporary leaders."[178] This model can be used to describe leadership processes where leaders train followers on how to adapt. The model works on two axes of assimilation and accommodation that provide four scenarios based on the follower's level of assimilation and accommodation. Assimilation refers to a person's ability to take in information and use pre-learned structures to attach meaning to the information received.[179] Accommodation refers to a person's internal change in a belief, idea, or attitude that requires a person to adapt to new experiences in new situations they are presented with.[180] This creates four possible situations of leadership that a leader can experience:

1. Maladaptive culture traps – Low assimilation and low accommodation
2. Leading change by chance – High assimilation and low accommodation
3. Serendipity – Low assimilation and high accommodation
4. Maximum adaptive potential – High assimilation and high accommodation[181]

This model can be used to discern the different adaptive situations that Nehemiah is in and whether that situation provides an adequate environment for Nehemiah to lead others to adapt themselves. The first scenario finds the leader and followers in a maladaptive culture trap.[182] Here, the situation prevents adaption to occur due to certain societal norms, cultural limitations, apathy to change, or corrupt environments where change is avoided to keep the status quo. Here, leaders and followers do not have the ability to assimilate new information and there is little accommodation of new thoughts or ideas. In this situation, leaders do not have the ability to adapt and create change. From Nehemiah's perspective, he sees his adversaries in a maladaptive culture trap. They are unwilling to recognize the changes needed to provide security, prosperity, and God's covering. We see these maladaptive culture traps in contexts where Nehemiah's enemies are threatening or talking about Nehemiah and his followers (contexts 4, 7, 9, 12). We also see the presence of these traps in Nehemiah's followers when they disobey the decrees of Nehemiah. Here, once again in Nehemiah's opinion, the

---

[178] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 15.
[179] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.
[180] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.
[181] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.
[182] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.

people of Yehud are unwilling to adapt to a better way of life and desire comfort, possession, and privilege (contexts 10, 23, 24, 25). In these contexts, Nehemiah is unable to use adaptive leadership and therefore, resorts to other leadership styles that gain success.

The second scenario, leading change by chance, is a process of natural selection where leaders take in information and collect data, but either choose not to use the information to change, are unable to change due to a limitation, or fail to take the adaptive steps required for change to occur.[183] The reverse is true in the third scenario, serendipity, where leaders desire to adapt at all times, but lack the information and data to know how to adapt or what they need in order for adaption to occur.[184] Both scenarios do not produce good environments for adaptive leadership and are not seen in the contexts of Nehemiah. This is primarily because Nehemiah would not choose an adaptive leadership strategy if he did not have correct information or did not have a need to cause adaptation to occur in his followers. He would choose another leadership style that is more effective in those specific contexts.

The fourth and final scenario, maximum adaptive potential, provides the best environment for adaptive leadership to occur.[185] Here, the leader possesses the required information to make an informed decision about how to cause their followers to adapt and change as the situation requires.[186] This is seen in five contexts in Nehemiah's leadership (contexts 2, 9, 10, 19, 22). While it is never the primary leadership style used, in each, there is a need for followers to adapt and therefore, Nehemiah implements adaptive strategies to help his followers succeed.

In context 9, we see the building process come under ridicule and potential attack from Nehemiah's enemies. Morale decreases, the threat of violence is real, and the workers are forced to adapt to the situation at hand. Nehemiah provides the charismatic leadership necessary to thwart any attack and boost morale, but he also needs to create a change in mindset with his followers. Here, we see the maximum adaptive potential where Nehemiah has assimilated the needed information about his enemies and has made accommodations that will

---

[183] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.
[184] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.
[185] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.
[186] Glover, et al., "Adaptive Leadership," 23-26.

protect his people and allow workers to change their processes and procedures to effect change and success (context 9).

In context 10, we see another adaptive situation where the wealthier people of Yehud are oppressing their own brothers and sisters. Here, Nehemiah once again assimilates the necessary information to make an informed decision and provides the necessary accommodations for his followers to change their actions to provide security and prosperity for those in need. What is also important in this context is that Nehemiah also is required to adapt as he is one exacting interests on his loans. Therefore, he acts as leader and follower in this situation (context 10).

In context 19, we see the necessity for the people of Yehud to adapt as ten percent of the population must relocated to Jerusalem. While Nehemiah's presence is not mentioned, the same process occurs. Information concerning the numbers needed to populate Jerusalem are procured and steps are made to accommodate the needs of the city. The followers are informed, and they adapt to that need (context 19).

Lastly, in context 22, the people of Yehud realize that they have been breaking Torah by intermixing with Ammonites and Moabites. They take this assimilated information and make accommodations to rectify the problem. Therefore, adaptive leadership is produced, and the people change to fit the needs of the law. Nehemiah is not mentioned, but once again, this process is adaptive in nature.

Model #3 – Uhl-Bien Et Al.'s Complexity Leadership Model and Nehemiah

The preceding two models center on adaptive leadership where the leader provides an environment and aids his or her followers in the process of adapting to new situations and challenges. However, it is also important to analyze how Nehemiah adapts to different situations and challenges. Therefore, a model of complexity leadership is needed that focuses on the adaptive nature of the leader. Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey (2007) produced a complexity leadership model that analyzes what leaders do in tense and challenging situations

and how they adapt to relieve the tension and solve the challenge.[187] In this model, three potential leadership situations are possible: 1) Adaptive situations involving tense and demanding challenges that require the leader to adapt to solve the problem. 2) Administrative situations where regular managerial issues require normalized and understood solutions. 3) Enabling situations allowing adaptive solutions to work within administrative groups where complex situations and solutions can be performed from an administrative position.[188] Adaptive leaders use a series of contexts and mechanisms to help alleviate the tense environment and work towards a solution of the complex problem.[189]

Before interacting with the different contexts where Nehemiah uses complexity leadership to mitigate a complex problem, it is important to distinguish between adaptive leadership processes and leadership where the leader takes the situation and alters his or her strategy to fit the needs of the context. Nehemiah, and most effective leaders, are proficient at adapting to the situation and being able to change their methods, actions, or procedure so that they can be effective in different situations. Nehemiah does this in all aspects of his leadership, and it is this form of adaption that I use as the center of my thesis. However, this complexity model, and adaptive leadership theory, seeks to show complex systems and situations that require the leader to use adaptive measures to find solutions, not just to adapt to a new leadership style or procedure.

