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Chapter 1: Introduction

In 2002, the scandal of child sexual abuse by clergy was uncovered in the Archdiocese of Boston by the *Boston Globe* (Rezendes, 2002). That horrible reality led to an in-depth exploration of the management practices of the archdioceses, dioceses, and religious orders across the United States and, eventually, around the world. There was a lack of best practices in the training, leadership, and management inside the Roman Catholic Church and especially of the bishops who are the executive leaders of each local geographic Church (Code of Canon Law, 1983, Canon #381). In 2004, a community of people, who would later develop the National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management, met in Philadelphia “bringing together members of the Church hierarchy with leaders from the religious, corporate, and non-profit worlds” (Leadership Roundtable, n.d., Our History – 2004) to discuss ways to strengthen the “management, financial structure, and human resources” (Leadership Roundtable, n.d., Guiding Principles) of the Catholic Church in the US. “The Leadership Roundtable promotes best practices and accountability in the management, finances, communications, and human resources development of the Catholic Church in the US, including greater incorporation of the expertise of the laity” (Leadership Roundtable, n.d., Our Mission).

The Leadership Roundtable is perhaps the first entity of its kind created to align lay leadership with clergy in the development of best practices in Catholic leadership. The group focuses on financial resource management at the parish and diocesan level. The Leadership Roundtable, however, is guided by a set of principles that claim that the
traditions and teachings of the Church already have room for the necessary elements for best practices in leadership (Leadership Roundtable, n.d.). The Roundtable’s assertion in making such a claim has challenged the researcher to explore what the canonization process has proclaimed to be, and also to explore notable leaders in the Catholic tradition; and in that process, to examine intersections between those notable leaders’ leadership and the contemporary leadership model developed by Jim Kouzes and Barry Posner (2012) as a result of what they called the “leadership practices inventory” (p. 25).

**Problem Statement**

Scholars have indicated that in the beginning of the 20th century, “leadership became a topic of academic introspection” and study (Northouse, 2013, p. 2). Given that the university system of higher education has roots in the medieval cathedral schools and monasteries, this shows that the development of leadership, as an academic discipline, is relatively recent. Kouzes and Posner (2012) held that what makes a good leader endures through time. If leadership, as an academic discipline of higher education, is relatively new to higher education, and if what makes a good leader includes the eternal truths of leadership, then the Church should be able to look to its tradition and find evidence of contemporary leadership models that are studied in higher education leadership programs today. This is a proof-of-concept dissertation that applies a contemporary model of leadership theory to historical documents.
Theoretical Rationale

The theory of transformational leadership has been popularly researched since the 1980s. This theoretical approach to leadership “gives more attention to the charismatic and affective elements of leadership” (Northouse, 2013, p. 185). Transformational leadership theory has to do with studying the process of change in people, or leaders’ abilities to inspire those who follow them. It is a process “that often incorporates charismatic and visionary leadership” (Northouse, 2013, p. 185).

Over 30 years ago, Kouzes and Posner (1987) developed an instrument, known as the leadership practices inventory (LPI), to assess what practices are used by effective leaders. That study generated the five practices model articulated in their book *The Leadership Challenge*. The practices are: (a) model the way, (b) inspire a shared vision, (c) challenge the process, (d) enable others to act, and (e) encourage the heart.

Modeling the way has to do with leaders expressing their beliefs of integrity through both what they say and how they behave. Inspiring a shared vision is about creating a captivating vision that can help form the behavior of others. Challenging the process “means being willing to change the status quo and step into the unknown” (Northouse, 2013, p. 198). Enabling others to act requires leaders to work well with a variety of constituencies while promoting collaboration. In order for leaders to encourage the heart, they must recognize the accomplishments of others while being attentive to their needs.

Between the years 2005-2009, a study was conducted to ascertain the contemporary reliability of the LPI (Posner, 2010). Posner received responses from 1.3 million people and concluded that “the LPI continues to be a reliable and valid
instrument” (Posner, 2010). Furthermore, that study affirmed that the LPI is a well-established theoretical framework to assess leadership. As such, the five practices model could be used to assess leadership in the Roman Catholic tradition.

The five practices model by Kouzes and Posner (2012) is a particular model of transformational leadership. It is not necessarily the preeminent scholarly model; rather, this model is widely used. The five practices model has been vetted by the professional world and the academy. This model has been raised as one of two most notable models of transformational leadership by Peter G. Northouse (2013).

The study of leadership in the Catholic tradition seems to be a development of the 21st century (Leadership Roundtable, n.d.); and, although times change, problems change, technologies change, and people change, “leadership endures” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 1). If what makes a good leader endures through time, and the five practices are evidence of good leadership, then the five practices can be used to assess the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church.

**Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to apply the 5-point model put forward by Kouzes and Posner’s (2012) text to the life and the preaching of Saint John Cardinal Fisher, bishop and martyr. Saint John Fisher was selected as the focus for this study for several reasons.

The sexual abuse crisis previously mentioned served as a triggering event that revealed a lack of leadership and leadership formation among some Catholic bishops. This demonstrated a need to study leadership. Saint John Fisher was a bishop who was popular for his scholarly life, holy witness, pastoral practice, and heroic leadership. He is
the patron of St. John Fisher College in Rochester, NY where the researcher studied Executive Leadership. Saint John Fisher confronted leadership issues regarding secular power and the role of the Church. These very themes are very much alive in discussions and controversy in our contemporary society. During the lifetime of Saint John Fisher, the Church was in a crisis of leadership. Saint John Fisher exemplified transformational leadership within that time in history. In the 21st century, the Church has, again, experienced a crisis of leadership. It makes sense to study the work of a proven leader at this time in history.

**Research Questions**

The questions that are the basis for this research are:

1. Are Kouzes and Posner’s five practices evident in the leadership of Saint John Fisher?
2. If so, is there evidence that he practiced one or some more than others?
3. Is there evidence of leadership practices in Saint John Fisher that are not part of Kouzes and Posner’s 5-point model?

**Potential Significance of the Study**

On December 15, 2008, a Vatican report was issued after an official visitation of all seminaries and houses of priestly formation in the United States of America (Congregation for Catholic Education (for Educational Institutions), 2008). This report evaluated the educational and formation-for-priesthood programs across the country and summarized various categorical elements important to all of them, for example, seminary government, human formation, and spiritual formation. Nowhere in the 20-page document was there a categorical reference to leadership. The Vatican visitation report
revealed that leadership was not a consistent area of formative education for candidates to the priesthood. The report neither evaluated leadership formation, nor mandated it into a curriculum for priestly formation (Congregation for Catholic Education, 2008).

A lack of leadership study and formation for the Roman Catholic clergy was demonstrated in the Vatican report (Congregation for Catholic Education, 2008), and the lack can also be validated in my personal experience of priestly formation. In explanation of the four priestly pillars of formation,

Pope John Paul II described the principal foundations for priestly formation as human, spiritual, intellectual, and pastoral. Each area, while distinct in itself, is naturally linked to the others. The four pillars form the comprehensive structure of formation that guides the development of the candidate toward Priesthood (Saint Charles Borromeo University, n.d.).

It is held that “research problems are found in personal experience with an issue [and also in] a job-related problem” (Creswell, 2013, p. 131). Noticing the general lack of leadership formation in United States seminaries (made evident by both the Vatican report and personal experience), I looked to the current state of study in the area of clergy leadership to determine the need for enquiry in that area. There are no empirical studies of Catholic clergy leadership formation using the contemporary model put forward by Kouzes and Posner (2012). The need for a study “also comes from certain deficiencies or gaps in the existing scholarly literature” (Creswell, 2013, p. 133). There is a significant gap in the realm of study regarding leadership in the Roman Catholic clergy.

The diocesan bishop is the executive leader of the local geographic Church (known as the diocese). Priests assist the diocesan bishop in his ministry as pastor of the
local Church. The United States’ Catholic Church crisis in 2002 “appears to have had a significant deleterious effect on the relationship of bishops and priests” (Rossetti, 2005, p. 72). In his quantitative study, Monsignor Stephen Rossetti, Ph.D. surveyed United States priests after the 2002 crisis. In it, “the priests were given the statement: ‘The church crisis has negatively affected my view of Church leadership.’ A majority, 53.7%, agreed with the statement” (Rossetti, 2005, p. 72). That information indicated a problem in the development and presence of good leadership in the Roman Catholic Church.

The legal system of the Roman Catholic Church is known as *Code of Canon Law* (1983). It contains the various descriptive elements of a bishop’s ministry, as well as the qualifications to be a candidate for the office of bishop. Canon # 375 articulates the threefold duty of a bishop (teach, govern, sanctify):

1. Bishops, who by divine institution succeed to the place of the Apostles through the Holy Spirit who has been given to them, are constituted pastors in the Church, so that they are teachers of doctrine, priests of sacred worship, and ministers of governance.

2. Through episcopal consecration itself, bishops receive with the function of sanctifying also the functions of teaching and governing; by their nature, however, these can only be exercised in hierarchical communion with the head and members of the college. (Code of Canon Law, 1983, Canon # 375)

There are implications for leadership contained within the notion of governing; however, the legal code is not a training manual, and no such training manual exists. To further clarify what is included in the Code regarding qualifications to become a bishop, Canon # 378 reads:
In regard to the suitability of a candidate for the episcopacy, it is required that he
is: (1) outstanding in solid faith, good morals, piety, zeal for souls, wisdom,
prudence, and human virtues, and endowed with other qualities which make him
suitable to fulfill the office in question; (2) of good reputation; (3) at least 35
years old; (4) ordained to the presbyterate [priesthood] for at least 5 years; (5) in
possession of a doctorate or at least a licentiate in sacred scripture, theology, or
 canon law . . . or at least truly expert in the same disciplines. (Code of Canon
Law, 1983, Cannon # 378)

The law of the Roman Catholic Church neither includes a theory nor a model of
leadership development. That legal reality, in addition to the above-mentioned gap in the
leadership formation of clergy, indicates that the “literature or discussions are deficient in
understanding the problem” (Creswell, 2013, p. 133). This deficiency seems to
underscore an overall problem in leadership for the Roman Catholic Church. That
problem has been manifested in various ways including issues of finance, human
resources, pastoral care, preaching, and teaching.

The Leadership Roundtable (n.d.) has taken on the issues around best practices in
financial and resource management for parishes and dioceses. The researcher has not
been able to find any evidence of research being done in the area of leadership formation
for clergy and, especially, for bishops. The bishop has the principle role in the diocese
for preaching (sanctifying), teaching, and managing (governing). The canonization
process brings about a recognition of Catholics who are holy, that is, set apart for the
whole world to learn from their witness. Cardinal John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester
England, was canonized for his witness as a good bishop, heroic leader, and man of faith (Pole, 1965).

The Roman Catholic tradition has put forward Saint John Fisher as a model Christian and bishop (Pope Pius XI, 1935). The researcher developed an “overarching central [research] question” (Creswell, 2013, p. 139): To what extent are the “five-practices” model evident in the preaching of Saint John Fisher, Cardinal and Bishop of Rochester, England? The researcher developed a system of analyzing documents from the Roman Catholic tradition, looking specifically at written works by Saint John Fisher, in order to integrate his teachings with contemporary leadership scholarship. This will potentially open the field of leadership study to Roman Catholic clergy in a non-threatening way that is rooted in their own clerical tradition.

Historical Context

Fisher’s world. The life and times of Saint John Fisher were filled with turmoil. Life expectancy for the poor was less than 40 years. The population of England was about 6 million. This was the age of the bubonic plague, which had a 90% fatality rate. There were no real effective methods for preserving food. Travel was dangerous, literacy was at an extreme low, and access to education was very limited (Rayne-Davis, 2015).

Sixteenth century English religion. There was growing distrust of the institutional papacy among much of the western Church. There had been the Avignon displacement from Rome, which led to rivals claiming the authority of Saint Peter. Doctrines regarding sacramental presence were being challenged by several. Martin Luther (1483-1546) began his reform efforts. Thomas More grew in credibility as a layman and Church/societal leader. Desiderius Erasmus began to unpack translational
realities from the scriptures. King Henry the VIII became the ruler, and he demanded supremacy over all nobles and Church leadership (Rayne-Davis, 2015).

**Fisher and the king.** There is some reporting that perhaps Fisher was a tutor to Henry VIII in his youth. Fisher certainly knew Henry’s grandmother, who was a great patroness of Fisher’s educational efforts. Regarding his relationship to King Henry VIII, Fisher gets recognized for standing in opposition to the king’s desire to claim his marriage to Catherine of Aragon as unlawful. Fisher did not sign the demand of submission by clergy to the supremacy of King Henry VIII. He was in conflict with the King, which ultimately led to his imprisonment, in the Tower of London, and his execution (Rayne-Davis, 2015).

**Leadership Context**

**Fisher as scholar and university chancellor.** Saint John Fisher was an educated man. He earned his bachelor of arts degree in 1487 or 1488, his master of arts degree in 1491, and he was ordained as a priest in that same year. Within the next 10 years, he earned his doctorate and began teaching and administrating at various institutions of higher education. He was eventually made Chancellor of Cambridge. He attempted to resign from his position, but Fisher was appointed the post for life, making him the first person to be appointed in this manner (Brooke, 2009).

**Fisher as diocesan bishop.** Saint John Fisher was made the Bishop of Rochester, England, in 1504. Rochester was between London and Dover. As a result, Fisher was expected to tend to his flock as well as become a diplomat to those who traveled to the royal court. In addition to being a bishop (an executive leader for the institutional Church) and a chancellor of Cambridge (an executive leader for the premier institution
for higher learning), Fisher served as a skilled theologian. This role was complimented by the other two. His education in theology empowered him with passionate preaching and teaching, which was printed and circulated among hundreds and thousands of people (Thompson, 2009).

**Basic Leadership Structure of the Roman Catholic Church**

The Roman Catholic Church was founded by Jesus Christ and his Apostles. Some hold that the Church came to be in the years 30-32 AD when Jesus is believed to have begun his public ministry. The tradition has upheld that Pentecost; that is, 50 days after the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, approximately in the years 33-36 AD, marks the birth of the Church. Jesus placed the Apostles in roles of responsibility for leading and cultivating leadership in the Church. Within approximately 60 years after the death of Christ, the Gospels of Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John were written as well as all of the letters of Saint Paul and the book of the Acts of the Apostles (Brown, Fitzmyer, & Murphy, eds., 1990).

As the Apostles and their successors traveled across the globe in the last 2,000 years, the Church has been localized inside many cultures (Gonzalez, 2010). A local geographic expression of the universal/global Catholic Church is known as a diocese. In a diocese, there is a bishop who is charged with the pastoral care of the faithful. The diocese and its bishop are considered the successors of the Apostles (Code of Canon Law, 1983). Jesus Christ charged his apostle, Peter, with leadership of the Church (Mt. 16: 18-19). Peter eventually moved to, and was martyred in, Rome. Ever since that time, the Bishop of Rome has been considered the successor of Peter. In each diocese, there are *diocesan priests* and *deacons* who assist the bishop in the pastoral care of the faithful.
The localized cultural Catholic churches are also known as *rites* (Appendix A). They are largely defined by particular cultural expressions lived out inside their liturgy.

Intentional communities have developed around publicly professing the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. These vows are meant to indicate, on earth, what life is like in heaven. In heaven, the souls of humanity do not own property. They are united in pure relationship with the Divine Creator. All spiritual beings in heaven acquiesce to the will of God. The heavenly realities are reflected in the vowed members of these intentional communities, and it is known as the *religious life*. Communities of religious life are often conducted according to a rule written by their founder, and they are known as *religious orders*. The origins of religious life are traced to first century hermits and monks. In the 13th century, *mendicant* religious life came about. By the 16th century, the third form of religious life developed into what is known as *clerks regular*. Inside of the religious life there are *religious priests*, brothers, and *sisters*. Some communities of religious life also include *deacons*. All members of the Catholic Church who are not ordained are members of the *laity* (*Code of Canon Law*, 1983).

**Definitions of Terms**

*Apostolic Succession* – the notion that a particular church has its origins in a community founded by the Apostles of Jesus Christ. Bishops are often considered successors of the Apostles, as their particular church (i.e., diocese) is considered in apostolic succession.

*Bishop* – ordained member of the clergy assigned to a diocese or particular church.

*Brother* – a male member of a religious life who is not ordained.
Cardinal – a dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church, next in rank to the Pope (Bumpus, 1969).

Clergy – people who are the leaders of a religion and who perform religious services.

Clerk Regular – a person who lives a religious life absent of a rule and is formally directed toward an active ministry.

Confessor – a priest who hears confessions. For example, Saint John Fisher was a confessor.

Deacon – an ordained member of the clergy who assists both priests and bishops in ministry.

Diocese – the area of a bishop’s jurisdiction or particular church (Bumpus, 1969).

Diocesan Priest – an ordained man who is not a member of vowed religious life and who assists diocesan bishops in their pastoral ministries.

Five Practices – the results of the LPI that are applications of belief common to effective leaders. They are (a) model the way, (b) inspire a shared vision, (c) challenge the process, (d) enable others to act, and (e) encourage the heart.

Formatter – an individual who is charged with the formation of candidates for priesthood and religious life.

Hermit – a person who lives a religious life in solitude.

Laity – member of the Church who is not ordained.

The Leadership Challenge – the book written by Jim Kouzes and Barry Posner (2012), which is currently in its fifth edition.

Liturgy – the public worship; that is, the work, of the people (of the Church).
**LPI** – the leadership practices inventory tool designed by Jim Kouzes and Barry Posner (2012).

**Luther** – Martin Luther (1483-1546). The founder of the Reformation movement.

**Martyr** – a person who willingly sacrifices his or her own life for the faith.

**Mendicant** – a person who lives a religious life in community with other members but is also engaged in work outside of the common home.

**Monk** – a person who lives a religious life inside of a monastery.

**Parish** – local community of the faithful people within a diocese.

**Priest** – an ordained member of the clergy.

**Praemunire** – a law that prohibits the assertion of papal jurisdiction.

**Reformation** – the movement of change and revolt founded by Martin Luther and his followers.

**Religious Life** – intentional communities of men and women of a particular system of faith and worship who take vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience.

**Religious Priest** – a male member of a particular system of faith and worship who is also an ordained priest.

**Religious Brother** – a male member of a particular system of faith and worship who is not ordained.

**Religious Sister** – a female member of a particular system of faith and worship who is not ordained.

**Sacrament** – outward sign, instituted by Christ, to give grace. There are seven sacraments in the Roman Catholic Church. Henry VIII wrote *Defense of the Seven Sacraments* (2015).
Sister – a female member of a religious life.

Tria Munera – the threefold responsibility of the bishop. The tria munera are (a) teach, (b) govern, and (c) sanctify.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the researcher has demonstrated the discovered lack of leadership study and formation in the Roman Catholic Church and clergy, and the hypothesis that states that what constitutes good leadership is eternal, able to be studied academically, and evident in the Roman Catholic tradition. The rationale for Kouzes and Posner’s (2012) text is articulated in a theoretical model known as “the five practices” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 14) as it could apply to leadership of Saint John Fisher. Next described is the potential significance of the study for the Catholic Church. Some historically contextualized information about this subject of the study; that is, Saint John Fisher, is articulated, and finally, a basic outline is included of the leadership structure of the Roman Catholic Church. Chapter 2 offers a brief biography of Saint John Fisher. Chapter 3 reviews the existent literature; Chapter 4 articulates the research method; Chapter 5 demonstrate the findings from the data analysis, and Chapter 6 discusses the implications, limitations, and recommendations remaining resulting from this study.
Chapter 2: Brief Biography of Saint John Fisher

Early Life

John Fisher was born in 1469 in Beverley of Yorkshire, England. He was one of the four children of Robert and Agnes Fisher. After the death of her husband in 1477, Agnes married William White. They bore five children together. When John Fisher was 13 years of age, he went to Cambridge to study. He began his studies at Michaelhouse, which would later become Trinity College. He studied grammar and the liberal arts, earning a BA and an MA. In 1491, Fisher received a papal dispensation so that he could be ordained. He was 22 years of age. After ordination, Fr. John Fisher began his decade-long pursuit of his doctorate in theology (Reynolds, 1956).

Meeting Lady Margaret Beaufort

Within 3 years, Fisher was elected senior proctor, positioning him to make several trips to London. As a result, Fisher came to know Lady Margaret Beaufort, the mother of Henry VII. Lady Margaret made Fisher the chaplain of her house, and confessor (Domvile, 1899). Because of this relationship, Fisher was able to convince Lady Margaret to become the benefactress to institutions of higher education. Fisher believed this would advance the quality of preaching and study for clerical students. Fisher earned his doctorate in 1501 and was appointed vice chancellor of the university in 1502 (Hatt, 2002).
University Chancellor and Bishop

In 1504, Fisher was made Chancellor of Cambridge University. He continued to be reelected each year for 10 years. In 1514, Fisher was made Chancellor for life. In 1504, he was made bishop of Rochester, England. He also began to serve on King Henry VII’s council. Shortly after, Fisher began to preach public sermons that were found worthy of being printed and distributed. The first series of these were 10 sermons on the penitential psalms, which were published in 1508. This was the first sermon sequence to be published in English (Mayor, 1876). With the help of Lady Margaret, Fisher went on to found several colleges in Cambridge. He was also elected to be the President of Queens’ College. During this time, Fisher met Erasmus, who would become a famously influential linguist and scripture scholar.

King Henry VII died in April of 1509. Fisher preached at the funeral, and later, in June of the same year, he preached at the funeral of Lady Margaret. In between the deaths, Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon were crowned. Fisher was very committed to his diocese, and he spent much of his time there. He attempted to resign from the Chancellorship of Cambridge but, instead, was appointed for life. Because of Rochester’s location, Fisher hosted many guests and members of the King’s Court (Brooke, 2009).

Fisher in Defense of the Church

In Germany, Martin Luther presented his academic debate in the form of 95 theses in October of 1517. By 1520, those theses were surfacing in England. At that time, Fisher began preaching against Luther. His sermons against Luther were printed and distributed in English and in multiple editions. Fisher began challenging the internal
Church leadership, as well, particularly the taxation policies of Cardinal Wolsey, who served as Chancellor of England (Schofield & Skinner, 2007). Fisher began writing frequently, often writing challenging material.

Henry VIII was attempting to force an annulment of his marriage to Catherine, which Fisher wrote against. He found their bond to be theologically and canonically legitimate, which Henry VIII had begun to doubt. Fisher’s defense of the Queen shed light on the lesser motivations Henry VIII had for the annulment and, thus, this created tension between the Bishop and the King. Cardinal Wolsey was removed as Chancellor of England and replaced by Sir Thomas More.

Tensions around the King’s authority began to surface. Henry VIII issued a praemunire against the priests and bishops in 1530. The clergy could have been pardoned if they paid a fee and also acknowledged the king as “Protector and Supreme Head of the English Church and Clergy.” Fisher argued against that, and he had the clergy support adding the phrase “to the extent permitted by the law of God.” It has been written that there were two attempts made on Fisher’s life shortly thereafter (Hatt, 2002).

King Henry VIII left Catherine and married Anne Boleyn. Due to the lack of canonical form, there was great controversy over the validity of Henry’s annulment (which did not come from Rome) and, therefore, the validity of his marriage to Anne Boleyn. In 1534, The Act of Succession was circulated. Citizens and clergy were obliged to swear an oath to the Act. The oath, based on the Act, would accept:

1. The invalidity of the marriage between Henry and Catherine, thereby bastardizing the Princess Mary;
2. The validity of the marriage between Henry and Anne, thereby legitimatizing the Princess Elizabeth;

3. The absolute interdiction of marriage within prohibited degrees with the implication that neither the Pope nor anyone else could grant a dispensation;

4. The absolute power of the bishops to annul unlawful marriages without appeal to Rome (Reynolds, 1956, p. 214).

Both Fisher and More would not sign the oath. As a result, both men were imprisoned in the Tower of London. The words of the oath were not included in the Act; thus, it was decided that Fisher and More were imprisoned illegally. A second Act of Succession was passed in 1534 along with an Act of Supremacy. The latter stated that the King of England was the supreme head of the Church in England. Such a proclamation would place the King over the bishops and over the Pope regarding all Church matters in the kingdom.

The overwhelming majority of clergy eventually submitted and took the oath. Fisher did not, although many attempted to persuade him. More also refused. While in the tower, Fisher continued to write. In 1535, Fisher was stripped of his diocese. That same year, several Carthusian monks were executed. These penalties were for their refusal to take the oath. Fisher was made a Cardinal, by Pope Paul III, in May of the same year. “It has been suggested that the Pope hoped the King would feel obliged to set a cardinal free” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 105).

Martyrdom

On June 17, 1535, Fisher was found guilty of high treason for not submitting to the oath affirming the king as head of the Church in England. He was originally
sentenced to be hanged, drawn, and quartered, but the sentence was lessened to beheading. Fisher was martyred on Tuesday June 22, 1535. His final recorded words were:

Christian people, I am come hither to die for the faith of Christ’s holy Catholic Church, and I thank God hitherto my stomach hath served me very well thereunto, so that yet I have not feared death; wherefore I do deserve you all to help and assist me with your prayers, that at the very point and instant of death’s stroke, I may in that very moment stand steadfast without fainting in my one point of the Catholic faith, free from any fear. And I beseech Almighty God of His infinite goodness to save the King and this realm, and that it may please Him to hold His holy hand over it, and send the King good counsel. (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 106)

Devotion to Fisher as a sainted man began to spread. In 1536, Reginal Pole wrote of him:

What other have you, or have you had for centuries, to compare with Rochester in holiness, in learning, in prudence, and in episcopal zeal? You may be, indeed, proud of him, for, were you to search through all the nations of Christendom in our days, you would not easily find one who was such a model of episcopal virtues. If you doubt this, consult your merchants who have travelled in many lands; consult your ambassadors; and let them tell you whether they have anywhere heard of any bishop who has such a love for his flock as never to leave the care of it, ever feeding it by word and example; against whose life not even a
rash word could be spoken; one who was conspicuous, not only for holiness and learning, but for love of country. (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 107)

Pope Leo VIII beatified Fisher in 1886. He was canonized by Pope Pius XI in 1935. Thomas More was beatified and canonized on the same days. They share a memorial feast day, June 22.

**Selected Leadership Aspects of Saint John Fisher**

The following essays were given at Cambridge University as part of a larger symposium marking the 450th anniversary of the death of Cardinal John Fisher. The researcher selected three that highlight different aspects of Fisher’s leadership:

- in higher education,
- as a diocesan bishop, and
- as a theologian.

**Fisher’s leadership in higher education.** Christopher N. L. Brooke delivered a paper entitled *The University Chancellor* (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009). Brooke explored the influence of Fisher on the foundation and federation of colleges that make up Cambridge University. After laying a contextual foundation, they shifted focus to Fisher’s role as the chancellor.

First, by articulating the known history of succession to the role, Brooke placed Fisher’s election as chancellor in either 1504 or 1505 (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009). He wrote that Fisher was an ambitious man who worked hard to find benefactors, preachers, and teachers for the university. Brooke demonstrated that Fisher was certainly imperfect, but placed inside the context, he was simply a man of his time. Despite Fisher’s imperfections (i.e., his lack of residency at Cambridge), Fisher was the first to be elected
University Chancellor for life. He served in that role while also being Bishop of Rochester, and a member of court. In short, Brooke summed up Fisher’s contribution as chancellor of Cambridge:

> When we see him sustaining Queens’ [college] and raising Christ’s and St. John’s [colleges], urging Margaret [Queen mother] on to the support of preachers and readers – and fighting with the relentless obstinacy which alone could have succeeded to save St. John’s from extinction – and when we set these in their place in the vision of the collegiate University which emerged from this world – then we may see very clearly that he remains the greatest of the benefactors of the University and of all the colleges of that age for his role in the creation of Cambridge as we know it. (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009, p. 60)

**Fisher’s leadership as a diocesan bishop.** Stephen Thompson (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009) delivered a paper entitled *The Bishop in His Diocese*. Thompson began by asserting Fisher to be the second longest serving bishop of the diocese of Rochester, and the longest serving diocesan bishop of his medieval time. “More important still, Fisher was one of the few of any generation to be hailed in his own lifetime as a model bishop” (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009, p. 67).

Fisher stood out as a bishop in many ways. His holiness of life was certainly one. Thompson pointed out that Fisher had exerted the effort to make known the pastoral role of clergy and the role of bishop as shepherd not ruler (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009). Thompson set out to answer a series of questions in his paper.

1. What was the relationship between Fisher’s high episcopal reputation and the reality?
2. How far did his own performance in his diocese match the high ideal of the episcopal office articulated so clearly in his commentaries and sermons?

3. How did Fisher the pastor compare with his fellows on the bench?

Thompson’s method was to examine Fisher’s episcopate (service as bishop) under seven aspects:

A study of the diocese of Rochester itself is followed by an examination of Fisher’s predecessors and successors in the bishopric in order to place him in some broader context. Then, using the diocesan registers and court books from Rochester (both comparatively full by late medieval standards), the study will examine Fisher’s record of residence in the diocese, his use of patronage, his role in the supervision of the clergy and laity, his participation in those sacraments and duties reserved to bishops and, finally, his charitable works. In order to establish just how exceptional Fisher was as a diocesan, contemporary material from a wide range of other dioceses will also be used. (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009, p. 68)

Thompson’s findings demonstrate that Fisher was consistently active in all the commitments required of him (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009). Fisher was responsible to Parliament. He was a preacher, patron of the poor, sacramental practitioner, manager, teacher, administrator, and statesman. The records of his diocese seem to have been exceptionally well kept during his time as diocesan bishop. He was shown to have been present to his people while most bishops were outside their dioceses more than inside. Fisher was shown to have been a good pastor of his people and an excellent leader for his Church.
Fisher’s leadership as a theologian. Richard Rex (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009) delivered a paper entitled The Polemical Theologian. Rex distinguished Fisher’s earlier theological writing as devotional and pastoral in nature. These works must be examined, however, because in this paper, Rex focused on Fisher’s polemical theology. Rex marked Fisher’s entrance to polemical theological work in 1519 at the age of 50. Fisher began to take on the theologians of the Reformation and was regarded by many to be the most important contributor to the movement against Luther. His works were among the most quoted in the later Council of Trent.

Rex’s method for delivery was to first set the course of Fisher’s theologically polemical career (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009). He divided it into two segments, separated by the condemnation of Luther in 1520. In the earlier segment, Rex explored the theological issues of the time; issues, such as the identity of Mary Magdalene, set theologians ablaze in the early 1500s. In the second segment, Fisher took on the works of the reformers in his preaching, teaching, and writing. Fisher preached what became a popular and printed sermon at the government’s initial campaign against Luther in 1521. Rex then looked at Fisher’s defense of the tradition of St. Peter’s ministry and martyrdom in Rome, published in 1522. In 1523, Fisher wrote a 200,000 word reply to Luther’s works. Rex noted that Fisher was allegedly the ghost writer of the famous Defense of the Seven Sacraments attributed to King Henry VIII.

Rex went on to highlight Fisher’s 70,000-word work of defense of Henry against Luther (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009). Rex showed how Fisher took on a debate-like tactic, showing Luther’s inconsistencies in sacramental arguments. Rex reviewed more writings before showing Fisher’s last theologically controversial piece, De Veritate Corporis et
Sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia (On the Truth of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist). This work of 220,000 words, written in 1526, was Fisher’s longest. Fisher’s defense in this work was against the figurative interpretation of the Eucharist coming from the reformers.

After surveying some works of others who claimed Fisher was striving for ambitious recognition, Rex went on to examine Fisher’s motives for moving into controversial work so late in his theological career (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009). Rex disputed the others claims, showing ambition as irreconcilable with Fisher’s works and reputation.

Rex then moved on to explore the language of Fisher’s polemic. He found it free of coarseness: “at least in comparison with that of Luther, Henry, or More” (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009, p. 115). He then shifted to the content of Fisher’s polemic, picking out major points and recurring themes. Rex highlighted Fisher’s views on the relationship between scripture and tradition with a focus on the teaching office of the Roman Catholic Church. This stood apologetically contrary to the reformers who claimed sole reliance on scripture. Rex demonstrated how Fisher appealed to the great saints, mystics, and Church fathers in his polemic. “To extend Fisher’s metaphor, he regarded tradition as the key to the treasure chest of scripture, and of course the Church (and pre-eminently the successor of St. Peter) held that key” (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009, p. 117).

Rex looked specifically at the differences between Fisher and Luther over scripture (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009). Luther, seeing scripture as self-explanatory, and Fisher seeing scripture as needing context and exegesis. Rex treated Fisher’s ecclesiology (study of the Church) only briefly, noting that Fisher focused a great deal on
papal primacy (a position that claims the Bishop of Rome has a primacy of place in relation to the other dioceses of the world. This is greatly due to the fact that Peter died and was buried in Rome).

Rex shifted to consider how Fisher’s theological career has been remembered (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009). He rejected the idea that Fisher flourished as a Christian humanist before the reformation and transitioned into a reactionary conservative after it. Rex went on to show Fisher as being consistent in his theology all along. Rex asserted that Fisher was “neither as progressive before the Reformation nor as reactionary afterwards as [some] suggest” (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009, p. 115).

Rex completed the paper by asserting Fisher as a leader for the ages. He thought that Fisher was a blend of humanism and scholasticism (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009. He credited Fisher with massive amounts of learning and the father of thought that would later develop in the Catholic tradition. Rex named him both polemicist and pastor. A holy man and a heroic martyr, Rex viewed Fisher’s death as the seal of Fisher’s moral authority. That authority caught the attention of the Church in such a way that Fisher’s works were the most cited at the Council of Trent. Fisher’s willingness to live and to die for his beliefs and his Church, Rex said, models Fisher’s absolute concern for his flock and for the truth.