The situation in Yehud is complex and is entangled with adaptive and administrative complications that require enabling leadership. There are complex networks of interaction as there are multiple leaders, cultures, and situations present. We see multiple groups and individuals including Nehemiah, the leaders of Yehud, and Sanballat and his supporters, just to name a few, all jockeying for power and authority in an area that has gone through significant change and crisis where everyone wants to give their opinion as to the solution required. There are complex patterns of constraints that prevent Nehemiah from easily solving the problem. There is a growing list of opponents to Nehemiah's vision, there are construction requirements that take people away from their livelihoods, there are religious limitations placed on the

---

[187] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 305-308.
[188] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 305-308.
[189] Uhl-Bien, et al., "Complexity Leadership Theory," 305-308.

people of Yehud by God, all creating the complex pattern in which Nehemiah must navigate. There are emotional, economic, and ethnic tensions, to name a few, that further complicate the situation. Also, there are independent relationships between different leaders, such as Nehemiah and Sanballat, that compete for authority and superiority. There are rules and procedures that must be addressed even before Nehemiah can hope to help the situation in Yehud. And there are rapidly changing environmental demands that make the situation convoluted and ever-changing.

These contextual issues produce a complicated and complex problem that requires specific mechanisms of adaptive leadership to solve. First, Nehemiah must use resonance to bring together tools that can work together to solve complex situations. Here, Nehemiah's presence in Yehud as a leader causes resonance as he is an authority figure from Persia who comes with soldiers, materials, and a vision to restore Yehud. Second, catalytic behaviors are required that can cause action to occur. This is seen in Nehemiah risking everything to present his request to the king and ask for help (context 3). His charismatic speech acts as a catalyst to inspire and motivate his followers (context 6).

Nehemiah also needs to use stable and unstable behaviors to achieve certain goals and to solve complex problems. We see many examples of stable and unstable behaviors that work to solve the complex vision that Nehemiah has for Yehud. Nehemiah brings the leaders together to unite them under a common cause (context 6). He brings stability in adapting the building project to interact with the workload and threat of attack (contexts 8, 9, 12). Nehemiah unconventionally places blame on himself, holds himself accountable for his actions, and gives freely to the people of Yehud (contexts 9, 10, 11, 13). We witness very unorthodox behavior, at least from a modern context, when Nehemiah beats and pulls the hair out of some of Yehud's citizens (context 25). His charismatic leadership helps in these situations as unorthodox methods are used to create solutions (contexts 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25).

Transition of leadership is another mechanism used to solve complex problems. We see this take place with the appointment of Nehemiah as governor of Yehud. This causes a stir in the leadership process of Yehud that helps to unravel complex problems. This is seen again as Nehemiah appoints specific individuals to carry out roles and responsibilities in the teaching

and governing of the people of Yehud (contexts 8, 14, 16, 21). Therefore, delegating responsibility helps to alleviate the complex situation in Yehud.

Finally, information flow and pattern formation are other mechanisms that can be used to stabilize tense and volatile situations. Nehemiah creates information flow and organized patterns to create a stabilized society in Yehud (contexts 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25). All these mechanisms work in unison so that complex issues and situations can be solved.

While the situation overall in Yehud is a complicated system that requires complexity leadership processes, we can see specific acts of complexity leadership in Nehemiah in specific contexts. We see Nehemiah having to take in the complex situation in context 1 and decide to be an instrument of change as the one who will interact with the complex problem (context 1). We also see complexity leadership being used in context 4 as Nehemiah must adapt to different situations to procure the necessary materials to allow his vision to be possible (context 4). Also, we see Nehemiah's adaptive needs as he inspects the wall without communication as he arrives in Yehud for the first time and fully understands the complex problem set before him (context 5).

Overall Discussion of Nehemiah's Use of Adaptive Leadership

I have often portrayed Nehemiah as a leader who adapts his behavior depending on the needs of the situation. It is important to distinguish this analysis from adaptive or complexity leadership theory as there are three separate concepts involved. In adaptive leadership theory, it is not the leader who is adapting, but it is the follower who learns to adapt from the leader's tutelage.[190] In complexity leadership theory, we see a need for the leader to adapt to specific complex environments that cannot be solved with simple solutions and normal leadership behaviors. And then we witness the basic adaptive process that occurs in leadership where leaders adapt and change to situations to be successful in a variety of environments and situations. We see Nehemiah using all three types of adaptions in his leadership in Yehud. He

---

[190] Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 257-258.

uses adaptive leadership when he needs to help his followers change and adapt to new situations. He uses complexity leadership when he needs to adapt to solve complex and difficult situations. And he constantly adapts to each new situation and context of leadership by changing his style of leadership to best effect the situation at hand and lead in a way that brings his vision to fruition and his goals achieved.

Overall Conclusions & Final Thoughts

One voice can change a room. And if one voice can change a room, then it can change a city. And if it can change a city, it can change a state. And if it can change a state, it can change a nation. And if it can change a nation, it can change the world. Your voice can change the world.[1]

- Barack Obama

Final Conclusions on Nehemiah's Leadership

This thesis includes an investigation into the context in which Nehemiah entered, an examination of the different facets of leadership studies and the wealth of knowledge that it presents, a leadership commentary on the text of Nehemiah, and an analysis of the different leadership styles that Nehemiah employs and their effect on the outcome of Yehud's social, political, and religious atmosphere during Nehemiah's leadership. Beginning with the idea that Nehemiah is a strong leader imbued with the gifts and talents required to come to Yehud, build a wall, and bring the people back to God, we see a shift in understanding that finds a much more complex and diversified leadership campaign as Nehemiah can adapt his leadership style to the varying situations presented. Nehemiah is a dynamic and versatile leader who alters his leadership style with fluidity to accomplish his overall goal of securing the Jewish people through a physical wall, while altering their social, political, and religious construct towards a platform that allows the opportunity to obey once again, in Nehemiah's view, the commandments of God and live as God's people. Nehemiah becomes a leader who does not rely on one specific leadership style, but instead, adapts his style to properly contend with the situation at hand.[2]

---

[1] Barack Obama, "One Voice Can Change a Room – Obama," Speech, Columbia, SC, December 9, 2007. https://youtu.be/sRqLRLI0q4g.

[2] Thomas, et al., "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts," 99.