Chapter Summary

A brief biographical sketch of the life of Saint John Fisher was provided. Additionally, the researcher looked to three academic essays that focused on three different areas of his life and leadership: Fisher as a university chancellor, Fisher as a diocesan bishop, and Fisher as a polemical theologian. These essays show that Fisher was a notable leader with many talents and skill sets. There were eight other essays
available in *Humanism, Reform, and the Reformation: The Career of Bishop John Fisher* (Bradshaw & Duffy, 2009). These essays were given at Cambridge University to mark the 450th anniversary of the death of Saint John Fisher. It is important to note that those academics were standing in the very university where Fisher served as Chancellor.
Chapter 3: Review of the Literature

Introduction and Purpose

To determine the availability of studies that apply The Leadership Challenge (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) framework to the leadership of a single individual, the researcher, in consultation with his committee, followed three approaches: (a) a systematic search for articles in three databases, (b) communication with the authors of the text and an analysis of the resources posted on their website, and (c) a comprehensive analysis of texts related to the application of The Leadership Challenge (Kouzes & Posner) to Catholic Christian leadership. The chapter is in the following manner. First, the search process via databases is articulated; second the lack of articles found through the database research is identified; third, the extensive resources posted in the Kouzes and Posner website is systematically reviewed; fourth, Christian Reflections on the Leadership Challenge text is analyzed; fifth, academic essays are reviewed on the selected aspects of Saint John Fisher; and sixth, the chapter finishes with an examination of the gaps in the literature.

Clarification of the Overall Intention and Unique Character of This Research

Saint John Fisher modeled the eternal truths of leadership that have only recently been understood as a discipline that can be studied. Jim Kouzes and Barry Posner have contributed greatly to the field of leadership. Their text The Leadership Challenge (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) has put forward a model of effective leadership that has been
studied, tested, and applied by millions. I have researched the use of their model with individuals so as to replicate that research style when looking into the life of Saint John Fisher, patron saint of St. John Fisher College. Empirical studies done on individuals’ use of *The Leadership Challenge* are not available in any great number, if at all.

This chapter will review what research is available regarding use of *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) in various aspects of professional life. After demonstrating that there is not an adequate supply of empirical studies regarding individuals, I will show what other forms of research are available regarding individuals’ use of *The Leadership Challenge*, and of the leadership of Saint John Fisher.

**Methods Used**

**Database process.** The twofold approach to identify and establish the parameters of the empirical literature review began in the Lavery Library databases, and it included the leadership of Saint John Fisher and the study of different individuals’ use of *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). The search parameters were set prior to 2005 in EBSCO, JSTOR, and ATLA for peer reviewed journal articles. The key words used in the database search were: leadership, John Fisher, Saint John Fisher, Bishop John Fisher, *The Leadership Challenge*, Kouzes, Posner, five practices, empirical, individual, individuals, and saints.

- Leadership was the key term crucial to the research done, and, to be done.
- John Fisher was the man who was studied.
- Saint John Fisher reduced the inclusion of others who share that name.
- Bishop John Fisher focused the topic more sharply.
• *The Leadership Challenge* was the title of the model/text being applied to the study.

• Kouzes was a co-author of *The Leadership Challenge*.

• Posner was a co-author of *The Leadership Challenge*.

• Five practices were the core model used in *The Leadership Challenge*.

• Empirical was the type of study being searched for.

• Individual was a key term for finding those who have been studied according to the model.

• Individuals was an attempt to focus the search.

• Saints was used in hopes that there may have been studies done regarding the leadership of other Roman Catholic saints.

Any articles that appeared to be relevant were separated by category. Three articles that had to do with the historical person of Saint John Fisher were originally placed together and put aside. They were soon found not be useful because they did not focus on the leadership of Saint John Fisher nor on *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Given that they were not used, they are not cited. It is important to note that no articles were found that looked specifically at the leadership of Saint John Fisher or any other Roman Catholic saint.

There seemed, due to their titles, to be five articles that (potentially) had to do with individuals and *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). None of these articles contained a model that was be useful for this research. The researcher found the lack of relevant and useful articles disappointing. After consultation with the doctoral program librarian, thorough exploration of three recommended databases, and the limited
results that followed, the researcher contacted the authors of *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner) directly.

**Contacting the authors.** The researcher wrote, individually, to Jim Kouzes and Barry Posner. In the email, the researcher explained the nature of the research and the need to find empirical studies regarding individuals and *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Within a matter of hours, both men wrote back. Neither Jim Kouzes nor Barry Posner offered any suggestions as to empirical studies of individuals and *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner). They both did, however, direct the researcher to website called The Leadership Challenge: A Wiley Brand (n.d.), which includes “over 600 research studies done using [the] assessment tool, the Leadership Practices Inventory, on a range of topics in a variety of settings” (J. Kouzes, personal communication, June 27, 2015).

**Significant Empirical Findings**

**Others’ research using the leadership practices inventory.** Following the advice of Jim Kouzes and Barry Posner, the researcher looked to others’ research who used the leadership practices inventory. The Leadership Challenge (n.d.) website included seven categories of empirical studies:

1. Not-for-Profit/Community-Based
2. Health Care
3. Higher Education
4. Religious
5. Secondary Education
6. Business
7. Government/Public Sector

In keeping with the above structure and terms from the recommended website, the following literature was reviewed.

*Not-for-profit/community-based.* There were 23 studies available to research under this category. The studies ranged in scope. There were similar themes in several areas, and there were several articles that looked into for-profit versus private and public sector, not-for-profit leadership comparisons (Berry, 2012; Mastneri, 1996; Nicewarner, 1997). Some articles looked at various categories of job satisfaction in the industry (Elpers, 2001; Elpers & Westhuis, 2008). The practices from *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) were assessed in terms of leadership experiences for family support programs (Okeefe, 1992). There were studies looking into the effectiveness of leadership development programs for community leaders (Siriwoharn, 1995), martial arts instructors (Joko, 2009), and organizational identification (Bennington, 2000). None of the studies explored one individual in relationship to *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

*Healthcare.* There were 85 studies available to research under this category. A variety of topics were explored, looking both at the categories of management and the categories of the rank-and-file employees. There were studies exploring organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Abaan & Duygulu, 2008; Foong, 1999), and the development of leadership programs for nurses (Anderson, 2011). Several studies looked into the factors of healthcare leadership and retention strategies (Arthurs, 2009; Eisler, 2009). Some scholars have explored veteran nurses compared to newly trained nurses and their inclinations for leadership in the field of nursing (Matthew, 2008).
One study looked into the roles of technology, politics, and cultural realities upon healthcare (Clement, 1997). Some researchers looked into the development of a staff shared leadership ethic (George et al., 2002). There were many studies that examined various evaluations of care to assess leadership in multiple healthcare fields (Kramer, 1997; Large, Macleod, Cunningham, & Kitson, 2005). There was at least one study that looked at managers’ self-assessment versus the assessment of their leadership by the staff (Caroll, 2010).

The theory of transformational leadership was explored in several studies; some looked specifically at the theory’s impact on job satisfaction (Bodin, 2008; Clavelle, Drenkard, Tullai-McGuiness, & Fitzpatrick, 2012; Heuston, 2010; Powell, 2010). There was at least one study that explored the correlation between spirituality and healthcare (Strack, 2001). None of the studies explored one individual in relationship to The Leadership Challenge (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

**Higher education.** There were 158 studies available to research under this category. Higher education was broken into three categories: management, teachers, and students. Regarding management, there was a variety of studies that explored gender-specific leadership issues (Aaker, 2003). One study evaluated the leadership of college presidents versus that of business leaders (Bauer, 1993). Leadership in higher education and faculty job satisfaction was studied in various ways (Afam, 2012; Brown, 1996; Dauffenbach, 1995). Mid-level management in higher education (e.g., gender, 4-year vs. 2-year colleges) was explored from different perspectives (Adcock-Shantz, 2011). A number of ethical leadership issues were explored in terms of leadership in higher education (Butler, 2009; Dikeman, 2007).
Ethnic, racial, and gender diversity and higher education leadership were the subject of a number of empirical studies (Barut, 2009; Bardou, Byrne, Pasternak, Perez, & Rainey, 2003). Administrative self-perception versus staff/faculty perception of ethnic, racial, and gender diversity and higher education leadership (Grafton, 2009), as well as ethics versus practices, were explored (Dikeman, 2007). Some scholars looked into the leadership of department chairs (Harris, 2004) and distance-learning development (Timmons, 2002). There was at least one study of a university’s religious affiliation and its influence on presidential leadership practices (Savior, 2014). None of the studies explored any one individual in relationship to The Leadership Challenge (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

In the category of teachers, one scholar explored collegiate leadership programs’ outcome evaluations (Brungardt, 1997). Some studied the leadership practices used by online instructors (Ledbetter, 2003). Some looked into southern community colleges, while others explored women of color in higher education (Solis, 2011; Lomax-Wardell, 2010). None of the studies explored one individual in relationship to The Leadership Challenge (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

Throughout the three categories in higher education, it was common to see the theory of transformational leadership employed. Outcomes and assessments of various programs developed to encourage leadership (directly or indirectly) have been studied across the three categories. None of the studies explored one individual in relationship to The Leadership Challenge (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

Religious. There were 28 studies available to research under this category. The religious category was subdivided into employees/membership/adults/individual and
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priests/pastors. The first subcategory showed a broad range of studies. Scholars looked at dyadic relationships between church supervisors and subordinate employees (Patterson, 1997) and their congregational effectiveness. There were studies looking into the perceived leadership development of divinity students in specific institutions of learning (Hillman, 2004). There was one article that explored the leadership development of diaconate ministry teams (Irving, 2012). There was even a study of learning styles and how they may sync with the leadership practices (Pettus, 2013). None of the studies explored one individual in relationship to *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

The subcategory of priests/pastors looked at a series of topical research. There was a study of vocational ministers (those who recruit for the ministry) and their job satisfaction (Crowther, 2012). Scholars studied the effects of senior pastors and church growth (Bridges, 1995) as well as leadership styles and church growth (Burton, 2010). The theory of transformational leadership was the subject of one of these studies as well (Fulks, 1994). Issues of multicultural and multiethnic realities were studied (Ramírez, 2012), as well as leadership curriculum in seminaries (Tilstra, 2007). None of the studies explored one individual in relationship to *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

*Secondary education.* There were 190 studies available to research under this category, which was divided into four areas: executive management, teachers, principals/superintendents, and students. In the first subcategory, there were studies that pertained to specific schools and in specific countries (Abu-Tineh, Khasawneh, & Al-Omari, 2008), the effects of technology on leadership development (Plotkin, 2009), and
studies of centralized management of schools (Okorie, 1990). There were studies specific to gender and race (Chance, 1990; Grady, 2008), and there were studies that look into the effectiveness of principals and superintendents (Sweeney, 2000).

Under the subcategory of teachers, there were many studies on perceptions of self and others’ leadership (Alagbada-Ekekhomen, 2013; Bankes, 1999; Belew-Nyquist, 1997). One study looked into teacher leadership as it related to student anxiety (Joannon-Bellows, 1997). Another study looked into informal teacher leadership effectiveness (Brown-Provost, 1995), and there were various self-assessment practices, as well as study of adapting the leadership practices inventory for use in other languages (Yavuz, 2010). None of the studies explored one individual in relationship to The Leadership Challenge (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

Under the subcategory of principals/superintendents, there were studies, as in every category, exploring self-perception versus that of others (Bray, 2004). Scholars explored a variety of aspects pertaining to principal hiring (D’Angelo, 2004), as well as leadership in urban schools (Alexson, 2008). There was at least one study of women superintendents’ leadership (Du Plessis, 2008). Job-related stress in relation to and with leadership was explored from different points of view (Strike, 2004). Principal behavior preferences were the subject of one study (Krause & Powell, 2002).

There was one study, in the form of an unpublished dissertation, from a Doctor of Education candidate from St. John Fisher College. Dean F. Goewey (2012) looked critically at Kouzes and Posner’s leadership practices in certain elementary school principals of central New York. This study was not a study of individuals, however, there was enough information in there using the model from The Leadership Challenge.
(Kouzes & Posner, 2012) that it was helpful for the research. Goewey was also helpful for purposing bibliographic findings and writing structures, as well as assisting in broadening questions for research.

Another study from this category, which may be helpful, is *Leadership and School Success: The Behaviors and Practices of a Principal in an Effective Urban High School* by Andrew Alexson (2008). This was an unpublished doctoral dissertation from Liberty University in Virginia. The objective of this study was “to explore the behaviors and practices of a principal in an effective, private, faith-based urban high school” (Alexson, 2008).

In his study, Andrew Alexson (2008) surveyed 15 faculty, staff, and board members and the school principal. Alexson’s dissertation abstract states:

The second survey included 30 questions that explored Kouzes and Posner’s leadership characteristics of Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart. The study confirmed many of the findings presented in the literature review and found that study school was effective in part because of the leadership behaviors and practices of the principal. The principal was instrumental in keeping the school moving toward the goal of providing an excellent, Christ-centered education that equips urban students for leadership, service, and peacemaking.

This article was helpful because it is a single study that focused on one individual in light of *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) five-part model. The faith-based component of the leadership being explored only added to this research study. Alexson’s (2008) study revealed the value of using Kouzes and Posner’s (2012) model in
application to the leadership of one person. Although *The Leadership Challenge* is not
the only lens Alexson used in his work, it is the only empirical study that explored one
individual in relationship to *The Leadership Challenge*.

The final subcategory was students. This area showed research into the
development of leadership in a series of schools in specific geographic areas across the
United States (Peyton, 2011). There was a demonstrable study of content-area
development for specific leadership training of students in junior high schools (Shirley,
2007), but none of the studies explored one individual in relationship to *The Leadership

**Business.** There were 96 studies available to research under this category. There
were two subcategories: pertaining to management and pertaining to employees. Under
the subcategory of management, there were studies exploring leadership and
psychological capitol (Adbullah, 2009) and emotional intelligence and leadership
(Alston, 2009). Grounded theory was applied in a number of the studies (Avena, 2006).
Some scholars explored various dynamics of manager behavior and job satisfaction (Bell-
Roundtree, 2004; Bell-Roundtree & Westbrook, 2001). One study looked specifically at
leadership and storytelling (Bennett, 2005).

There were empirical studies of the role of gender, for example, the behaviors of
women executives (Beutel, 2012). Several studies explored leadership of business
executives in various countries outside the United States (Wilberg, 2003). In a similar
vein, some scholars explored the leadership of various countries in comparison to that
found in the US (Zagorsek, Jaklic, & Stough, 2004). Vocationally specific studies were
explored fields including golf course superintendents (Lenhardt, 2009), finance
executives (Petroy, 2006), and hotel and hospitality service executives (Singh, 1999). The role of transformational leadership in relationship to cross-cultural experiences has been studied as well as the role of creativity in leadership (Dunn, Dastoor, & Sims, 2012); however, none of the studies explored one individual in relationship to *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

Under the subcategory pertaining to employees, there were fewer studies to explore. Scholars have studied employee motivation in relationship to management (Aegerter, 2006), leadership styles in relation to various vocations (Sylvester, 2009), and gay and lesbian leadership (Coon, 2001). There was at least one study on knowledge sharing and leadership (Mulligan, 2001), and the relationship between job morale and leadership was examined (Wright, 2009), but none of the studies explored one individual in relationship to *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

**Government/public sector.** There were 23 studies available to research under this category. There were two subcategories: pertaining to management and pertaining to employees. Regarding the first subcategory, scholars have studied the leadership of volunteers (Bowers, 2012). Also, scholars have examined nurses’ leadership in countries outside the US (Chitonnom, 1999). There was at least one study regarding competency versus leadership (Grafton, 2010), and several studies explored the role of leadership in law enforcement officers (Harvey, 2004). Gender and leadership was studied in numerous ways, such as gender-differentiated values in leadership (Kahl, 1999). Some studied leadership in the military (Metscher, 2005), and one study looked into emancipated foster youth (Williams, 2013), but none of the studies explored one individual in relationship to *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).
Under the subcategory pertaining to employees, there were three studies available. One study explored the leadership issues pertaining to the operations of fire officers (Lowe, 2008). Another study examined leadership practices and organizational commitment in fire service (Lowe, 2000), and the final study of Vito and Higgins (2010) looked into law enforcement and the validity of *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). None of the studies explored one individual in relationship to *The Leadership Challenge*.

**Substantive Gaps and Recommendations for Further Research**

**Other applications of The Leadership Challenge.** *Christian Reflections on The Leadership Challenge* was of special interest because of the direct application of the practices inside of the Christian context. This edited book was of special interest because of the direct application of *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Jim Kouzes and Barry Posner asserted that this book had been “well grounded in research” (Kouzes et al., 2004), which collects leaders’ insights on the Christian faith in light of *The Leadership Challenge*. Similar to the Gospel accounts of Jesus, this book used stories in order to connect the five practices (found in *The Leadership Challenge*) to their lives as faith-filled leaders.

**Reflections on model the way.** John Maxwell (Kouzes et al., 2004) shared reflections on the first of the five practices, which is model the way. He looked to scripture, his own experience, and stories of those he had known as he contributed to the essay. Maxwell began by acknowledging the weaknesses of the human condition and remarked that “regardless of their past, God still calls men and women to serve Him in
leadership roles” and that God “specializes in taking broken, weak individuals and changing the course of history through them” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 41).