Primarily a charismatic leader, Nehemiah steps into crisis upon the authority of divine and royal decree as the leader of Yehud. He brings with him extraordinary abilities to cast his vision of Yehud, and then execute that vision through capturing the hearts and minds of his followers to work together achieving the vision set forth. When charisma is not the most efficient or useful style of leadership, Nehemiah alters his leadership style and switches into different modes of leadership. When it is necessary for Nehemiah to transform his followers into the appropriate future leaders necessary to continue his vision, Nehemiah becomes a transformational leader. When it is available for Nehemiah to serve his fellow countrymen from a position as servant, Nehemiah becomes a servant leader. When transactional tasks are needed to achieve a goal, Nehemiah steps in as a path-goal leader to help his followers create an efficient and less stressful path towards success. When authenticity is required that expresses the morals and ideologies of God's people, Nehemiah uses authentic leadership. And when Nehemiah needs his followers, and in several situations, himself, to adapt to changing situations and make hard choices in difficult environments, Nehemiah uses adaptive or complexity leadership to find success. Nehemiah can engage with the God-given attributes he possesses to interact with the different contexts presented in the text. And in engaging the context with his specific attributes, we see a leader fully himself, acting from a position of confidence and authority, unwavering in his vision, and secure in his identity.[3]

Nehemiah recognizes the necessities of the people of Yehud and leads in a way that provides for their needs of the people, while also creating structures that helps secure their loyalty. Nehemiah recognizes that for success to occur, the people of Yehud's physical safety must be solidified. The building of the wall presents a physical barrier from their enemies, while finding closure to captivity and freedom from shame, God's wrath, and any outside pressure (contexts 8, 9, 12, 13). With the wall constructed, Nehemiah begins to navigate through the people's beliefs, customs, and lifestyles with the intention of bringing the people back into alignment with God (contexts 14, 16, 18, 19, 20). This occurs through the leader controlling the education of the people to control their thoughts and actions (contexts 16).[4] Through Ezra

---

[3] Huizing, "Bringing Christ," 65.
[4] T. Takala, "Plato on Leadership," *J Bus Ethics* 17, no. 7(1998): 793-796.

reading and teaching the law of God, Nehemiah succeeds in controlling the pathway of education for the people to realize their need for God and to solidify their obedience and compliance.

When looking at Nehemiah's success, the initial accurate claim is that Nehemiah is a successful leader. He builds and completes the wall around Jerusalem which he said he would do. He restores, albeit temporarily, the social, political, and religious order in Jerusalem and in the surrounding region. He brings prosperity, harmony, and rest to the land and its people that the captivity took away. When crisis arises, Nehemiah leaps into action and solves the problem facing him and his people.[5] Ultimately, Nehemiah is successful at unifying the people, with their enemies understood as the "other," all moving towards a collective goal of rebuilding Jerusalem physically, economically, socially, and religiously.

However, Nehemiah is not a perfect leader. In his dependence on God's direction, coupled with his human nature, he is flawed in his execution of leadership. No leader in the Bible is a perfect leader, nor should anyone think that. For it is not the image of perfection that holds the only potential to help us grow and develop into better versions of ourselves. But it is also the examples of a leader's flaws and failures that can help us understand the human condition, recognize the shortcomings of others, and then learn from their mistakes to further the journey of personal improvement. We see acts of extraordinary leadership in Nehemiah, but we are also given his shortcomings, some of his impulses, and ultimately his failures.[6] We see that everything does not turn out to be perfect, the story does not find a happy ending, and as Malachi picks up the story, we see Yehud once again falling from its graces (Mal 1.2,6-14; 2.11, 17; 3.8, 13).[7] And what is most important to understand is that the presence of an imperfect ending provides more hope for us than that of a perfect one. It represents a reality that if the people of God are not perfect, and God still pursues them, cares for them, instructs them, and takes them as his own people, then that provides greater hope for us, confidence in our relationship to the divine, and resolve in our ability to lead.

---

[5] Stanley, "Charismatic Leadership in Ancient Israel," 148.
[6] Schnittjer, "The Bad Ending of Ezra-Nehemiah," 40.
[7] Schnittjer, "The Bad Ending of Ezra-Nehemiah," 46.

The message given in Nehemiah does not represent a perfect leader, who acts perfectly, and who creates a fully sustainable and perfect situation. Instead, it shows the reality and difficulty of this world that future leaders must also interact with as they take up the call of leadership, put their hearts and energy into an endeavor, and attempt to make the world a better place. The story reminds us that God uses flawed individuals with specific leadership skills to change and mold the world. And even though his chosen people turn their backs on him, he continues to use them for his purposes.[8] And this is the success of the text of Nehemiah, represented in an imperfect, but passionate leader.

Nehemiah finds success through his shortcomings and his failures by having the capacity to adapt to his surroundings and effect change. He uses a variety of styles of leadership to implement the vision that he receives from God and brings the people of God to that vision. His purpose finds success, his vision is shared and embraced, and his legacy is solidified as Yehud, with Jerusalem as its center, survives and thrives into the future.

Benefits & Contributions to Scholarship & Future Implications

This thesis provides many benefits and contributions to scholarship. Specific concepts already introduced in scholarship are embraced and expanded upon. The concept of leadership studies is introduced to the world of biblical leadership and a conversation is had, perhaps for the first time, that will hopefully usher in a new era of relationship between the two disciplines bringing insight, research, and revelation to both. Areas of academic discipline are expanded, and new processes are introduced, providing valuable discussion benefiting both biblical studies and leadership studies. Hopefully, leadership theory will no longer be absent from journal articles surrounding biblical leadership. Additionally, it is hoped that research into leadership theory and examples of leadership will no longer be void of biblical examples that can aid in the overall understanding of leadership.[9] Overall, this body of work provides avenues

---

[8] Schnittjer, "The Bad Ending of Ezra-Nehemiah," 55.
[9] Ali Aslan Gümüsay, "Embracing Religions in Moral Theories of Leadership," *Acad Manag Perspect* 33, no. 3 (2019): 293.

for the two disciplines to begin to speak and collaborate to produce more robust research that will bring deeper conclusions to the world.

Specifically, there are three core contributions that this thesis offers academia and society in general. The first contribution to scholarship in this thesis includes an extension of Thomas, Hebdon, Novicevic, and Hayek's (2015) work of dividing an ancient text into specific contexts and then using those contexts to analyze the use of different leadership styles. The work of Thomas et al. (2015) provides a starting point for a new process for analyzing biblical leaders using leadership theory. However, their model is not descriptive enough and does not divide the biblical text into focused contexts where individual leadership acts can be analyzed. Therefore, this thesis continues their work by dividing the text into different phases, or different scenes of scripture with different settings, and then divides those phases into focused contexts that can be individually analyzed. This allows for a biblical leader's style of leadership to be analyzed on a context-by-context basis to ascertain overall leadership pathways. Additionally, this thesis expands the reach of Thomas et al.'s work by evaluating six theories of leadership and employing three models of each leadership theory to better evaluate the leadership of Nehemiah.

The second contribution to scholarship from this thesis is the construction of a leadership commentary on the book of Nehemiah. Each context is described and analyzed for leadership attributes to understand Nehemiah's leadership and his ability to adapt to different contexts using different leadership styles. To my knowledge, there has never been a commentary produced with the specific intention of analyzing the leadership of a biblical character using leadership studies. As a pioneering attempt, success is found in being able to produce a leadership commentary of Nehemiah and the information produced will be beneficial to the biblical studies community.

However, this process is also challenging in several ways. First, it is difficult to create a methodology that produces a holistic analysis of Nehemiah's leadership for each context. As each context is different, thus making Nehemiah's leadership within each context different, it is difficult to use the same analysis structure for each context. Second, working with an ancient text is challenging in several ways. Modern leadership studies has the advantage of interacting

with living people and therefore, can use multiple tools to grasp a better picture of the individual's leadership. This is not possible using an ancient text, and therefore, there are limitations to the analysis that can be produced. Additionally, the text has a specific agenda and point-of-view that must be considered. Having only one vantage point does not allow for a full analysis of leadership. We do not have the ability to witness other opinions or perspectives of the leadership events that take place in an ancient document to gain a full understanding of Nehemiah's leadership. There are also textual issues that cause challenges including multiple editions of the text, lost segments, and debate concerning the translation and interpretation of the text. The text of Nehemiah also has first person and third person writing that brings in the question of multiple authors. While I stated that I would be using the final form of the text in an English translation, it still is difficult to move through these discrepancies to analyze Nehemiah's leadership.

The third challenge comes when Nehemiah is not present in the text and his leadership is either delegated, or his presence is not mentioned. This proves challenging as I must wrestle with whether Nehemiah is still leading, if he has delegated his leadership to others but is still present in a supervisory role, or if he is absent altogether. These challenges are typical from an ancient text and produces limitations to the depth of analysis that can be performed on biblical leadership.

However, the benefits of analysis outstretch the challenges as conclusions can be made about the leadership of Nehemiah and the model presented offers a starting point to develop empirical processes that can further analyze Nehemiah's leadership. In the future, this process should be replicated and used on other biblical leaders to produce an anthology of research on biblical leadership.

The third contribution to scholarship from this thesis includes a discussion of six leadership styles used to analyze the leadership of Nehemiah. These styles include path-goal, transformational, charismatic, authentic, servant, and adaptive leadership. This allows a deeper discussion of how Nehemiah uses a specific style of leadership effectively and evaluates why Nehemiah is shown as a specific type of leader in certain contexts. There are challenges and limitations to this process as well. First, the wealth of knowledge and study from leadership

studies presents an overwhelming choice of theories and models of different leadership styles. There are many more leadership theories than the six chosen that could be used to analyze the leadership of Nehemiah. Also, new theories of leadership are emerging that can also be used in the future to analyze biblical leadership. Therefore, the process of choosing which leadership styles to use to analyze Nehemiah is difficult. In the end, I chose these six due to 1) their popularity in leadership studies, 2) their high levels of empirical study that have been performed on these theories, and 3) their potential to be used to analyze Nehemiah specifically. Another challenge came in selecting the different models within each theory to use to analyze Nehemiah. Once again, there are multiple models available and choosing which models to use proved difficult. I wanted to provide as much of a holistic view of the leadership theory as I could in the three models selected. However, by selecting only certain models, I found that I was limited in my analysis of Nehemiah as I was confined to the structure, focus, and methods of those models.

Again, the leadership information gathered far outweighs the challenges and limitations produced from my selection of theories and models. This thesis is an excellent testing ground to see if this method is viable. I believe it is and the challenges will aid in the future as new models and theories arise in the discipline that can provide further analysis of Nehemiah's leadership and biblical leadership altogether.

This is an investigative thesis where new models are created to test the viability of studying Nehemiah's leadership using leadership studies. The next step in the process of analyzing Nehemiah's leadership will be to include empirical experiment and coding structures to create a verified list of terms ascribed to each leadership theory and then to code each context to ascertain the extent to which each leadership theory is used in each context. This future work will further extend the knowledge and understanding of Nehemiah's leadership. The future implications of this process are significant as it will bring concrete leadership theory into the field of biblical studies and provide definitive markers to conclusions about biblical leadership. Other future ventures can include a leadership commentary series where different biblical leaders are evaluated through leadership studies using the same parameters of this thesis, coupled with the coding structures that will be put in place to better analyze Nehemiah's

leadership. This series not only would provide deeper understanding of each biblical leader and his or her leadership but could be combined to produce an overall understanding of biblical leadership that would better represent a holistic look of how leadership is portrayed in the Bible. Another future implication that can come from this thesis would be a leadership symposium where scholars who are experts on different biblical leaders could collaborate with scholars from leadership studies and create methods and processes to better analyze biblical leaders, ancient leaders, and can create pathways to analyze modern leaders to generate constructs for leadership training, leadership development, and leadership engagement with multiple spheres of modern society.

As a potential future direction, this thesis creates a conduit to which biblical studies and leadership studies can begin to communicate. The potential developed from this thesis is extremely potent as biblical studies can benefit from using the lens of leadership studies to analyze the biblical text and come to concrete conclusions more accurately. Likewise, leadership studies can benefit from including biblical studies into its collection of disciplines as they see the value that biblical studies brings to their overall scholarship. By including biblical examples of leadership, the field of leadership studies is strengthened and more holistically represented. This is a pioneer study into how the two disciplines can be use by each other and hopefully will produce an introduction so that scholars from the two disciplines can continue, or start, a conversation, generating a relationship for decades to come.

There is much to learn about Nehemiah and his leadership. This thesis provides an avenue in which Nehemiah is brought to light and discussed in an arena that allows deeper understanding of the context of Yehud in which Nehemiah leads. More concrete discussion and conclusions are produced about Nehemiah's overall leadership through the inclusion of leadership theory and methodology, and in the end, we gain richer meaning to the person of Nehemiah, his legacy, and the future that he produced in Yehud. The future is looking bright for analysis of biblical leadership as the path of Nehemiah has been traveled, the journey experienced, and now a new path lays before us to continue the journey of discovering biblical leadership and what it has to offer.

Bibliography

Adams, Samuel L. *Social and Economic Life in Second Temple Judea*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014.

Alatawi, Massad Awdah. "The Myth of the Additive Effect of the Transformational Leadership Model." *Contemporary Management Research* 13, no. 1 (2017): 19-30.

Albertz, Ranier. *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period Volume II: From the Exile to the Maccabees.* Translated by John Bowden. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.

Allen, William E. "Leadership Theory: A Different Conceptual Approach." *Journal of Leadership Education* (April 2018): 149-161.

Angelou, Maya. *Letter to My Daughter*. New York, NY: Random House, 2008.

Antonakis, John and Robert J. House. "The Full-Range Leadership Theory: The Way Forward." In *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead.* Vol. 2. Edited by Bruce J. Avolio and Francis J. Yammarino, 3-33. *Monographs in Leadership and Management*. Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2008.

Arthurs, Jeffery and Gregory MaGee. *Ephesians: A Commentary for Biblical Preaching and Teaching*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2021.