Maxwell (Kouzes et al., 2004) identified five principles that he believed serve as indicators of modelling the way:

1. Work on yourself before you work on others.
2. Work on yourself more than you work on others.
3. It is easier to teach what is right than to do what is right.
4. People do what they see.
5. The example of others profoundly impacts our lives. (p. 42)

**First, lead yourself.** Maxwell (Kouzes et al., 2004) condensed the first two principles into this one category due to their similarity. Basically, he articulated how leaders naturally want to change other people, and thus, he challenged the reader to change him- or herself before trying to change others. Maxwell shared experiences from his early days in ministry as a pastor. He found it much easier to facilitate others’ sharing their faith than sharing his own. Reflecting on this difficult experience allowed him to recognize that God was forming him. Maxwell wrote “That experience taught me that leadership is all about being the right person before you start doing the right thing” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 44).

Maxwell (Kouzes et al., 2004) reflected on how sharing his own faith encouraged others to do the same in their families and workplaces. He shared the story of Michael Joseph, chairman and CEO of Dacor. Michel Joseph intentionally integrated his faith into his workplace. He observed that leading himself, first, in the practice of faith-based work ethics bore much fruit. Joseph explained:
When we respect and help one another, we are able to recognize the talent throughout the organization. When we practice forgiveness and give thanks to one another, and thanks to God as well, we open and improve communications. When we deliver innovative and high-quality products, we do good work. And when our business behavior is driven by these values everyone benefits and we have many reasons to celebrate our lives. (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 45-46)

*It is easier to teach what is right than to do what is right.* Maxwell challenges the readers/leaders to live what they teach, and not to teach what they don’t live.

“Powerful leadership emerges when your life matches the message” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 47). He posited that when a person’s life matches what he or she does, that person has both character and credibility. If one claims to be a Christian, that should be witnessed always, and it should be recognizable by others.

*People do what they see.* Maxwell cited studies done by Stanford University which indicate that “89 percent of how we learn is visual, 10 percent is oral, and 1 percent is obtained through the other senses” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 49). He drew connections between this principle and the writings of Saint Paul who consistently referred to his own behavior as a model for the early Christian communities. Maxwell shared the story of Walt Griffin, who transformed an unsuccessful, inner-city, middle school in Florida into an award-winning educational environment with a waiting list. Walt Griffin believed his faith had to be lived. He served the school, the community, the poor, and the underprivileged with conviction.

*The example of others profoundly impacts our lives.* Maxwell (Kouzes et al., 2004) took the reader through a similar exercise that was done at St. John Fisher College.
In the earlier courses of the Education Doctorate program, St. John Fisher College students were asked to consider powerful leaders in their lives and stories. They imagined “the dinner party” they would invite these people to. Maxwell asked who had profound impact on our lives. He shared the story of Bill Bright, founder of Campus Crusade for Christ. Maxwell contacted Bill Bright to express his gratitude, and to learn Bright’s own story better. Maxwell encouraged the reader to reflect on his/her own personal models of godly leadership and challenged the reader to be a model for others. He closed his reflection on the first of the five practices by stating: “I can’t think of another time in history when we were more in need of upright standards—and standard-bearers—to lead the way” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 52).

**Reflections on inspiring a shared vision.** David McAllister-Wilson (Kouzes et al., 2004) began his reflections by drawing attention to the fact that much of the language used in leadership development texts, often used in business, finds its source in the Christian tradition and scripture. He explained: “It isn’t just a coincidence. The language and the concepts of the Christian church are part of the deeply embedded operating system of Western capitalism” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 56). He claimed that inspiring a shared vision is perhaps the most important teachable leadership practice. McAllister-Wilson claimed this because vision is where everything starts.

Using biblical images and notions, McAllister-Wilson (Kouzes et al., 2004) made 7 points. Although, unlike the principles from Maxwell, these are not numbered.

- Inspiration and vision emerge from suffering.
- Visions have a rainbow quality.
- Fish with a net.
• Keep your eye on the horizon.
• Listen deeply.
• Sacrifice is the soul of leadership.
• Give life to your vision

**Inspiration and vision emerge from suffering.** McAllister-Wilson (Kouzes et al., 2004) reminded the reader of the Judeo-Christian tradition of drawing upon the stories of struggle to gain hope for the future. He looked to the prophets of the ancient world, and drew parallels to those of the modern day. McAllister-Wilson invited the reader to consider the text of Martin Luther King Jr.’s final speech where he inspired hope inside of struggle.

**Visions have a rainbow quality.** McAllister-Wilson (Kouzes et al., 2004) challenged the reader to consider the power of risk-taking and storytelling. A leader must come with a vision. “Visions are necessarily hyperbolic, unrealistic, and irresponsible. They express goals that have a rainbow quality” (p. 58). McAllister-Wilson drew connections between faith and vision, calling the reader/leader to trust in God and aim high to inspire vision among the masses.

**Fish with a net.** McAllister-Wilson (Kouzes et al., 2004) reminded the reader that Christianity is a group activity and that “church” is a plural noun. From the time of Jesus Christ, what came to be known as the Christian community has been about gathering people around a shared vision. McAllister-Wilson reflected on Christian leadership during times of crisis such as September 11, 2001 and natural disasters. He articulated how gathering people together can, in itself, be a form of leadership. Preaching is not the only way to lead a community of believers.
**Keep your eye on the horizon.** McAllister-Wilson (Kouzes et al., 2004) highlighted the challenge that came from frustration and organizational disorientation. He explained that when pilots feel disoriented, their training tells them to keep focused on the horizon. Communities of people can collectively share a sense of horizon, a sort of northern star. We can call this project *mission.* “Mission is a shared sense of destiny that requires a leadership that is systemic in nature” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 62). Having a collective sense of mission helps drive a shared vision.

**Listen deeply.** A leader must be able to articulate the shared vision in words. McAllister-Wilson (Kouzes et al., 2004)) quoted Charles Kuralt regarding Irving Berlin: “He eavesdropped on the American heart. When we heard his songs, we knew, ‘That’s us’” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 63). Leaders must be able to articulate to people what they think, feel, and inspire belief. In order to do this, they must first be good listeners. Christians believe that everyone has a role to play in building the kingdom of God. People need to be heard, and have participation in the process of crafting the shared vision.

**Sacrifice is the soul of leadership.** The Christian project is rooted in the Cross of Christ. McAllister-Wilson (Kouzes et al., 2004) reminded the reader that Jesus commanded to love as He loved; and, Jesus loved in a self-sacrificing way. He challenged the reader to recognize that great leadership is born of great sacrifice. He looked to Gandhi, Mother Theresa, and Saint Paul to prove this point. McAllister-Wilson claimed the questions of what we live for and/or what we die for are, in fact, the same question.
**Give life to your vision.** In this final point, McAllister-Wilson (Kouzes et al., 2004) evoked the images of tangible experience and use of our senses. According to McAllister-Wilson, Christians learn their faith through the décor in church, lyrics and tone of music, the smell of incense, and the taste of bread and wine. Leaders must ask questions about what success looks like and how to get that. Leaders must recognize the power of God at work in all aspects of life, and they must inspire a vision that recognizes His presence in the ordinary. If this can be accomplished, McAllister-Wilson believed the vision of a group could shift from their *job* to their *calling*.

**Reflections on challenge the process.** Patrick Lencioni (Kouzes et al., 2004) challenged the reader/leader to consider the important characteristics that make world-changing leaders. After listing many, he posed two qualities do not tend to surface often (a) humility, and (b) pain tolerance. The first quality inspired the question, *Who am I really serving?* Lencioni shared a story about his own ambition and desire to be recognized for his own glory. He then pointed to Jesus Christ as the perfect example of humility that is world changing. Lencioni noted that Jesus’ message was neither self-serving nor self-aggrandizing.

The second quality inspired the question, *Am I prepared to suffer?* Lencioni (Kouzes et al., 2004) reflected on how Jesus paid the price of suffering and death for being a world-changing leader. The followers of Jesus would challenge the process in ways that they knew would lead to suffering and, for many, martyrdom. Lencioni pointed to Christian leaders, such as John the Baptist, Saints Peter, Paul, Joan of Arc, and Thomas More. It would be remiss not to note the mention of More and not Fisher, his
companion in martyrdom. Lencioni mentioned other Christian leaders, such as Abraham Lincoln and Martin Luther King Jr., as well.

Lencioni (Kouzes et al., 2004) challenged that leadership requires perseverence in the face of challenge. He directed the reader to the works of great leaders such as Jim Collins’s book *Good to Great* (2001). The role of leaders demands not being satisfied with the status quo. Leaders must take risks. Leaders must also be open to making mistakes. Lencioni (Kouzes et al., 2004) concluded by reminding the reader that challenging the process for a better world is not easy; and, neither is finding the leader to do it.

**Reflections on enabling others to act.** Nancy Ortberg (Kouzes et al., 2004) reflected on the challenge of gaining a shared vision and shifting toward action in a collaborative manor. She looked to Jesus as the “ultimate example of someone who fostered collaboration and strengthened individuals” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 87). She went on to note that in the business world, team building is essential, and Jesus did exactly that when he called the Disciples. Within 3 years, Jesus built the team he would leave his mission to.

Ortberg (Kouzes et al., 2004) made the point that Christianity follows along in the tradition of the priesthood of all believers. Every Christian is called to act as a leader for the faith. The collective project of leading, and being Christian, requires collaborative trust in one another. Ortberg reflected on stories of effective examples of trust and collaboration. She then moved on to challenge the reader to, from a place of trust, give his or her power away. Inspired by the Christian tradition that is rooted in Jesus doing
that very thing, Ortberg shared stories from her own experience of handing over her power.

Ortberg (Kouzes et al., 2004) continued to share stories of cultivating the gifts recognized in others and to lift others up as heroes. Leadership, she believed, requires a perspective of leading from service. Ortberg believed that the cumulative effect of all these things, in fact, enables others to act. She concluded: “No matter where you serve as a leader, serve in such a way that when people leave your presence, they stand a little taller and smile a bit longer and say to themselves, ‘There’s something different about that place.’” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 98).

Reflections on encouraging the heart. Ken Blanchard (Kouzes et al., 2004) believed that the fifth and final practice of exemplary leadership, to encourage the heart, was best articulated when he wrote: “Over the years, I think the most important concept I have ever taught is to accentuate the positive and catch people doing things right” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 101). He articulated his reflections using four H’s:

- The Heart
- The Head
- The Hands
- The Habits (p. 103).

The heart. Changing the way people lead cannot start from the outside and travel in. Blanchard (Kouzes et al, 2004) pointed to the heart as the motivating principle for people. He challenged the reader/leader to serve others’ interests and to be grounded in God.
**The head.** Using servant leadership theory, Blanchard (Kouzes et al., 2004) focused on the leader’s belief system as another needed avenue of encouragement. The head is where the vision lies. Vision must be built around purpose, mission, a picture of the future, and values. The vision must be compelling and it must be lived.

**The hands.** The hands were a way Blanchard (Kouzes et al., 2004) referred to a leader’s behavior. How a leader behaves in relation to those who follow is a key consideration. Leaders must pay attention, as Jesus did when he traveled from place to place, noting what people do well and encouraging those who stray to correct their ways. Blanchard wrote that it is critical for leaders to personalize recognition of others. He noted: “A one-size-fits-all approach to recognition feels contrived, and people can see right through it” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 112).

**The habits.** Blanchard (Kouzes et al., 2004) challenged the reader/leader to “recalibrate” his/her good intentions each day through:

1. Solitude
2. Prayer
3. Study of scripture
4. Faith in God’s unconditional love
5. Involvement in accountability relationships (p. 115)

These disciplines, he wrote, keep the leader focused toward servant leadership and encourage the heart. Blanchard asserted: “True greatness only occurs when the heart, head, hands, and habits of a leader are aligned” (Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 116).
Chapter Summary

The research available regarding the use of *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) in various aspects of professional life is abundant. There is not, however, an adequate supply of empirical studies regarding an individual’s use of *The Leadership Challenge*. There is a significant gap in the research and body of knowledge in this field of leadership.

This chapter demonstrated that there were no empirical studies of the leadership of Saint John Fisher and, certainly, no studies that use his life as a model for the five practices of leadership articulated within the book. There is almost nothing available on an individual’s use of *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) as a model for dissertation research and literature review.

There are, however, other forms of research that pertain to individuals, *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012), Saint John Fisher, and areas in which the former bishop of Rochester led. This chapter briefly examined the contributions of Christian leaders who found *The Leadership Challenge* helpful and meaningful for their own lives as leaders. A synopsis conveyed their shared stories. The text does not demonstrate any of the individuals’ use of all five practices, but it does show each individuals’ use of an individual practice.

**What do/don’t we know about applying *The Leadership Challenge* to an individual?** It is fair to say that we know the five practices of *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) can be applied to an individual. We know very little, however, about it. There were extremely few examples in the form of empirical studies to
demonstrate how this has been done. The Kouzes and Posner (2013) model is so widely known and incorporated into research that it is vital that this area of research be explored.

**What do/don’t we know about applying *The Leadership Challenge* to Christianity?** We know that there is a respectable number of empirical studies that incorporate various aspects of *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) to various aspects of Christian context. The Kouzes and Posner/Wiley Brand website highlights abstracts of many, if not all, of those studies. None of those studies were examples of one individual in relation to all five practices of *The Leadership Challenge*.

We also know that one book has been written that incorporates each of the five practices to individuals’ experiences of Christianity. As indicated above, there were three key lessons that the researcher learned from *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). They are: (a) the power of story-telling is profound, (b) the collection of essays included in this text were good and helpful, and (c) they were neither empirical studies nor examples of one individual in relationship to all five practices of *The Leadership Challenge*.

**What do/don’t we know about applying *The Leadership Challenge* to Saint John Fisher?** There is a significant gap in the research and knowledge regarding the patron saint of St. John Fisher College in Rochester, NY. There is no study in existence that synchronizes the seminal text of the College’s Education Doctorate in Executive Leadership to its program and *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) with the life and leadership of its patron, Saint John Fisher.

This research will contribute to the body of knowledge by beginning to fill in the demonstrated gap. This research contribution could become a resource for the scholarly
community at St. John Fisher College, particularly in its Executive Leadership Doctoral Program. We are reminded of the quote from Saint John Fisher: “David wasn't thinking of being king when he was tending sheep; he was just doing what God sat before him.”

One could build a framework to evaluate the leadership of Saint John Fisher using the Kouzes and Posner (2012) model of the five practices. A critical examination of how Saint John Fisher “modelled the way,” for example, may be easily recognized, while the same of how he “inspired a shared vision” may not. This work has yet to be done.
Chapter 4: Research Design Methodology

Introduction

Kouzes and Posner (2012) held that what makes a good leader endures through time. If leadership, as an academic discipline, is relatively new to higher education, and if what makes a good leader includes eternal truths of leadership, then the Church should be able to look to its tradition and find evidence of contemporary leadership models studied in contemporary higher education leadership programs.

Study Purpose

Saint John Fisher (1469-1535) has been held up by the Roman Catholic Church as an example of leadership and holiness. This academic institution, St. John Fisher College in Rochester, NY, is under the patronage of Saint John Fisher. It is only right that those associated with teaching and learning at St. John Fisher College should have some understanding of the namesake of this institution, which is “in the Catholic tradition of American higher education” (St. John Fisher College, 2012). The Roman Catholic tradition memorializes Saint John Fisher on June 22 each year.

Study Design

A qualitative study design, using a “systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents” known as document analysis (Bowen, 2009, p. 27) was used for this research. Document analysis can be used as a “standalone method” (Bowen, 2009, p. 29); however, it is part of the method of analytic induction.
The documents. Much of the works of Saint John Fisher were destroyed. Given his challenging tenor toward King Henry VIII’s issues around supremacy and sacramental marriage validity, coupled with what is commonly known of as Henry VIII’s dealings with those who disputed him, it is not alarming to find Saint John Fisher’s English works limited in number. The most recent critical collection of the English works of Saint John Fisher include six sermons (Fisher & Hatt, 2004, pp. 42-349). Thematically, they vary in style and intention. They were written and published in the style of English that was contemporary to Saint John Fisher’s time, and they were all unquestionably attributed to him. This is a particular challenge because the writing style and spelling is somewhat unfamiliar to the present-day scholar.

There are also several, older, biographies written about Saint John Fisher. Saint John Fisher by E. E. Reynolds, most recently published in Great Britain in 1956, is commonly referenced by other scholars. This is the principal biography used in this research study. There are several others cited, and therefore they are in the reference list, which were also used. In addition to the sermons and biographies, there are numerous academic papers that have been delivered regarding the life and work of Saint John Fisher. The three previously mentioned have to do directly with his leadership. Guided by the research questions in Chapter 1, sermons, biographies, and academic papers of/about Saint John Fisher have been used as a research method known as analytic induction.

Analytic Induction

Analytic induction is attributed to the philosopher Florian Znaniecki (1934), of the early 20th century, as a method of sociology. He founded this methodology in
Chicago, Illinois, USA, and offered this method as an alternative to statistical analysis. Znaniecki found statistics focused on probabilities, while he was looking to demonstrate scientific laws, that is, that “something” holds in all circumstances and throughout time. His analytic induction holds that if an exception is found, the researcher must revise the theory.

Analytic induction’s function “is to build up and confirm a set of causal links in the setting we’re looking at” (Gibbs, 2010). The process can begin by developing a rough definition of a research question. From that, a hypothesis or prediction is developed. There would be several of these. Then the researcher must go through the evidence cases by case. In each case, the question must be asked “Is this a deviant case?” In other words, does this case follow what has been predicted by the researcher (Gibbs, 2010)?