Athanasopoulou, Andromachi and Sue Dopson. "Leadership Theories and Their Links to EC." In *Developing Leaders by Executive Coaching: Practice and Evidence*, 117-142. 1st ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Avolio, Bruce J. and Bernard M. Bass, eds. *Developing Potential Across A Full Range of Leadership.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, Associates, 2002.

Avolio, Bruce J., William L. Gardner, Fred O. Walumbwa, Fred Luthans, and Douglas R. May. "Unlocking the Mask: A Look at the Process by which Authentic Leaders Impact Follower Attitudes and Behaviors." *Leadership Quarterly* 15 (2004): 801-823.

Avolio, Bruce J., W.L. Gardner, and F.O. Walumbwa. *Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ).* Palo Alto, CA: Mindgarden, 2007.

Barber, Cyril J. *Nehemiah and the Dynamics of Effective Leadership.* Neptune, NJ: Lorizeaux Brothers, 1991.

Bass, Bernard M. and Bruce J. Avolio, eds. *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1994.

Bass, Bernard M. and Ronald E. Riggio. *Transformational Leadership*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge, 2014.

Bass, Bernard M. *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*. 3rd ed. New York, NY: The Free Press, 1990.

Bass, Bernard M. "Two Decades of Research and Development in Transformational Leadership." *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 8, no. 1 (1999): 9-32.

Batten, Loring W. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The International Critical Commentary*. Edinburgh, UK: T & T Clark, 1913.

Beecher, Willis J. "The Postexilic History of Israel. V: The Reform Under Ezra and Nehemiah." *The Old and New Testament Student* 9, no. 5 (1889): 291-297.

Bennis, Warren G. and Burt Nanus. *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York, NY: HarperBusiness Essentials, 2007.

Bennis, Warren G. "The Challenges of Leadership in the Modern World: Introduction to the Special Issue." *American Psychologist* 62, no. 1 (2007): 2–5.

Billsberry, Jon. "Teaching Leadership from a Social Constructionist Perspective." *Journal of Management & Organization* 19, no. 6 (2013): 679-688.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Leadership in the Hebrew Bible." *The Review of Politics* 47, no. 2 (1985): 312-313.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "The Mission of Udjahorresnet and Those of Ezra and Nehemiah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106, no. 3 (1987): 409-421.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited by John B. Thompson. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Bowser, Mark. *Nehemiah on Leadership*. Issaquah, WA: Made For Success Publishing, 2014.

Breuer, Edward. "Particularity and Pluralism: Judaism and the 'Other' in an Age of Dialogue." *Religious Education* 90, no. 2 (Spring 1995): 277-285.

Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Gravesboro, CA: Snowball Publishing, 2010.

Brown, Gregory. "Nehemiah: Becoming a Godly Leader The Bible Teacher's Guide." Self-Published: BG Publishing, 2015.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Ethnicity Without Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Bryman, Alan. *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations*. London, UK: Sage Publications, 1993.

Burns, James MacGregor. *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial Political Classics, 2010.

Carlyle, Thomas. *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and The Heroic in History.* Whithorn, UK: Anodos Books, 2019.

Cataldo, Jeremiah W. "The Other: Sociological Perspectives in a Postcolonial Age." In *Imagining the Other and Constructing Israelite Identity in the Early Second Temple Period*. Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana V. Edelman, 1-19. *Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies*. London, UK: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016.

Ciulla, Joanne B. "Handmaiden and Queen: What Philosophers Find in the Question: 'What is a Leader?'" In *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*. Edited by Michael Harvey and Ronald E. Riggio, 54-65. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2011.

Conger, Jay A. and Rabindra N. Kanungo. *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2003.

Conger, Jay A. and Rabindra N. Kanungo. "The Empowerment Process: Integrating Theory and Practice." *Academy of Management Review* 13, no. 3 (1988): 471-482.

Conger, Jay A. and Rabindra N. Kanungo. "Towards a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings." *Academy of Management Review* 12 (1987): 637-647.

Conger, Jay A. *The Charismatic Leader: Behind the Mystique of Exceptional Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1989.

Cottle, Ron. *Studies in Nehemiah*. Columbus, GA: Christian Life Publications, 1997.

Couto, Richard A. "Dear Publius: Reflections on the Founding Fathers and Charismatic Leadership." In *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead.* Vol. 2. Edited by Bruce J. Avolio and Francis J. Yammarino, 95-108. *Monographs in Leadership and Management*. Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2008.

Cunningham, Carolyn M., Michael Hazel, and Tracey J. Hayes. "Communication and Leadership 2020: Intersectional, Mindful, and Digital." *Communication Research Trends* 39, no. 1 (2020): 4-31.

Czovek, Tamas. "Three Charismatic Leaders: Part Three: Solomon." *Transformation* 19, no. 4 (2002): 248-259.

Davies, Gordon F. *Berit Olam Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry: Ezra and Nehemiah*. Edited by David W. Cotter. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999.

Dent, E.B., M.E. Higgins, & D.M. Wharff. "Spirituality and Leadership: An Empirical Review of Definitions, Distinctions, and Embedded Assumptions." *Leadership Quarterly* 16, no. 5 (2005): 625–653.

Dierendonck, Dirk van and I. Nuijten. "The Servant Leadership Survey: Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Measure." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 26 (2011): 249-267.

Dinh, J.E., R.G. Lord, W.L. Gardner, J.D. Meuser, R.C. Liden, & J. Hu. "Leadership Theory and Research in the New Millennium: Current Theoretical Trends and Changing Perspectives." *Leadership Quarterly* 25, no. 1 (2014): 36–62.

Dumdum, Uldarico Rex, Kevin B. Lowe, and Bruce J. Avolio. "A Meta-Analysis of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction: An Update and Extension." In *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead.* Vol. 2. Edited by Bruce J. Avolio and Francis J. Yammarino, 35–66. *Monographs in Leadership and Management*. Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2008.

Eagly, A.H. "Achieving Relational Authenticity in Leadership: Does Gender Matter?" *Leadership Quarterly* 16 (2005): 459-474.

Eatwell, Roger. "The Concept and Theory of Charismatic Leadership." *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 7, no. 2 (2006): 141-156.

Edelman, Diana V. *The Origins of the Second Temple: Persian Imperial Policy and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem*. London, UK: Routledge, 2014.

Eeden, Rene van, Frans Cilliers, and Vasi van Deventer. "Leadership Styles and Associated Personality Traits: Support for the Conceptualization of Transactional and Transformational Leadership." *South African Journal of Psychology* 38, no. 2 (2008): 253-267.

Eisenbeiß, Silke Astrid and Sabine Boerner. "A Double-Edged Sword: Transformational Leadership and Individual Creativity." *British Journal of Management* 24, no. 1 (2013): 54-68.