In situations when the case is not deviant; in other words, the case does fit the prediction, then the hypothesis is confirmed. When a hypothesis has been confirmed, the researcher ends that particular examination and the data collection ceases. It is unusual that every case is not a deviant case. It is more common that the original prediction needs to be “tweaked” (Gibbs, 2010). This means that the hypothesis has not been confirmed.

The next question, then, becomes, “Can the hypothetical explanation be redefined to exclude the deviant cases?” Oftentimes the original idea simply might not have allowed for enough variation (Gibbs, 2010). If the hypothesis can be tweaked to exclude a deviant case and there are no other cases, then the researcher has the explanation and completes the process, but this is not always possible.
If the hypothesis cannot be tweaked, a new hypothesis must be determined. Once the researcher has “reformulated the hypothesis” the process of examining for deviant cases begins over again (Gibbs, 2010). If an hypothesis has been changed, then the researcher must look at all of the cases over again. Every time a hypothetical explanation of the research question is altered, the process must be reviewed case by case.

Additionally, Dr. Martyn Hammersley (2012) lectured that there are six steps of analytic induction. They are (Figure 3.1):

1. Initially specify the outcome to be explained.
2. Collect data on a small number of cases in which the outcome is present.

3. Identify what these cases are and formulate a hypothesis on that basis.
4. Collect data on further cases.
5. If one is found that does not fit the hypothesis the either reformulate that hypothesis or redefine the outcome.
6. Continue until data from new cases no longer force revisions (Hammersley, 2012).

Hammersley (2012) went on to explain that more recent approaches to analytic induction claim that, “analytic induction is unlike other qualitative approaches since it begins with a pre-existing theoretical viewpoint or premise that guides the investigator’s approach to the cases that are examined” (Sussman & Gilgun, 1996, p. 208). This more contemporary definition allows the researcher to begin with an hypothesis as opposed to being literally inductive.

Analytic induction raises several issues, and it attempts to respond to them. Hammersley (2012) listed some of them:

- What is the form of adequate scientific explanation of any phenomenon?
- What is required if we are to develop such an explanation?

**Method for the Study**

Analytic induction requires an observed outcome, and then it provides a process to understand the “why” or the “how” of that outcome. The explore outcome was that Saint John Fisher demonstrated good leadership. That outcome is widely accepted in the Catholic community, as evidenced by his canonization. That outcome has been accepted by the broader society, noting that world-renowned institutions of higher learning were founded, led by, and named after him. Saint John Fisher’s witness and leadership is so
greatly accepted that even the Anglican Church, which he was martyred in opposition to, has claimed him as a saint.

The researcher used analytic induction to determine what about Saint John Fisher produced such an outcome. The 5-point model of Kouzes and Posner (2012) help to explain the outcome. The driving theoretical question about the leadership of Saint John Fisher was: Can we find evidence of each of the five practices in the life and writings of Saint John Fisher? The researcher explored what documents and events support the Kouzes and Posner (2012) theory and what contradicts or does not support it.

No coding mechanisms was performed in this study because the study was not performed with a mechanistic process. The process of analytic induction is a macro-level analysis. Coding is a micro-level analysis. While understanding coding was helpful to the researcher, analytic induction requires the researcher to use an implicit and interpretive procedure while examining the data (Smelser & Baltes, 2001). The “logic of proof in [analytic induction] relies solely on the richness or variety of the cases” that share consistency (Smelser & Baltes, 2001, p.6).

Knowing that analytic induction can be aided by the researcher having an awareness of themes to look for; and, knowing the researcher used Kouzes and Posner’s five practice theory as an implicit lens, five practices are listed with their supporting indicators.

- Model the way.
  - Clarify values.
  - Set the example.
• Inspire a shared vision.
  o Envision the future.
  o Enlist others.

• Challenge the process.
  o Search for opportunities.
  o Experiment and take risks.

• Enable others to act.
  o Foster collaboration.
  o Strengthen others.

• Encourage the heart
  o Recognize contributions.
  o Celebrate the values and victories. (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, pp. xi-xiii)

This theoretical lens allowed the researcher to engage the contemporary use of analytic induction. The 5-point model, with its indicators, operated as a guide to looking for themes in the literature. Having this lens might have created limitations, potentially forcing an author’s particular view upon the researcher. Being conscious of that risk the researcher looked for counterexamples. It also encouraged the researcher to be on the watch for leadership characteristics that might be present in Saint John Fisher that were not explained by the theoretical model.

While exploring examples of leadership through the theoretical lens of Kouzes and Posner (2012), the researcher also searched for counterexamples. In addition, the inductive process of analysis could have produced qualities, behaviors, and traits of leadership that were not addressed by the theoretical 5-point model. When discovering
such evidence, the researcher noted it. Such a discovery could provide an answer to questions about what Saint John Fisher could teach to the contemporary world about leadership and, therefore, not limiting that discovery to how contemporary leadership theory is evidenced in the leadership of Saint John Fisher.

Summary

This chapter has outlined the study purpose, design, methodological theory, and method for this study of the leadership of Saint John Fisher. The outlined process gives a comprehensive view of the leadership of Saint John Fisher. It is comprehensive because it is an informal investigation of all of the materials that were available to the researcher, using an accepted sociological methodology which provided for such an effort to be legitimate and scholarly.

Using this design, the researcher was able to study the leadership of Saint John Fisher in different contexts such as his roles of bishop, educator, and theologian. Throughout the course of this research, the researcher looked for the counterexamples against the theoretical model, he looked to find any leadership traits that were exemplified by Saint John Fisher that, perhaps, the theoretical model does not include.
Chapter 5: Results

Research Questions

The questions that are the basis for this research are:

1. Are Kouzes and Posner’s five practices evident in the leadership of Saint John Fisher?
2. If so, is there evidence that he practiced one, or some, more than others?
3. Is there evidence of leadership practices in Saint John Fisher that are not part of Kouzes and Posner’s 5-point model?

Data Analysis and Findings

The researcher analyzed six original works of Saint John Fisher as well as the scholarship of seven academics. Regarding the original works of Saint John Fisher, the researcher analyzed two of his personal letters, three sermons, and one prayer. These works were selected in dialogue with committee and because they sample each category of the existent primary documents. In addition to reading two biographies prior to this analysis and the scholarly works of others, the researcher analyzed one biographical text about Saint John Fisher, three histories of the English reformation, and two academic essays.

This chapter first articulates the evidence found for each of the five practices from Kouzes and Posner (2012). Next, the chapter communicates the counterexamples of those practices found by the researcher. Then the chapter states any discovered evidence of Saint John Fisher’s leadership practices that are not represented in Kouzes and
Posner’s 5-point model. Finally, the chapter summarizes the findings in light of the research questions established for this work.

**Model the way.** The researcher recorded instances where the practice “model the way” was evident. Kouzes and Posner (2012) designated two sub-codes to indicate modeling the way. They were “clarify values” and “set the example” (p. 42). Among all the literature analyzed, the researcher recorded 42 cases of modeling the way. Of the 42 cases, 26 were recorded under the clarifying values and 16 under setting the example.

**Clarifying values.** Bishop Fisher took seriously his role as Chancellor at Cambridge. In his effort to plan for the future, Bishop Fisher clarified three needs of the university, which were financial patronage, the value of scholarship to all of England and Christendom, and that the university needed representation with access to the Royal Court (Brooke, 2009). Of course, being Chancellor was not Bishop Fisher’s only responsibility. His own access to the Royal Court, as a chancellor and as a bishop, gave him access to many situations that needed clarity of value.

Henry VIII had married his deceased brother’s wife, Catherine of Aragon. He had received a papal dispensation for this wedding because Catherine’s first marriage had not been consummated. In time, however, Henry VIII desired to divorce his wife and marry another woman. His efforts to acquire the necessary annulment were met with difficulty. In order to declare a marriage nulled, there needs to be evidence that it never had validly taken place. There was no evidence to that effect. In fact, Henry VIII and Catherine had a daughter, Mary. His wandering affections, coupled with his fruitless desire to have a male heir, seemed to drive Henry VIII into conflict with the Church over his desired divorce/annulment.
Regarding the divorce desired by King Henry VIII from Catherine of Aragon, “Fisher declared that no power whether human or divine could dissolve this marriage” (Bernard, 2005, p. 13). In so doing, Fisher clarified the value the Church placed on sacramental validity. Henry VIII argued that the book of Leviticus disallows brothers to marry the same woman. References to this line of argumentation can be found, such as: “You shall not uncover the nakedness of your brother’s wife; it is your brother’s nakedness;” and “a man takes his brother’s wife, it is impurity; he has uncovered his brother’s nakedness; they shall be childless” (Leviticus 18:16, 20:21, Recovery Version Online).

Bishop Fisher took Henry VIII’s argument into consideration. The Bishop responded, however, “that the Levitical prohibition applied only if both brothers were alive” (Bernard, 2005, p. 13). Over time, Henry VIII was able to influence the bishops of England to side with him on this issue. Bishop Fisher, however, valued the truth of the sacramental bond above fear from an authoritarian king. In fact, “of all the bishops of the English church, only John Fisher (1469-1535), Bishop of Rochester, firmly refused to go along with the divorce and with the ensuing break with Rome” (Bernard, 2005, p. 101).

During the year 1534, Henry VIII issued the Act of Supremacy. It stated that he would be supreme head of the Church of England and its clergy. All clergy were expected to sign an oath agreeing to that supremacy, as well as how the Act outlined succession to the throne. Bishop Fisher “did not dispute the right of Parliament to settle the succession, but [he] rejected the Royal Supremacy, and the assertion that the King’s first marriage was unlawful” (Dickens, 1964, p. 119). As such, Bishop Fisher was arrested and jailed in the Tower of London. The following year, “on May 7 Fisher
declared that the king was not supreme head on earth of the Church of England” (Bernard, 2005, p. 121). While in an interrogation, he did this from his cell in the Tower of London. Fisher’s refusal to agree to the dismissal of the king’s first marriage, and his refusal of consent to the Act of Supremacy, earned him a death sentence. Fisher (and very few others) were committed to a clear witness of the universal Church, established by Christ, led by the Bishop of Rome and his successors. “Richard Crawley, Curate of Broughton, Oxfordshire, called the Bishops of Rome ‘Pope’ and declared that Fisher, Reynolds, and More had died for the true faith” (Bernard, 2005, p. 199).

Fisher was the bishop of the Diocese of Rochester, England. He was known to both royalty and the common folk as a pastoral bishop. In an essay about Fisher as diocesan bishop, Stephan Thompson (2009) quoted Reginald Pole, a contemporary of Bishop Fisher. Pole wrote to King Henry VIII of Bishop Fisher’s “holiness, learning, prudence, and episcopal zeal” (p. 67). In the same essay, the Thompson wrote of Bishop Fisher’s unique quality among his fellow bishops, in that he was one of the few to express the value of the pastoral role of the clergy. Bishop Fisher also worked to protect the rights of clergy, especially in the face of a king who was trying to usurp their power and their Church. Bishop Fisher wrote an argument vindicating “the rights and dignity of the clergy” while “defending the legislative independence of the Church” (Bernard, 2005, p. 113).

Bishop Fisher made many an effort to articulate clear arguments with Martin Luther, who was disputing with the Church. One such issue Luther wrote against was the validity of the seven sacraments. Fisher clarified that all of the sacraments “took their meaning and their power from the blood of Christ” (Duffy, 1992, p. 108). Luther also
proposed that faith alone, and not good works, was necessary for salvation. To that, Bishop Fisher systematically clarified the value of “works” with faith evidenced in both scripture and the work of the Church Fathers (Fisher, 1935b, p. 328). Luther argued that scripture alone, and no tradition, guides the faithful. Against this argument, Bishop Fisher preached brilliantly, pulling it apart piece by piece to clarify Catholic values. He wrote that Luther “sayeth: councils sometimes err, therefore he is bound to believe none of them” (Fisher, 1935b, p. 337). Bishop Fisher went on to articulate the examples of when, in scripture, the “prophets did sometimes ‘square’ from the truth” (Fisher, 1935b, p. 337), and how “Saint Peter confessed Christ . . . yet a little after dissuaded Christ from His passion” (Fisher, 1935b, p. 338).

Bishop Fisher continued to provide examples of the fallibility included in scripture in order that he might make this point: “Prophets and apostles [are] fallible; so are the doctors; yet their occasional errors will not justify us in denying their authority generally” (Fisher, 1935b, p. 338). Luther, according to Fisher, could not hold a solid argument. Bishop Fisher went on to argue the cumulative value of the prophets, apostles, Church fathers, and ecumenical councils, demonstrating the guidance of the Holy Spirit throughout. In so doing, Bishop Fisher preached the clear value of God’s guidance in the work of the Holy Spirit. Conversely, Bishop Fisher preached, “we may be sure that Luther hath not this Spirit, when he cuts away traditions, councils, doctrine of the fathers, the seven sacraments, free will. [Luther] must have some other spirit, a spirit of error” (Fisher, 1935b, p. 336). Clarifying these values, Bishop Fisher could demonstrate the continued value of Church authority.
Preaching is one of the fundamental ministries of a bishop. In his role as a preacher, Bishop Fisher led many people in prayer and praise. Bishop Fisher was regarded as the “Greatest preacher of the period” (Duffy, 1992, p. 79). It has also been noted that both his “pastoral solicitude and powerful preaching were rooted in and nourished by his life of prayer” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 102).

One value Bishop Fisher had expressed concern for, and regarded, was “incomplete repentance” on the part of penitents because it affected their ability to “die well” (Duffy, 1992, pp. 342-343). At the funeral for King Henry VII, Bishop Fisher preached about divine values. He preached that God:

- is merciful,
- has taken the king into His custody,
- delivered the king from evil, and
- will shower favor on the deceased. (Fisher, 1935d, p. 281)

Bishop Fisher took the opportunity to clarify some values of the king’s leadership. He pointed out King Henry VII’s commitments to:

1. reform his officers of and for justice;
2. promote virtuous and well learned men; and
3. grant pardon and offer forgiveness. (Fisher, 1935d, p. 271)

Fisher ended the funeral homily clarifying 12 points of value, under three categories, to highlight how the king had lived well and how those who remain should live. The categories were commendation, compassion, and comfort. The values were:

- Commendation of one’s love of God.
- Commendation of one’s hope in prayer.
• Commendation of one’s belief in the sacraments.
• Commendation of one’s diligence calling for grace.
• Compassion for bodily pains.
• Compassion for fear of God’s judgments.
• Compassion for pain and travail from this world’s vanities.
• Compassion for lamentable cries to God for help.
• Comfort in God’s mercy.
• Comfort for the dead being in God’s tuition.
• Comfort for being delivered from so many perils.
• Comfort knowing to continue in God’s favor. (Fisher, 1935d, p. 288)

We can look to Bishop Fisher’s written prayers to find clear values of the spiritual life. In a prayer he wrote while imprisoned and awaiting death, Bishop Fisher expressed:

We may be certain and sure of three things. The first is that thou art our father, the second that thou are a more kind and loving father unto us than are the carnal fathers of this world unto their children. The third that thou wilt give, to such as devoutly ask it of thee, thy most holy spirit. (Fisher, 1956, p. 298)

Bringing his lengthy prayer to a close, Bishop Fisher prayed that he not be consumed with human weaknesses, which would be understandable given his impending death. He asked for the grace to love God “with all my heart, with all my soul, with all my mind and all my power. Amen” (Fisher, 1956, p. 299). Those final words of prayer offer the reader insight into what the bishop clearly valued. That sentiment is echoed in Bishop Fisher’s letter to his sister, which he also wrote while imprisoned. Fisher compared the
value “the hunter” places on game to how the “religious person seeks Christ without concern” (Fisher, 1935a, p. 367).

**Setting the example.** Fisher “was a devoted and active senior proctor and vice chancellor” (Brooke, 2009, p. 57) at the university. Many people respected Fisher and considered him of “saintly personal character” (Dickens, 1964, p. 123). King Henry VII named John Fisher Bishop of Rochester “whom he greatly revered on account of the pure devotion, perfect sanctity, and great learning” (Bernard, 2005, p. 101). One author noted, “You would not easily find one who was such a model of episcopal virtues” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 107).

Additionally, Fisher was considered a “model diocesan bishop. Ascetic, deeply committed to his pastoral duties, and ordained priests in person” (Bernard, 2005, p. 102). Fisher’s contemporaries praised him for many things, but most of all “simply for his holiness of life and devotion to his diocese” (Thompson, 2009, p. 67). Additionally, Fisher was “hailed in his own lifetime as a model bishop,” (Thompson, 2009, p. 67) and “was indeed a devoted pastor” (Brooke, 2009, p. 57). Bishop Stokesley, a contemporary of Bishop Fisher, articulated his own quiet respect for him: “lamenting his own helplessness in the face of advancing heresy and wishing that he had had the courage to stand against it with his brother the Bishop of Rochester” (Duffy, 1992, p. 592). Bishop Fisher was very devoted to his poor diocese and to the truth in the face of death. Future bishops would look to Bishop Fisher’s example. “Such a blatant disregard for careerism made him a model for Saint Charles Borromeo, the reforming archbishop of Milan” (Bernard, 2005, p. 101).
Shortly after Bishop Fisher’s imprisonment in the Tower of London, the Pope named him a cardinal. This was believed, at least in part, to put additional pressure on the king to not execute him. However, “cardinals wear crimson robes to show that, like the early martyrs of Rome, they are prepared to witness to Christ, even to the point of shedding their own blood” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 100). In actuality, “Bishop John Fisher, the most spiritual prelate of his generation, paid with his life” (Bernard, 2005, p. 172); and, “among the English cardinals, only Fisher has been allowed to exemplify this greatest love” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 100). Sir Thomas More, a friend in the cause for keeping communion, was also martyred for that cause. Rev. Robert Parkyn, curate of Adwick “admired More and his fellow martyr Bishop John Fisher, making copies of their more intimate meditations” (Dickens, 1964, p. 6). Cardinal Fisher’s entire letter Ways to Perfect Religion . . . (Fisher, 1935a) demonstrates selfless concern for God, the Church, and others. To that end, Cardinal Fisher modeled the way by exemplifying Christ-like behavior in the face of death. In the final words of that letter to his sister, the Cardinal wrote: “If ever you feel dullness of mind, quicken it by the meditation of death which I send you, or by prayer” (Fisher, 1935a, p. 386).

**Inspire a shared vision.** The researcher recorded instances where the practice “inspire a shared vision” was evident. Kouzes and Posner (2012) designated two sub-codes to indicate inspiring a shared vision. They are “envision the future” and “enlist others” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 100). Among all the literature analyzed, the researcher recorded 33 cases of inspiring a shared vision. Of the 33 cases, four were recorded under envisioning the future, and 29 were recorded under enlisting others.
Envisioning the future. Bishop Fisher was both an educated man and a man dedicated to the benefit of education. He had a concern for the education of priests so that they might be effective and accurate preachers. This concern arose from his growing awareness of “uneducated and wicked priests” (Dickens, 1964, p. 45). Bishop Fisher worked toward the academic formation of clergy to foster a better future for all. Bishop Fisher “first inspired the Lady Margaret” with the idea of centers of study for preaching formation (Brooke, 2009, p. 47). She agreed and worked for that future, with Bishop Fisher, as financier of St. John’s College.

While imprisoned in the Tower of London, awaiting capital punishment, Bishop Fisher wrote a letter to his half-sister Elizabeth. Elizabeth was a nun. He wrote her a Spiritual Consolation that many scholars considered pessimistic (Surtz, 1967). The tenor of the letter, however, was very much about encouraging “the Christian to do something now so as to be ready at the summons of inexorable death” (Surtz, 1967, p. 373). In that, Bishop Fisher was attempting to envision a heavenly future for his sister. An example found in the letter was Bishop Fisher’s vision of the Christian vision for loving God in return for God’s love of humanity. God’s love, he wrote, “should pierce your heart moving you to love him” (Fisher, 1935f, p. 374).

Bishop Fisher was regarded as the greatest preacher of his day (Duffy, 1992). In his role as a preacher, Bishop Fisher worked to sanctify and teach his audience so that they might gain salvation in the future. A powerful example of his preaching was A Sermon . . . Preached Upon a Good Friday (Fisher, 1935c). Following the tradition established by Saint Francis of Assisi and made popular in the writing of Saint Bonaventure, Bishop Fisher envisioned how the Christian could enter into the passion of
Jesus Christ so that the Christian could enjoy his resurrection (Hatt, 2002). In order to envision that reality, Bishop Fisher wrote, “If thou lament with Jesus, thou shalt sing with him” (Fisher, 1935c, p. 427).

**Enlist others.** In the same sermon on Good Friday, Bishop Fisher enlisted the authority and appeal of the saints to preach the message affectively. As the devotional practices mentioned above, attributed to Saints Francis and Bonaventure, offered thematic roots for his sermon, Bishop Fisher invoked the name and example of Saint Francis of Assisi and his devotion to the humility of Christ’s passion and death (Fisher, 1935c). He went on to enlist the authority and example of the saints throughout the ages.

Referencing the relationship humanity has with God and the effect of human sin, Bishop Fisher enlisted the example of Saint Bernard (Fisher, 1935c, p. 401). In the same thematic vein, he enlisted King David’s work in Psalm 43 (Fisher, 1935c, p. 401). Bishop Fisher continued the theme of the sorrow of the passion, and humanity’s connection to it, by enlisting Mary Magdalene and her “flood of tears” shed in repentance for sin (Fisher, 1935c, p. 404). Connecting contemporary sorrow with the tradition, Bishop Fisher enlisted the appeal of “the virgin Mary and the apostles” to communicate the message (Fisher, 1935c, p. 404).

In an appeal to love more powerfully and not give into hate, Bishop Fisher enlisted the examples Joab and David and their efforts to love people and “hate sin” (Fisher, 1935c, p. 406). To further the case for a loving witness, Bishop Fisher enlisted the prayer of Moses: “What doth thy Lord God require of thee, but that thou love Him?” (Fisher, 1935c, p. 407). Humanity, however, struggles with sin, and Bishop Fisher enlisted the work of Saint Paul to articulate the truth of our sinful condition. “Saint Paul
calls sin our handwriting,” he wrote (Fisher, 1935c, p. 415). Human beings can inflict their sinful condition onto others with their behavior, and Fisher highlighted this. He explained the salvific quality, such shame, can have when linked to the passion of Christ. He enlisted the witness of Saint Susanna and how she was “slandered by two lewd priests, but when the matter was tried and she was clearly delivered from this shame, it was a great comfort to her” Fisher, 1935, pp. 415-416).

Bishop Fisher preached at the funeral of King Henry VII. In the same act of sanctifying and teaching, he enlisted the saints in his homily, while highlighting the value of the King’s leadership. Reminding the faithful of the mercy of God, Bishop Fisher enlisted the preaching of Saint Austin (Augustine). “Saint Austin sayeth: No amount of crime, nor shortness of time, excludes from pardon, if the sinner’s will be turned to God” Fisher, 1935, p. 283). Bishop Fisher further explained the humility of God by enlisting Saint Anthony, who knew “that lowliness alone,” could pass the dangers of and snares of humanity’s drive for power and greatness (Fisher, 1935d, p. 283).

To further the value of humility in leadership, Bishop Fisher enlisted the witness of King Ahab “who did great idolatry and slew many prophets, yet, when the prophet Hely threatened him, repented and was spared because he humbled himself before God” (Fisher, 1935d, p. 284). Once he demonstrated the humble way of living was the way to Christ, Bishop Fisher shifted to the importance of union with God. He enlisted the preaching of Saint John Chrysostom, quoting, “The grief of 10,000 hells is nothing to exclusion from Christ” (Fisher, 1935d, p. 287).

King Henry VIII desired an annulment from Catherine of Aragon, to marry Anne Boleyn. He argued that because Catherine was the widow of his brother, their marriage
was not licit. Bishop Fisher argued the validity of their marriage, stating that the 
“continuance of so long space had made the marriage honest.” Bishop Fisher went on 
further to enlist Pope Clement VII to offer further dispensation to satisfy King Henry 
VIII’s conscience (Bernard, 2005, p. 24).

In time, King Henry VIII grew to desire a break with Roman Catholic authority to 
name himself as the head of the Church in England. “Fisher, emerging as a crucial 
opponent of the king, with the skill and authority to rally his fellow bishops” was 
enlisting them to qualify the king’s authority (Bernard, 2005, p. 109). Bishop Fisher 
wanted an addendum to the king’s declaration as supreme head of the Church in England. 
He enlisted the support of his fellow bishops to add the phrase “so long as the law of God 
allows” to the end of the oath.

Bishop Fisher reached out, strategically, “to the holy Roman emperor, Emperor 
Charles V” (Bernard, 2005, p. 115) and “appealed for help” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, 
p. 104). The emperor was the nephew of Catherine of Aragon. Bishop Fisher’s outreach 
did not yield the results he was hoping for; however, his very example enlisted others in 
the struggle. When King Henry VIII attempted to suppress and claim Catholic property, 
the Abbot of Colchester refused to surrender his monastery and “inveighed against the 
tyranny of executing the monks of Syon and Fisher and [Thomas] More” (Bernard, 2005, 
pp. 470-471).

Always committed to learning, Bishop Fisher had worked hard to develop 
institutions for higher learning. He “befriended Desiderius Erasmus and encouraged him 
to teach” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, 101). Bishop Fisher also enlisted and “encouraged 
Erasmus in his labors in translating the Bible” (Bernard, 2005, p. 102). Bishop Fisher
enlisted Lady Margaret Beaufort, as a patron, for the concern of growing educational opportunities for clergy (Duffy 1992). “Lady Margaret and Fisher are inseparable in their foundations” concerning the creation of St. John’s College, which was eventually named Cambridge University (Brooke, 2009, p. 47). “If Fisher had not first inspired the lady Margaret with the idea . . . St. John’s College would not have been founded” (Brooke, 2009, p. 47). Additionally, Bishop Fisher “encouraged Margaret to take over Godshouse and refound it” as a college (Brooke, 2009, p. 60). Bishop Fisher’s commitment to educating clergy dovetailed with his role as diocesan bishop. He “appointed clergy of good quality” to ministry (Thompson, 2009, p. 72).

Writing to his half-sister Elizabeth, Bishop Fisher enlisted her in her special vocation as a consecrated woman to prayerfully consider the call to perfection. Regarding that call, he wrote, “Each of those chosen had some likelihood to be accepted for [God’s] spouse” (Fisher, 1935f, p. 375). In an effort to further inspire and enlist Sister Elizabeth in the pursuit of holiness, Bishop Fisher wrote of Christ’s unconditional love. He wrote “For you he suffered all, as if there had been no more in the world but only yourself. If this belief settles in your heart, you cannot contend it without the love of Him” (Fisher, 1935f, p. 379).

In his preaching against Luther’s heresy, Bishop Fisher enlisted the faithful to keep communion. He wrote that “Christ bids us, when clouds of heresy darken the heaven, to be constant in believing as holy church believeth” (Fisher, 1935b, p. 342). In his preaching on Good Friday, Bishop Fisher enlisted the Christian to respond to the need for conversion by highlighting the atonement of Christ. He wrote, “If sin was so grievously punished in Him that never did sin, how much more in thee o sinful creature”
Moreover, before he was publicly martyred, Bishop Fisher enlisted the crowd to aid him. He spoke out, “help and assist me with your prayers” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 106).

**Challenge the process.** The researcher recorded instances where the practice “challenge the process” was evident. Kouzes and Posner (2012) designated two sub-codes to indicate challenging the process. They are “search for opportunities” and “experiment and take risks” (p. 156). Among all the literature analyzed, the researcher recorded 14 cases of challenging the process. Of the 14 cases, six are recorded under search for opportunities, and eight are recorded under experiment and take risks.

**Search for opportunities.** As a bishop, Fisher had a committed concern for challenging souls under his care toward growth and fervor. In the letter he wrote to his half-sister, a nun, Bishop Fisher concluded his writing of a series of considerations by encouraging her: “These considerations, often read and truly imprint them in your remembrance, will inflame your heart with love of Christ” (Fisher, 1935f, p. 386).

Regarding King Henry VIII’s desire to be proclaimed head of the Church in England, Bishop Fisher “suggested the insertion of the clause ‘as far as the law of Christ allows’” into the king’s oath (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 104). That clause allowed for the possibility of challenging the king’s authority. Regarding King Henry VIII’s desire to divorce his wife Catherine, Bishop Fisher also worked to encourage the Queen to enter religious life, which would have been an acceptable form of release from marriage vows (Bernard, 2005).

When considering Bishop Fisher’s reputation, he was often referred to as “John Fisher, the arch reformer” (Brooke, 2009, p. 60). Bishop Fisher searched for
opportunities to reform monasteries. He was not afraid to challenge and suppress religious houses that were abusing privileges. He often even made them into places of study (Brooke, 2009).

At the moment he faced his own violent death, which was brought about by a command of the king who he challenged frequently, Bishop Fisher searched for opportunities to find goodness in the king and preach hope to the crowds gathered. Bishop Fisher said: “And I beseech almighty God of His infinite goodness to save the king and his realm, and that it may please him to hold His holy hand over it, and send the king good counsel” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 106).

Experiment and take risks. Bishop Fisher took serious risks in standing against King Henry VIII. Although he had been close to the king for generations, “Fisher in his later years stood apart from the [royal] court” (Brooke, 2009, p. 54). The king wanted to both divorce his wife, and name himself head of the Church in England. “Among the English bishops of his generation, only Fisher firmly opposed Henry VIII’s divorce and break with Rome” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 100).

Regarding the king’s desire to divorce his wife, Bishop Fisher stood strongly opposed to the king. “It was at the legatine trial in June 1529 that Fisher made his rejection of the king’s case dramatically public” (Bernard, 2005, 104). The king’s case had been processed in ecclesiastical court. As such, Catherine had the right to be represented in court. Bishop Fisher was her advocate. He declared that “no power whether human or divine could dissolve this marriage . . . an opinion for which he would lay down his life” (Bernard, 2005, p. 13).
Regarding the king’s desire to separate with Rome, “it was Fisher who led the resistance to Henry VIII’s claim to be supreme head of the Church in England” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 104). Bishop Fisher did not challenge the king’s hope for parliament to grant his arguments about royal succession, with which the king had been leveraging his influence with parliament. Bishop Fisher, however, “rejected the Royal Supremacy and the assertion that the king’s first marriage had been unlawful” (Dickens, 1964, p. 119). The parliamentary act having to do with succession procedures became aligned with the king’s position regarding his supremacy over the Church. As such, Bishop Fisher “refused to take the oath which confirmed the Act of Succession” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 105). Because of his risk-filled refusal, Bishop Fisher was “seized and sent to the tower” and imprisoned (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 105). We can understand, from his writing while imprisoned, Bishop Fisher’s confidence in the witness of martyrs who “shed their blood” for the love of and witness to God (Fisher, 1935f, p. 385).

**Enable others to act.** The researcher recorded instances where the practice “enable others to act” was evident. Kouzes and Posner (2012) designated two sub-codes to indicate enabling others to act. They are “foster collaboration” and “strengthen others” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 216). Among all the literature analyzed, the researcher recorded 25 cases of enabling others to act. Of the 25 cases, 10 are recorded under foster collaboration, and 15 are recorded under strengthen others.

**Foster collaboration.** Bishop Fisher’s dedication to the education of others would not have been institutionalized in the realm of higher education without the philanthropic collaboration of Lady Margaret Beaufort. Having spent years in close
relationship to her and her family, Bishop Fisher could call upon her in the building up of
the academy. To that end, “Lady Margaret and Fisher are inseparable in their
foundations” of schools (Brooke, 2009, p. 47). The project consisted of reorganizing his
Alma Mater, Michaelhouse School (which later merged with King’s Hall to form Trinity
College).

Bishop Fisher “also persuaded Lady Margaret to found lectures in divinity both in
Cambridge and in Oxford” (Bernard, 2005, p. 101). The growth of the academy
continued. Through Bishop Fisher’s collaborative leadership, “the two worked together
to build up the university: through Fisher’s encouragement, she established the Lady
Margaret Professorship of Divinity (1502) and enlarged Christ’s College (1505)”
(Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 101). Even in her death, Lady Margaret’s generosity
continued. Bishop Fisher acquires money from her estate to found St. John’s College.

Bishop Fisher’s preaching was another way in which he enabled others to act by
way of fostering collaboration. He had a deep faith in the supernatural bond that gathered
the living and the dead into one Church (Duffy, 1992). Bishop Fisher preached that the
living “should pray for the deceased in purgation for we are all bound together by faith,
hope, charity” and we are “partners of the same sacraments” (Duffy, 1992, p. 349). His
long-standing relationship with the Tudor family availed him with the opportunity to
preach at the funeral of King Henry VII. Bishop Fisher believed in the power of common
prayer for the dead. As such, he called upon the living faithful to “help [the deceased
king] with our prayers” (Fisher, 1935d, p. 280). Such faith and prayer binds all believers
together. Bishop Fisher preached on Good Friday a message of collaboration with the
passion of Christ for the benefit of souls. He wrote: “Oh Christian soul, take upon thee

78
the cross of penance, and thou shalt be partner of his passion. Who shall exclude thee from His merit? Not God the Father, for He gave His Son for us all” (Fisher, 1935c, p. 410).

Bishop Fisher also preached passionately against the teaching of Martin Luther, who challenged the validity of the seven sacraments as well as the ecclesiastical unity symbolically present in the bishop of Rome. In his effort to foster collaboration, Bishop Fisher called upon the architects of the Christian tradition, that is, the Church Fathers. Bishop Fisher collaborated with the saints, quoting Saints Austin, Ambrose, Peter, Gregory, Paul, Andrew, John, Hierome, Cyprian, Chrysostom, and the theologian Origen (Fisher, 1935b, pp. 318-320).