Ellis, Patterson Dwyer. "Contrasting Jesus' Leadership Style with that of Selected Old Testament Prophets, Pre-Christian Leaders, and His Contemporaries." PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1994.

Eskenazi, Tamara Cohn. "Imaging the Other in the Construction of Judahite Identity in Ezra-Nehemiah." In *Imagining the Other and Constructing Israelite Identity in the Early Second Temple Period*. Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana V. Edelman, 230-256. *Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies*. London, UK: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016.

Eskenazi, Tamara Cohn. *In an Age of Prose: A Literary Approach to Ezra-Nehemiah*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988.

Fabian, Johannes. "Presence and Representation: The Other and Anthropological Writing." *Critical Inquiry* 16, no. 4 (Summer, 1990): 753-772.

Fiedler, F.E. "The Effects of Leadership Training and Experience: A Contingency Model Interpretation." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17, no. 4 (1972): 453-470.

Fitzpatrick-McKinley, Anne. "Models of Local Political Leadership in the Nehemiah Memoir." In *Leadership, Social Memory, and Judean Discourse in the Fifth-Second Centuries BCE*. Edited by Diana V. Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi, 165-200. Bristol, CT: Equinox Publishing, 2016.

Fitzsimons, Stephen. "The Leadership Styles of the Persian Kings in Herodotus' *Histories*." PhD diss., University of Manchester, 2017.

Flusser, David. *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*. Vol. 2. Translated by Azzan Yadin. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2020.

Foley, Michael. "Doing Leadership: Types, Styles, and Contingency." In *Political Leadership: Themes, Contexts, and Critiques*, 31-58. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Foucault, Michel. "Afterword: The Subject and Power." In *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Edited by H. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow, 208-228. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press, 1983.

Fretheim, Terence E. "8505 שָׂכַל." In *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis*. Vol. 3. Edited by Willem A. VanGemeren, 1243. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1997.

Fryer, Mick. "A Review of the Leadership Literature." In *Ethics and Organizational Leadership: Developing a Normative Model*, 13-33. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Glover, Jerry, Harris Friedman, and Gordon Jones. "Adaptive Leadership: When Change is Not Enough (Part One)." *Organization Development Journal* 20, no. 2 (2002): 15-32.

Grabbe, Lester L. *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. *Vol. 1. Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah.* New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2006.

Grabbe, Lester L. *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2007.

Grabbe, Lester L. *Ezra-Nehemiah*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 1998.

Greenleaf, Robert K. *Servant Leadership: A Journey Into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness.* New York, NY: Paulist Press, 2002.

Gümüsay, Ali Aslan. "Embracing Religions in Moral Theories of Leadership. *Academy of Management Perspectives* 33, no. 3 (2019): 292-306.

Hannaford, Ivan. *Race: The History of an Idea in the West.* Washington, DC/Baltimore, MD: Woodrow Wilson Center/John Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Harvey, Michael. "Questioning Leadership: An Integrative Model." In *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*. Edited by Michael Harvey and Ronald E. Riggio, 199-230. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2011.

Haslam, S. Alexander, Stephen D. Reicher, and Michael J. Platow. *The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence, and Power*. Hove, East Sussex, UK: Psychology Press, 2011.

Hayibor, Sefa, Bradley R. Agle, Greg J. Sears, Jeffrey A. Sonnenfeld, and Andrew Ward. "Value Congruence and Charismatic Leadership in CEO-Top Manager Relationships: An Empirical Investigation." *Journal of Business Ethics* 102, no. 2 (2011): 237-254.

Heifetz, R.A. *Leadership without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Helland, Martha R. and Bruce E. Winston. "Towards a Deeper Understanding of Hope and Leadership." *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* 12, no. 2 (2005): 42-54.

Herodotus. *Histories.* Translated by George Rawlinson. Coppell, TX: Digireads.com Publishing, 2016.

Hoffman, Sharon C. "Credible Leadership—In the Eyes of the Follower: A Historical Review of Leadership Theory Throughout the Twentieth Century in the United States." PhD diss., The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska, 2008.

Hoglund, Kenneth G. *Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series* 125. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.

Hollander, Edwin P. "The Essential Interdependence of Leadership and Followership." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 1, no. 2 (1992): 71-75.

Hook, Sidney. *The Hero in History: A Study in Limitation & Possibility*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2019.

Horrell, David G. "Introduction." In *Ethnicity, Race, Religion: Identities and Ideologies in Early Jewish and Christian Texts, and in Modern Biblical Interpretation.* Edited by Katherine M. Hockey and David G. Horrell, 1-20. London, UK: T & T Clark, 2018.

House, Robert J. "A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership." In *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*. Edited by J.G. Hunt and L.L. Larson, 189-207. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977.

House, Robert J. "A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership." *Working Paper Series.* Faculty of Management Studies, University of Toronto. Toronto, Canada: Toronto University, 1976.

House, Robert J. "A Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 16 (1971): 321-338.

House Robert J. and T.R. Mitchell. "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership." *Organizational Effectiveness Research Programs,* Office of Naval Research (April, 1975): 1-18.

House, Robert J. "Path-Goal Theory and Leadership: Lessons, Legacy, and a Reformulated Theory." *Leadership Quarterly* 7, no. 3 (1996): 323-352.

Houston, Tom. "Biblical Models of Leadership." *Transformation* 21, no. 4 (2004): 227-233.

Huizing, Russell L. "Bringing Christ to the Table of Leadership: Moving Towards a Theology of Leadership." *The Journal of Applied Christian Leadership* 5, no. 2 (2011): 58-75.

Ilies, Remus, Frederick P. Morgeson, and Jennifer D. Nahrgang. "Authentic Leadership and Eudaemonic Well-Being: Understanding Leader-Follower Outcomes." *Leadership Quarterly* 16 (2005): 373-394.

Ivry, Alred L. "Nehemiah 6,10: Politics and the Temple." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 3, no. 1 (1972): 35-45.

Jacobsen, Chanoch and Robert J. House. "Dynamics of Charismatic Leadership: A Process Theory, Simulation Model, and Tests." *The Leadership Quarterly* 12, no. 1 (2001): 75-112.

Kernis, Michael H. "Towards a Conceptualization of Optimal Self-Esteem." *Psychological Inquiry* 14, no. 1 (2003): 1-26.

Kidd, Colin. *The Forging of Races: Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600-2000.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Kim, Kyoungsu, Fred Dansereau, and Insook Kim. "Extending the Concept of Charismatic Leadership: An Illustration Using Bass's (1990) Categories." In *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead.* Vol. 2. Edited by Bruce J. Avolio and Francis J. Yammarino, 143-172. *Monographs in Leadership and Management*. Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2008.

King, Albert S. "Evolution of Leadership Theory." *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers* 15, no. 2 (1990): 43-56.

Klein, Ralph W. *The New Interpreter's Bible Commentary*. Vol. 4. Edited by Leander E. Keck. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2015.

Knoppers, Gary N. "Nehemiah and Sanballat: The Enemy Without or Within?" In *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* Edited by Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainer Albertz, 305-331. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007.

Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Translated and edited by M.E.J. Richardson. Leiden, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 2001.

Kotter, J. "Winning at Change." *Leader to Leader Journal* 10 (1998): 27-33.

Kouzes, James M. and Barry Z. Posner. *Leadership Challenge: How to Make Extraordinary Things Happen in Organizations*. 6th ed. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated, 2017.

Kraft, Dave. "Learning Leadership from Nehemiah." Self-Published: Dave Kraft, 2015.

Laird, Donna. *Negotiating Power in Ezra-Nehemiah*. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2016.

Langille, Tim. "Hybrids, Purification, and Multidirectional Memory in Ezra-Nehemiah." In *History, Memory, Hebrew Scriptures: A Festschrift for Ehud Ben Zvi*. Edited by Ian Douglas and Diana V. Edelman, 375-386. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, Inc., 2015.

Lawrence, T.E. *Seven Pillars of Wisdom: A Triumph*. Mount Pleasant, SC: Arcadia Press, 2017.

Levering, Matthew. *Ezra & Nehemiah*. *Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2007.

Levine, Lee I. *Jerusalem: Portraits of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E. – 70 C.E.)*. Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 2002.

Lichtenstein, Benyamin B., Mary Uhl-Bien, Russ Marion, Anson Seers, James Douglas Orton, and Craig Schreiber. "Complexity Leadership Theory: An Interactive Perspective on Leading in Complex Adaptive Systems." *E:CO* 8, no. 4 (2006): 2-12.

Liden, Robert C., Jeremy D. Meuser, Sandy J. Wayne, John P. Dugan, Susan R. Komives, Jia Hu, and Alexandra Panaccio. "Servant Leadership: Antecedents, Processes, and Outcomes." In *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations*. Vol. 1. Edited by David V. Day, 357-379: Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Linley, P. Alex, Susan Harrington, Fred O. Walumbwa, Jakari Griffith, Robert B. Kaiser, Robert E. Kaplan, Tara S. Wernsing, Bruce J. Avolio, and Nicola Garcea. "What is Authentic Leadership Development?" In *Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology and Work*. Vol. 1. Edited by P. Alex Linley, Susan Harrington, and Nicola Garcea, 39-52. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Lyman, D. *The Moral Sayings of Publius Cyrus, a Roman Slave*. Cleveland, OH: L.E. Barnard & Company, 1856.

McEvenue, Sean E. "The Political Structure in Judah from Cyrus to Nehemiah." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43, no. 3 (1981): 353-364.

Middlehurst, Robin. "Not enough Science or Not enough Learning? Exploring the Gaps Between Leadership Theory and Practice." *Higher Education Quarterly* 62, no. 4 (2008): 322-339.

Miller, D. and P. Friesen. *Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984.*

Miller, David M. "Ethnicity Comes of Age: An Overview of Twentieth-Century Terms for *Ioudaios*." *Currents in Biblical Research* 10 (2012): 293-311.

Moffitt, Heather, ed. "Ezra and Nehemiah: Leadership Matters*." Today in the Word A Ministry of Moody Bible Institute*. Chicago, IL, March 2011.

Myers, Jacob Martin. *Ezra Nehemiah*. *The Anchor Yale Bible*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010.

Nash, Manning. *The Cauldron of Ethnicity in the Modern World*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Newsom, Carol A., Sharon H. Ringe, and Jacqueline E. Lapsley, eds. *Women's Bible Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.

Nikezic, Srdjan, Suzana Doljanica, and Dragan Bataveljic. "Charismatic and Transformational Leadership: Approaches for Effective Change." *Annals of the Oradea University* 2 (2013): 179-187.

Northouse, Peter Guy. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 2016.

Obama, Barack. "One Voice Can Change a Room – Obama." Speech, Columbia, SC, December 9, 2007. https://youtu.be/sRqLRLI0q4g.

Olmstead, A.T. *History of the Persian Empire*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Olyan, Saul M. "Purity Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah as a Tool to Reconstitute the Community." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 35, no. 1 (2004): 1-16.

Parry, Ken, Michael Cohen, Sukanto Bhattacharya, Andrea North-Samardzic, and Gareth Edwards. "Charismatic Leadership: Beyond Love and Hate and Towards a Sense of Belonging." *Journal of Management & Organization* 25, no. 3 (2019): 398-413.

Petkeviciute, Nijole, Violeta Barvydiene, and Natasija Surpikiene. "Authentic Leadership: Leader-Follower Relationship Genesis." *Transformations in Business & Economics* 17, no. 1 (2018): 83-99.

Piaget, J. *The Biology of Knowledge.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Plato. *The Republic*. Translated by F.M. Cornford. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1945.

Rapoport, David C. "Moses, Charisma, and Covenant." *The Western Political Quarterly* 32, no. 2 (1979): 123-143.

Riggio, Ronald E. "Introduction: The Dialogue of Disciplines." In *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*, edited by Michael Harvey and Ronald E. Riggio, 3-8. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2011.

Riggio, Ronald E. "The Management Perspective: Engineering Effective Leadership in Organizations." In *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*. Edited by Michael Harvey and Ronald E. Riggio, 119-128. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2011.

Rosca, Catalina Andra and Dan Florin Stanescu. "The Influence of Values on the Leadership Style." *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy* 2, no. 3 (2014): 480-491.

Rost, J.C. *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. New York, NY: Praeger, 1991.

Sacavém, António, Luis F. Martinez, João Vieira Da Cunha, Ana Maria Abreu, and Stefanie K. Johnson. "Charismatic Leadership: A Study on Delivery Styles, Mood, and Performance." *Journal of Leadership Studies* 11, no. 3 (2017): 21-38.

San Juan Jr., E. "Orientations of Max Weber's Concept of Charisma." *Centennial Review* 11, no. 2 (Spring, 1967): 270-285.

Sandberg, Ylva and Christopher M. Moreman. "Common Threads among Different Forms of Charismatic Leadership." *Journal of Religion and Business Ethics* 3, no. 1 (2015): 1-17.

Schermerhorn, Richard A. *Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Schnittjer, Gary E. "The Bad Ending of Ezra-Nehemiah." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 173 (2016): 32-56.

Schriesheim, Chester A. and Linda L. Neider. "Path-Goal Leadership Theory: The Long and Winding Road." *Leadership Quarterly* 7, no. 3 (1996): 317-321.

Sendjaya, Sen, James C. Sarros, and Joseph C. Santora. "Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership Behaviour in Organizations." *Journal of Management Studies* 45, no. 2 (2008): 402-424.