As a colleague, Bishop Fisher had the respect of his brother bishops and was amenable to collaboration of ideas and efforts. There is evidence that “bishops do appear to have gone to see him to receive his advice – an interesting glimpse of his standing in their eyes” (Bernard, 2005, pp. 112-113). Notable laymen also shared the respect given to him by bishops. Sir George Throckmorton, a knight, visited Bishop Fisher many times to seek understanding of the authority of the Roman bishop. Bishop Fisher would meet with him, but also collaborated with other learned men to respond to Throckmorton. “Fisher advised him to see the theologian Dr. Nicholas Wilson, which Throckmorton did” (Bernard, 2005, p. 115). When the opposition to King Henry VIII’s absolute earthly authority in England became more public, both Bishop Fisher and Thomas More were imprisoned for refusing to sign the oath of the king’s supremacy. “Fisher wrote to More saying that since the statue used the word ‘maliciously,’ anyone who spoke nothing of
malice did not offend the statute: More agreed” (Bernard, 2005, p. 144). In so doing, Bishop Fisher could collaborate with Thomas More on a strategy of opposition.

**Strengthen others.** At a time when many Christians were preoccupied with a notion of a judgmental God, Bishop Fisher strengthened the faith of his flock with his preaching of Christ’s advocating love for them. “If any of us have sinned, let us not despair, for we have an advocate just and without sin, and He shall be a means for all the world’s sin” (Fisher, 1935d, p. 282). Bishop Fisher did not only preach of the redemptive power of Christ, but also of how God welcomed that advocacy. He referred to the redemptive action of Christ’s death as the tuition paid on the behalf of humanity. He assured the believers that “God’s mercy and tuition are great comforts” and that “the greatest comfort is the assured presence of God’s countenance for evermore” (Fisher, 1935d, pp. 286-287).

In his letters to his half-sister, Bishop Fisher encouraged strong action in the life of religious devotion. Aware of his own life ending soon, Bishop Fisher wrote her, “You that have precious time in your liberty employ it well” (Fisher, 1935e, p. 355). Furthermore, Bishop Fisher reminded her to “Love then this gracious Lord” because he generously made her (Fisher, 1935f, p. 369). God had not only made her, Bishop Fisher wrote, he called her into her vocation as a Religious Sister, and she should act out of that truth. Bishop Fisher wrote, “Let this loving preforment stir you to love your God, who has called you” (Fisher, 1935f, p. 372). Having written her a great deal of advice and concern, Bishop Fisher encouraged ongoing action in his half-sister. He wrote, “These considerations, often read and truly imprinted in your remembrance, will inflame your heart with love of Christ Jesus and make your ‘religion’ easy” (Fisher, 1935f, p. 386).
Bishop Fisher enabled the action of others by way of his Good Friday preaching as well. Inspiring others toward acts of conversion from sin, Bishop Fisher preached that “the crucifix is hung in every church, that we may see how grievously sin was punished in the most blessed body of Christ” and that they be inspired by that atonement toward action (Fisher, 1935c, p. 398). Continuing the theme of Christ’s passion, Bishop Fisher pointed out that humanity still failed to respond to God with action witnessing to Christ’s selfless gift. He attempted to motivate the faithful by highlighting the personal; writing, “O most unkind sinner, all this He suffered for thee” (Fisher, 1935c, p. 400). Bishop Fisher went on, however, to encourage the faithful to act on their faith in the mercy of God. “He who, beholding the crucifix, believeth that on the Cross was paid the ransom for our sins, will trust that, if he ask for mercy, he shall be forgiven” (Fisher, 1935c, p. 412). As such, Bishop Fisher reminded the faithful that no matter what their sin or struggle, God welcomes them back home.

Part of King Henry VIII’s argument for annulling his marriage to Catherine was that the pope did not possess the authority to have declared his wedding valid in the first place. As such, Henry VIII began to regard himself as supreme head of the Church in England. Bishop Fisher demonstrated the strength of papal authority when solicited for his opinion in June of 1527. He argued that given “the fullness of the authority granted by Jesus to St. Peter, and thence to the popes, it would be for the pope, Fisher declared, to offer dispensations” (Bernard, 2005, p. 26).

Bishop Fisher’s arguments for strong papal authority were finessed by seemingly submitting to the king’s demand for supremacy. It was a seeming submission because Bishop Fisher demanded an addendum. At the end of the line in declaring the king as
supreme head of the Church in England, Bishop Fisher added that the king “can have no further power or authority by it than is allowed by the law of God” (Bernard, 2005, p. 109). Initially, his fellow bishops were “moved by Fisher’s arguments” and did not consent to absolute supremacy of the king (Bernard, 2005, p. 109).

Bishop Fisher was initially able to strengthen the apostolic authority and collegiality of his fellow bishops and, especially, the bishop of Rome. The strength and fraternal witness of the English bishops eventually faded. In an opposite vein, Reginald Pole (the last Roman Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury) had previously and not publicly opposed the king’s divorce. When he learned of the martyrdom of Fisher, More, and the Carthusian monks, Cardinal Pole strengthened his resolve and “wrote at length and defiantly” (Bernard, 2005, p. 404).

Bishop Fisher strengthened others, both individually and corporately. Bishop Fisher worked with Lady Margaret to “guide and exhort her” regarding the Christian fundamentals (Duffy, 1992, p. 298). As she grew in knowledge of the faith, Lady Margaret recognized the value Fisher placed on higher education. Under his leadership, Bishop Fisher and Lady Margaret strengthened the institutions of higher education that made up Cambridge University. Bishop Fisher was and “remains the greatest of the benefactors of the University and all the colleges of that age for his role in creation of Cambridge as we know it” (Brooke, 2009, p. 60). Even 70 years after his death, Bishop Fisher’s witness and leadership strengthened the vocational resolve of Cardinal Borromeo. Borromeo found Bishop Fisher’s “holiness of life and devotion to his diocese” a strong inspiration to act likewise in his own bishopric (Thompson, 2009, p. 67).
Encourage the heart. The researcher recorded instances where the practice “encourage the heart” was evident. Kouzes and Posner (2012) designated two sub-codes to indicate encouraging the heart. They are “recognize contributions” and “celebrate the values and victories” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 272). Among all the literature analyzed, the researcher recorded 14 cases of encouraging the heart. Of the 14 cases, five are recorded under recognize contributions and nine under celebrate values and victories.

Recognize contributions. Preaching against Martin Luther, Bishop Fisher highlighted the contributions of the Church Fathers and how “much more does the Spirit speak in [ecumenical] councils” to encourage fidelity to the Church’s tradition (Fisher, 1935b, p. 335). Additionally, Bishop Fisher recognized the contributions of the prophets, apostles, and doctors of the Church. Considering Luther having tried to use their faults against them, Bishop Fisher preached, “their occasional errors will not justify us in denying their authority generally” (Fisher, 1935b, p. 338). In so doing, Bishop Fisher encouraged all who struggle with the limitations of human weakness.

In his preaching, Bishop Fisher recognized the contributions of the saints and biblical figures as models and inspiration for those to whom he preached. On Good Friday, Bishop Fisher recognized Ezekiel, Habakkuk, St. Francis, and Christ, himself, to name only a few (Fisher, 1935c). In his writing from prison to his half-sister, Bishop Fisher recognized her contribution to the body of Christ. He reminded her that she was “like [Christ], touching His manhood, both in body and soul” (Fisher, 1935f, p. 377). In his eulogy at the funeral of King Henry VII, Bishop Fisher recognized the king’s value of, and commitment to, mercy. As such, Bishop Fisher called upon the faithful to pray for the king’s soul. He wrote, “If this great sinner were heard for his own prayer, much
more shall the great number be heard that prayed for our late king” (Fisher, 1935d, p. 273). I so doing, Bishop Fisher recognized the contributions the faithful can make in building up the kingdom of God.

**Celebrate the values and victories.** While preaching the eulogy of King Henry VII, Bishop Fisher celebrated the value of the king’s prayer life and the victory won him in death by his sharing in the sacraments (Fisher, 1935d). He went on to preach of “Jesus who of His mercy came into this world to die for sinners” and, as such, was victorious over sin and death (Fisher, 1935d, p. 281). Bishop Fisher continued, highlighting the value of eternal peace with God shared, won by the deceased who “is now at rest from this vain world” (Fisher, 1935a, p. 285). Turning his attention to Henry VIII, Bishop Fisher pointed out that “rejoicing for him shadows the sorrow for his father’s death” (Fisher, 1935a, p. 285).

Writing to his half-sister regarding successfully living a consecrated life, Bishop Fisher wrote about the value of celebrating God’s selfless creation of humanity. He instructed her to “thank God who has made you in his very likeness” (Fisher, 1935f, p. 370). Continuing to celebrate the special vocation of consecrated religious women, and the victory they win in heaven as brides of Christ, Bishop Fisher wrote: “blessed is that ‘religious’ woman who so prepares herself now by prayer and tears that after this life she may be admitted to that most excellent honor” (Fisher, 1935f, p. 375).

Bishop Fisher celebrated values and victories in his liturgical preaching. In an effort to encourage the hearts of the faithful on Good Friday, Bishop Fisher preached the salvific value of Christ’s passion as the ultimate victory over sin (Fisher, 1935c). Preaching also of God’s invaluable mercy, Bishop Fisher called the faithful to celebrate.
He said, “Rejoice at the recovery of thy father’s love” like the prodigal son of Luke’s gospel (Fisher, 1935c, p. 414). In his prayer written shortly before his martyrdom, Bishop Fisher celebrated the value of charity and total devotion to God. He wrote:

I beseech thee to shed upon my heart thy most holy spirit by whose gracious presence I may be warmed, heated, and kindled with the spiritual fire of charity and with the sweetly burning love of all godly affections, that I may fastly set my heart, soul and mind upon thee and assuredly trust that thou art my very loving father and according to the same trust I may love thee with all my heart, with all my soul, with all my mind and all my power. Amen (Fisher, 1956, p. 299).

**Counterexamples**

The researcher used Kouzes and Posner’s 5-point model to analyze the life and leadership of Saint John Fisher. In addition to the evidence found for each of the practices and codes, the researcher found several counterexamples. Under the code “inspire a shared vision,” the researcher found three counterexamples. Under the code “enlist others,” the researcher found three counterexamples. Under the code “envision the future,” the researcher found two counterexamples.

**Inspire a shared vision.** Bishop Fisher argued against the clergy’s submission to the king’s declaration of supremacy. Fisher failed to inspire a shared vision in his role as a member of the House of Lords (Dickens, 1974). Though Fisher had initially been successful in gaining the support of the English bishops, their fear of the king ultimately led them astray and they “finally agreed to [Henry VIII’s] demand” (Bernard, 2005, p. 109). Furthermore, it was recorded that Bishop Fisher had two assassination attempts “meant toward him” (Bernard, 2005, p. 110).
**Enlist others.** In the face of being convicted of treason, “all of Fisher’s appeals were to no avail” (Bernard, 2005, p. 118). In fact, “there is little evidence of the Bishop recruiting followers” (Schofield, & Skinner, 2007, p. 105). When in prison, Bishop Fisher was visited by several other Bishops. They went in hopes of convincing him to submit to the king’s supremacy over the Church in England. In turn, he attempted to enlist them in his opposition. Though Bishop Fisher voiced his arguments forcefully, his fellow bishops responded only with “attempts to persuade him otherwise” (Bernard, 2005, p. 122).

**Envision the future.** The energy around reformation was not restricted to the desires of King Henry VIII. Bishop Fisher resisted such efforts inside England and across Europe. Though he argued well against the reforms he faced directly, Bishop Fisher could not envision the future of reform.

Had Fisher been able to see ahead thirty or forty years, he would have witnessed, alongside the immense growth of secular interests, a world which had by no means lost its interest in the Christian faith, a world which still felt fiercely on theological matters, yet a world in which all the protagonists, even those who revered his memory, had at least agreed to discard his own fifteenth-century patterns of thought (Dickens, 1974, p. 102).

Part of the movement toward modernization and reform in Europe was toward educating laypeople in religion. That would have included vernacular translations of the scriptures. Bishop Fisher was ever focused on the value of tradition and perhaps lost sight of this vision for the future. “Even the more intelligent and spiritually minded, like
John Fisher, failed to perceive that a shifting lay outlook demanded new methods” (Dickens, 1974, p. 326).

**Missing Models of Leadership**

The focus of this analysis has been to look for evidence of Kouzes and Posner’s (2012) 5-point model in the life and leadership of Saint John Fisher. The following are models found in the life and leadership of Saint John Fisher that are missing from Kouzes and Posner’s 5-point model. The researcher identified four additional models. They are humility, repentance, presence, and courage.

**Humility.** Fisher was familiar with the family of King Henry VII, especially with his mother Lady Margaret. The two of them had influence on the recommendation that Fisher become a bishop. Early biographers noted that Fisher’s humility positioned him as “reluctant to accept the dignity” of episcopal ordination (Thompson, 2009). Fisher remained as Bishop of Rochester for over 30 years, “and turned down translation to the richer dioceses of Lincoln (1514 and 1521) and Ely (1515)” (Schofield & Skinner, 2007, p. 101).

Bishop Fisher valued humility as an exemplary trait in the Christian. In his Good Friday sermon, he preached about the father in faith. “Abraham, though a man of high perfection, when he should speak unto God, said: I am but dust and ashes” (Fisher, 1935c, p. 392). Not long before Bishop Fisher was martyred, Pope Paul III declared him a Cardinal. The king’s representative as to whether he would accept the position questioned Bishop Fisher. He responded saying:

“I know myself far unworthy of any such dignity, that I think of nothing less than such matters; but if [the pope] do send it me, assure yourself I will work with it by
all means I can to benefit the Church of Christ, and in that respect, I will receive it on my knees (Schofield, & Skinner, 2007, p. 105).

**Repentance.** Bishop Fisher preached a great deal about the value of repentance. It was a constant theme of his sermon on Good Friday (Fisher, 1935c). He also wrote of the need for repentance in his two letters to his half-sister (Fisher, 1935e, f). Biographers also referred to Bishop Fisher’s emphasis on repentance (Schofield, & Skinner, 2007). It is important to note that Bishop Fisher had, in all of his writings referred to here, an inseparable connection between the need for repentance and the mercy of God (Fisher, 1935).

**Presence.** Bishop Fisher had multiple obligations to uphold. He was Chancellor to Cambridge University and as such he “hoped to be a frequent visitor” and even to be “often or long in Cambridge” (Brooke, 2009, p. 57). Bishop Fisher’s desire to be present to the university was in conflict with his need to be present to his diocese. It was suggested that he refused to accept the Lincoln diocese because its large size would not allow him to be present to the people in the same way he was in Rochester (Thompson, 2009). Bishop Fisher “allowed few distractions to keep him away from his diocese,” and “was present in his diocese for about 90 percent of the period December 1504 to 1534” (Thompson, 2009, p. 71). Bishop Fisher also made himself present to the monastic communities in his diocese. He “took their professions in person, as he did all regulars and hermits in the diocese” (Thompson, 2009, p. 73). That kind of commitment was unheard at that time.

**Courage.** There are countless examples of Bishop Fisher’s courage. Innumerable accounts of his daily opposition to King Henry VIII’s violent pursuit of
power, coupled with the bishop’s courageous loyalty to Queen Catherine. account for much of this point. There are numerous accounts of his facing into his imprisonment and impending martyrdom. The accounting for the courage of Bishop Fisher is evident in all of the data that demonstrated his challenging the process, as well as much of his modeling the way.

**Summary of Results**

This chapter addressed the following research questions:

1. Are Kouzes and Posner’s five practices evident in the leadership of Saint John Fisher?

2. If so, is there evidence that he practiced one or some more than others?

3. Is there evidence of leadership practices in Saint John Fisher that are not part of Kouzes and Posner’s 5-point model?

The research has demonstrated that yes, the five practices of Kouzes and Posner (2012) are all evident in the leadership of Saint John Fisher. Regarding the second research question, “model the way” is most represented, numbering 44 cases recorded. The second-most common practice was “inspire a shared vision,” noting 33 cases recorded. The third most common practice was “enable others to act,” noting 25 cases recorded. The final two practices, “challenge the process” and “encourage the heart” were noted equally with 14 cases recorded of each.

Additionally, the researcher found evidence of counterexamples for three of the practices and codes. Specifically, the researcher found eight counterexamples under three practices/codes. Under the code “inspire a shared vision,” the researcher found three counterexamples. Under the code “enlist others,” the researcher found three
counterexamples. Under the code “envision the future,” the researcher found two counterexamples.

Finally, the researcher found evidence of leadership practices in Saint John Fisher that are not part of Kouzes and Posner’s (2012) 5-point model. The researcher noted four such practices or traits. The four practices are humility, repentance, presence, and courage. These themes began to emerge in reading the documents and, in time were discovered to be consistent across most of the resources employed. It will be for another study to discover just how frequently they can be found.
Chapter 6: Discussion

Introduction

This chapter includes the range of implications made known by the qualitative analysis. First, the researcher articulates the implications for researchers of leadership. Next, he explains the implications for researchers of church history. Then, the researcher articulates the implications for the formation of clergy, followed by the implications for the selection of bishops. The final implication articulated in this chapter is for the ongoing formation for priests and bishops. The researcher next highlights the limitations of the findings. Then, the researcher includes his recommendations as a result of his findings. Finally, the researcher offers conclusory remarks.