Shamir, Boaz and G. Eilam. "What's Your Story? A Life-Stories Approach to Authentic Leadership Development." *Leadership Quarterly* 16 (2005): 395-417.

Shamir, Boas, Robert J. House, and Michael B. Arthur. "The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-Concept Based Theory." *Organization Science* 4, no. 4 (November, 1993): 577-594.

Shelton, Edward J. *Transformational Leadership: Trust, Motivation and Engagement*. Bloomington, IN: Trafford Publishing, 2012.

Shepherd, David J. and Christopher J.H. Wright. *Ezra and Nehemiah. The Two Horizon Old Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2018.

Shuffler, Marissa L., C. Shawn Burke, William S. Kramer, and Eduardo Salas. "Leading Teams: Past, Present, and Future Perspectives." In *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership*. Edited by Michael G. Ramsey, 144-166. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Spears, L.C. "Tracing the Growing Impact of Servant Leadership." In *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant-Leadership*. Edited by L.C. Spears, 1-12. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, 1998.

Spoelstra, Sverre, Nick Butler, and Helen Delaney. "Never Let an Academic Crisis Go to Waste: Leadership Studies in the Wake of Journal Retractions." Leadership 12, no. 4 (2016): 383-397.

Stanley, Rhona L. "Charismatic Leadership in Ancient Israel: A Social-Scientific Approach." PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2001.

Steinmann, Andrew E. *Ezra and Nehemiah*. *Concordia Commentary: A Theological Exposition of Sacred Scripture*. Saint Louis, MO: Concordia Pub. House, 2010.

Stewart, Jan. "Transformational Leadership: An Evolving Concept Examined through the Works of Burns, Bass, Avolio, and Leithwood." *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy* 54 (2006): 1-29.

Storey, John. "Signs of Change: 'Damned Rascals' and Beyond." In *Leadership in Organizations: Current Issues and Key Trends.* Edited by John Storey, 3-16. London, UK: Routledge, 2004.

Takala, T. "Plato on Leadership." *Journal of Business Ethics* 17, no. 7 (1998): 785-798.

Thomas, Christopher H., Andrew S. Hebdon, Milorad M. Novicevic, and Mario J. Hayek. "Fluid Leadership in Dynamic Contexts: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of the Biblical Account of Nehemiah." *Journal of Management History* 21, no. 1 (2015): 98-113.

Throntveit, Mark A. *Ezra-Nehemiah*. *Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Edited by James Luther Mays. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.

Tucker, R.G. "The Theory of Charismatic Leadership." In *Philosophers and Kings: Studies in Leadership*. Edited by D.A. Rustow, 69-94. New York, NY: Braziller, 1970.

Twigg, Nicholas W. and Satyanarayana Parayitam. "Spirituality as A Determinant of Transformational Leadership: Moderating Effects of Religious Orientation." *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion* 4, no. 3 (2007): 326-354.

Uhl-Bien, Mary and Russ Marion. "Complexity Leadership in Bureaucratic Forms of Organizing: A Meso Model." *Leadership Quarterly* 20 (2009): 631-650.

Uhl-Bien, Mary, Russ Marion, and Bill McKelvey. "Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting Leadership from the Industrial Age to the Knowledge Era." *Leadership Quarterly* 18 (2007): 298-318.

VanGalder, Loren. "Rebuild the Walls: Lessons in Leadership from Nehemiah." Self-Published: Spiritual Father Publications, 2013.

Van Seters, John. *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983.

Vroom, Victor H. *Work and Motivation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995.

Walumbwa, F.O., Bruce J. Avolio, W.L. Gardner, T.S. Wernsing, and S.J. Peterson. "Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure." *Journal of Management* 34, no. 1 (2008): 89-126.

Weber, Max and S.N. Eisenstadt. *Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building: Selected Papers*. Edited by S.N. Eisenstadt. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Weber, Max. "Race Relations." In *Selections in Translation.* Edited by W.G. Runciman, 359-369. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Edited by Talcott Parsons. Translated by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino Publishing, 2012.

Williamson, H.G.M. *Word Biblical Commentary: Ezra-Nehemiah*. Vol. 16. Edited by David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, John D.W. Watts, and Ralph P. Martin. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2018.

Wren, J. Thomas. "Of History and Leadership: The Discipline of History and the Understanding of Leadership." In *Leadership Studies: The Dialogue of Disciplines*, edited by Michael Harvey and Ronald E. Riggio, 66-81. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2011.

Wyk, Wouter C. van, Jr. and A.P.B Breytenbach. "The Nature of the Conflict in Ezra-Nehemiah." *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 57, no. 3&4 (2001): 1254-1263.

Zehir, Cemal, Büşra Müceldili, Erkut Altindağ, Yasin Şehitoğlu, and Songül Zehir. "Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Role of Ethical Climate." *Social Behavior and Personality* 42, no. 8 (2014): 1365-1375.

Zvi, Ehud Ben. "Othering, Selfing, 'Boundarying' and 'Cross-Boundarying' as Interwoven with Socially Shared Memories: Some Observations." In *Imagining the Other and Constructing Israelite Identity in the Early Second Temple Period.* Edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana V. Edelman, 20-40. *Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies*. London, UK: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016.

Appendix 1
Evidence for Ethical Approval

Per my supervisor and department chair, my thesis does not require ethical approval. This is to note that ethical approval has been sought and deemed unnecessary.

Appendix 2

Declaration of Originality

Appendix 2

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY
Students are reminded that the work that they submit for assessment must be their own.
Please read the following statements and sign and date at the bottom of this form to show
that you have complied:
1. This thesis and the work to which it refers are the results of your own efforts. Any ideas,
data or text resulting from the work of others (whether published or unpublished) are fully
identified as such within the work and attributed to the originator in the text, bibliography or
footnotes.

2. This thesis has not been submitted in whole or in part for any other academic degree or
professional qualification at this or any other institution.

3. Any chapters that describe the outcomes of joint research should be clearly identified as
such with a statement inserted as a footnote on the first page and contributors named.
Significant data, images or text resulting from the input of other researchers should be
identified as such and attributed to the persons concerned by means of a footnote within the
chapter.

4. It is usual to acknowledge the help and guidance of others who have assisted you during
your research and preparation of your thesis. Such acknowledgements do not replace or
obviate the need for individual attribution as discussed in points 1 and 3.

5. The University reserves the right to submit electronic versions of your draft documents
for assessment of plagiarism using electronic detection software such as 'turnitin'. In
addition, whether or not drafts have been so assessed, the University reserves the right to
require an electronic version of the final document (as submitted) for assessment.

SIGNED:

PRINT NAME: Jeremy White

DATE: May 12, 2022

V1 July 2021