Implications for Researchers of Leadership

Kouzes and Posner (2012) held that what makes a good leader endures through time. Although scholars have indicated that in the beginning of the 20th century, “leadership became a topic of academic introspection” (Northouse, 2013, p. 2), the findings of this study show that a 21st century lens can be used to analyze the leadership of a 15th century individual. As such, this proof-of-concept qualitative analysis did prove that Kouzes and Posner’s contemporary model of transformational leadership theory does endure through time, and it can be used to analyze the leadership of an historical figure.

Doing such research has demonstrated the further implication that there is much that contemporary scholars of leadership theory can learn from historical figures who predate their academic discipline. This one study has revealed several consistent,
effective, and important themes that could be harnessed into a theoretical model of leadership study. It would hold that the more that historical figures of executive leadership are studied, the more thematic traits of leadership could be discovered.

Additionally, further research should be inspired to consider counterexamples of the theoretical model that has been employed. This researcher did discover, although not many, counterexamples in the course of this analysis. Paying attention to counterexamples allowed the researcher to critically reflect on the theoretical model and, thus, on the subject of the study. Doing so not only highlighted elements of critique, it also lends credibility to the study of leadership development over time while simultaneously bringing about the awareness of human error and fallibility.

**Implications for Researchers of Church History**

This research study demonstrates the lack of scholarship in the area of Church leadership through the lens of contemporary leadership theories and, specifically, the highly popular and proven model produced by Kouzes and Posner (2012). The researcher not only highlights the lack of study, he has demonstrated that such a study can be and has been done by him.

As such, the implications for researchers of Church history are broad. Church historians can study the leadership of historical figures using contemporary empirical leadership theory. Doing so will open new fields of study inside their historical discipline. The implications of such study include a greater understanding of what constitutes a good leader inside of the Roman Catholic tradition, and it could assist the contemporary institution in its training for, and selection of, candidates for executive leadership.
Implications for Formation for Clergy

Context. As introduced earlier in this document, the Congregation for Catholic Education (2008) conducted an official visitation of all seminaries and houses of priestly formation in the United States of America prior to December of 2008. The findings from that visitation were published on December 15, 2008 (Congregation for Catholic Education, 2008). Nowhere in that 20-page document was there a categorical reference to leadership. As such, the Vatican visitation report revealed that leadership was not a consistent area of formative education for candidates to the priesthood. The report neither evaluated leadership formation nor mandated it into a curriculum for priestly formation (Congregation for Catholic Education, 2008).

That visitation was conducted under the auspices of the universal authority of the Roman Catholic Church. This researcher has been exploring the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church, universal, through the Western World lens of the United States of America. To understand the implications for the formation for clergy, it is important to highlight the expectations and limitations of the formation for clergy in the United States of America. Such expectations are formalized in conferences by the bishops of the United States.

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), in 2006, published the fifth edition of The Program for Priestly Formation. That document outlines the expectations and requirements for those who are in formation for ordination to the priesthood. The document outlines “the four pillars or the integrated dimensions of formation” that are highlighted in Pope Saint John Paul II’s apostolic exhortation, I Will Give You Shepherds (John Paul II, 1992). The four pillars of formation are:
• Human
• Spiritual
• Intellectual
• Pastoral (USCCB, 2006, p. 19).

Pastoral formation includes the skill development needed for public ministry as a clergyman. The bishops did address the concept of “leadership development” (USCCB, 2006, p. 81) by writing:

Pastoral formation means that seminarians learn how to take spiritual initiatives and direct a community into action or movement. That leadership also includes a dimension of practical administration. The pastoral formation program should provide opportunities for seminarians to acquire the basic administrative skills necessary for effective pastoral leadership, recognizing that programs of continuing education and ongoing formation will be necessary to equip newly ordained priests to assume future responsibilities as pastors. Additional leadership skills include an ability to manage the physical and financial resources of the parish, including educating parishioners about the gospel value of stewardship, and an ability to organize parochial life effectively to achieve the goals of the new evangelization. (p. 81)

Dr. Lawrence DiPaolo, Jr., the associate dean and assistant professor of Sacred Scripture at the University of St. Thomas School of Theology, Houston, TX, commented regarding the text quoted directly above:

Two things are notable about this paragraph from the PPF: first, continuing education after seminary study seems to get the bulk of the treatment; and second,
the requirements for practical instruction in the administration of a parish take up, solely, one paragraph. (DiPaolo, 2012)

There is not much emphasis on leadership development in *The Program for Priestly Formation* (USCCB, 2006). In reference to the value of pastoral formation overall, the bishops wrote, “The pastoral formation program should be an integral part of the seminary curriculum and accredited as such, but none of its elements should compromise the two years of full-time pre-theology studies or the four years of full-time theological studies” (USCCB, 2006, p. 83). The phrase that must be highlighted is “should be an integral part of seminary curriculum” (USCCB, 2006, p. 83).

In the sections of *The Program for Priestly Formation* (USCCB, 2006) having to do with intellectual formation, the bishops made clear expectations on the curriculum of study. They used differentiated vocabulary such as “should,” “require,” “expected,” and “must” throughout the section on norms (USCCB, 2006, p. 69). The implications are that pastoral formation, within which is found leadership development, *should* be included in essential training for clergy, but it is not necessarily expected or required. Within pastoral formation, the bishops emphasized that leadership development opportunities *should* be provided, and if they are, they *should* include opportunities to learn basic administrative skills.

**Implications for the future.** The researcher discovered both the significant gap in leadership formation for clergy, and that contemporary leadership theory can be used to harness the leadership qualities evident in figures from Church history. The introductory pages of this research demonstrated a consequential example of the lack of
effective executive leadership, namely, the mismanagement of clergy personnel. Considering these things, there are several implications for future formation of clergy.

The 5-point model presented by Kouzes and Posner (2004) was shown to be effective in the leadership of other Christians. It was also shown to be relevant in the life and leadership of Saint John Fisher, bishop, cardinal, and martyr. As such, the Kouzes and Posner model was used to evaluate an historical leader of good repute, and the model can be replicated. Using these findings, seminary faculty and religious formators should be compelled to advance comprehensive leadership development curricula in their pastoral formation programs.

While Dr. DiPaolo (2012) was advocating for a pastoral administration course in each seminary, this researcher believes the implications of the exposed gap and the analysis conducted demonstrate a larger need. Administration of parochial realities is only one aspect of leadership for clergy (Dolan, 2000). Addressing this gap by only introducing management courses would not reverence the discovery in this research. Catholic priests are to be followers of the saints, especially a saint whose “identity was that of a priest” (Dolan, 2000, p. 227).

The discovery of the lack of leadership training, coupled with determining a method for analyzing the leadership of Church figures and clergy, uncovered the implication that such leadership development is needed and can be done by following the example of the saints. Tradition, along with scripture, serves as an official medium of Christian revelation (Groome, 2002). As such, it is important to form men for the priesthood in the tradition of priests who have given great witness to that vocation. This research demonstrates that is now possible.
Implications for Selection of Bishops

Context. The diocesan bishop, as demonstrated above, is the executive leader of the diocese. Priests assist the diocesan bishop in his ministry as pastor of the local Church. Additionally, priests are members of a consecrated life and, as such, they do not necessarily have the geographic boundary of just one diocese. Bishops are selected from the pool of ordained priests, both diocesan and religious. The qualifications for candidacy, noted in the Code of Canon Law (1983), reads:

In regard to the suitability of a candidate for the episcopacy, it is required that he is: (1) outstanding in solid faith, good morals, piety, zeal for souls, wisdom, prudence, and human virtues, and endowed with other qualities which make him suitable to fulfill the office in question; (2) of good reputation; (3) at least 35 years old; (4) ordained to the presbyterate [priesthood] for at least 5 years; (5) in possession of a doctorate or at least a licentiate in sacred scripture, theology, or canon law . . . or at least truly expert in the same disciplines. (Cannon # 378)

Furthermore, the bishop’s ministry includes the threefold duty of teaching, sanctifying, and governing. The Code of Canon Law (1983) clarifies:

- Bishops, who by divine institution succeed to the place of the Apostles through the Holy Spirit who has been given to them, are constituted pastors in the Church, so that they are teachers of doctrine, priests of sacred worship, and ministers of governance.

- Through episcopal consecration itself, bishops receive with the function of sanctifying also the functions of teaching and governing; by their nature,
however, these can only be exercised in hierarchical communion with the head and members of the college. (Canon # 375)

The law of the Roman Catholic Church neither includes a theory nor a model of leadership development. Furthermore, the law neither provides a theory nor a model of leadership practice.

**Implications for the future.** The National Leadership Roundtable (n.d.) has taken on the issues around best practices in financial and resource management for parishes and dioceses. As mentioned above, however, parochial administrative skills are only a few among the skills needed to effectively function in the fullness of clerical ministry. The bishop has the principle role in the diocese for preaching (sanctifying), teaching, and managing (governing). The canonization of Cardinal John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester England, publicized his witness as a good bishop, heroic leader, and man of faith (Pole, 1965).

When considering the qualifications for clergy to become bishops, we now can begin to look to both the academy and the Catholic tradition in that discernment. The academy has been developing empirical studies on what constitutes good leadership and leadership development. It has also shown those things to be timeless. The Catholic tradition has long held up saints as models of Christian living. Modeling the way is a key element of Kouzes and Posner’s (2012) approach to transformational leadership. This study reveals that the academy and the Catholic tradition can come together to highlight models of good and holy leadership and use that to develop formation models for good and holy leaders.
Implications for Ongoing Formation for Priests and Bishops

**Context.** Ongoing formation of clergy has to do with vocational development beyond ordination (John Paul II, 1992). In his Apostolic Exhortation, Pope Saint John Paul II (1992) wrote:

The ongoing formation of priests, whether diocesan or religious, is the natural and absolutely necessary continuation of the process of building priestly personality which began and developed in the seminary or the religious house with the training program which aimed at ordination. (para. 71)

The Pope went on, however, to explain that the value of ongoing formation should be established prior to ordination in the first place. He wrote:

Long-term preparation for ongoing formation should take place in the major seminary, where encouragement needs to be given to future priests to look forward to it, seeing its necessity, its advantages and the spirit in which it should be undertaken, and appropriate conditions for its realization need to be ensured. (John Paul II, 1992, para. 71)

In the American Church, often referring to *I Will Give You Shepherds* (USCCB, 2006), the USCCB recognized that “programs of continuing education and ongoing formation will be necessary to equip newly ordained priests to assume future responsibilities as pastors” (p. 81). The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2001) also crafted a document specifically dealing with ongoing formation of priests. Regarding leadership, the bishops (USCCB) (2001) wrote:

The Church that priests serve is both a spiritual and a visible-institutional reality. Part of their continuing pastoral formation must include knowledge of the ways of
institutional leadership and management. In their pastoral function, priests are responsible for the Church as a community ordered in love. Additionally, they function as employers and as stewards of the temporal goods of the Church. None of these responsibilities is outside the pale of their pastoral task. All dimensions of management require thoughtful attention, specific knowledge, and particular competencies and skills to make appropriate applications of the knowledge to practical situations. Even as more and more pastors hire business managers to be directly responsible for temporal matters, priests still need some management development. Ongoing pastoral formation ought to include the following areas:

- Canon law updates
- Personnel management
- Conflict resolution
- Financial management
- Effective leadership in meetings
- Facilitation of parish communication (Section L – pastoral formation)

**Implications for the future.** Considering the context, and in conjunction with this research, there are several implications for the future. Ongoing formation programs are highly recommended by Church leadership. The bishops have expressed an importance of leadership development as a part of ongoing formation. Leadership development in ongoing pastoral formation is even fleshed out into the above-listed six suggestions (USCCB) (2001).
This current research partners nicely with the directives for ongoing pastoral formation. The researcher has seen potential areas of overlap in the study of the life and leadership of Saint John Fisher using Kouzes and Posner’s (2012) 5-point model and the six pastoral formation directives. The researcher has demonstrated that Kouzes and Posner’s 5-point model of transformational leadership can be complimented, and added to, by way of investigating consistent traits of effective leaders. The researcher believes there are areas presented by the six directives of pastoral formation that could also compliment and add to the Kouzes and Posner’s 5-point model.

This research shows the potential for those engaged in the development of, and responsibility for, ongoing formation for clergy to bring the scholarly work of leadership development together with the directives for ongoing pastoral formation and the now-proven method of retrospectively analyzing leaders from Church tradition; and, craft new intentional models of ongoing formation of clergy. This potential is for all clergy, not just for priests. The researcher could not find any documents clarifying the expectations for bishops to engage in ongoing formation. Since all bishops are first priests; and given that Saint John Fisher was a bishop, the implications are also there for developing models to create and assess ongoing formation programs for bishops.

**Limitations**

This study shows that the contemporary 5-point model of transformational leadership theory put forward by Jim Kouzes and Barry Posner (2012) can be used to assess the life and leadership of Saint John Fisher. This study also shows that there are implications for formation as a result. While there are many opportunities to consider those implications, one limitation of this study is that it did not uncover any
developmental models for implementation of contemporary leadership theory in formation. Furthermore, while there are proven consistencies between the Kouzes and Posner model and the leadership of Saint John Fisher, this study did not reveal how Fisher developed those leadership qualities for himself.

**Recommendations**

*Take on the project in the first place.* The researcher believes that the Roman Catholic Church and, in particular, the Roman Catholic Church in the United States of America, needs a collective understanding that there is a gap in leadership formation. Additionally, the bishops and religious superiors should agree to create comprehensive leadership development programs at both the initial and ongoing formation levels. Furthermore, they should work with both scholars of leadership theory and of clerical formation to create such programs.

*Commission a study of the saints in various vocations.* The researcher demonstrated that the study of the life and leadership of a saint is possible via the lens of contemporary leadership theory. More saints can and should be studied along the same vein; so long as there remains sufficient writings and records of the saint, as well as historical and biographical scholarship. This research has used the 5-point model of Kouzes and Posner (2012) as a priori codes, including two sub-codes in each of the five as also provided by the authors. The researcher recommends that there be a commission to do research using the same method. Additionally, the researcher recommends that the commission begin with at least the following saints:

- Saint Bonaventure of Bagnoregio, Italy (1221-1274). Saint Bonaventure was a scholar, professor, Franciscan Friar (Order of Friars Minor), Minister
General of the Order of Friars Minor (successor of Saint Francis of Assisi), priest, bishop, and cardinal. Saint Bonaventure is a Doctor of the Church. (Watkins, 2002)

- Saint Charles Borromeo of Rocca d’Arona, Italy (1538-1584). Saint Charles was a cardinal and a bishop before becoming a priest. He was secretary of state for the papacy and was instrumental in the counter-reformation reform. Saint Charles Borromeo is regarded as the patron saint of bishops. (Watkins, 2002)

- John-Baptist de la Salle of Rheims, France (1651-1719). Saint John-Baptist was a cathedral canon, chaplain to nuns, and a priest. He created an institute of religious life known as the Brothers of the Christian Schools, and is regarded as the patron saint of teachers. (Watkins, 2002)

- Saint John Vianney of Lyons, France (1786-1859). Saint John struggled as a seminarian but was eventually ordained a priest. He became famous in his sacramental ministry in his parish after the French revolution. He is regarded as the patron saint of parish priests.

- Saint Vincent Pallotti of Rome, Italy (1581-1660). Saint Vincent became a diocesan priest in 1820. He founded a society of missionary priests known as the Pallotines in 1835 and is regarded as the patron saint of missionaries.

**Develop a curriculum.** In addition to the recognition of a need for leadership, the hopeful creation of an effort to create institutionalized formation for that development, and inclusion of at least the suggested saintly leaders from Church history into such a study; the researcher makes further curricula recommendations. The
researcher recommends that the formation programs take seriously the USCCB (2001) suggestions for leadership development in the following areas:

- Canon law updates, doing so in consultation with the Canon Law Society of America. (Canon Law Society of America, 1983)
- Personnel and human resource management. Suggested texts:
- Conflict resolution. Suggested texts:
- Financial management. Suggested texts:

• Effective leadership in meetings. Suggested text:

• Effective communication. Suggested texts:

In addition to the six areas outlined by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2001) listed above, the researcher recommends the following course of study and suggested texts:

• Diversity awareness. Suggested texts:
• Leadership. Suggested texts:
  o Byron, W. J. (2010). *Next-generation leadership: A toolkit for those in their teens, twenties, and thirties, who want to be successful leaders.* University of Scranton Press.

• Priesthood. Suggested texts:

**Do a study (after 10 years).** The researcher recommends that a study be done 10 years after such coursework and formation programs have been developed and instituted. The study should consist of surveying the clergy as to their experience in leadership development and its preparatory qualities for active ministry. The study should also look
to the financial stability of the institutions run by clergy (parishes, schools, and dioceses, for example) about the same more than 10 years prior. At that point, an evaluation should be conducted and any adaptations to leadership development and pastoral formation that need to be made should be instituted.

Conclusion

This research is original both in concept and in application. There has not been an extensive investigation of historical Church leaders using contemporary scholarship in the area of transformational leadership. The researcher articulated the need for such a study in Chapter 1. He offered a brief biography of Saint John Fisher in Chapter 2. The researcher proved the gap in his review of the literature in Chapter 3. He crafted a method for investigation using a proven theory in the fourth chapter. The fifth chapter affirmed the research questions in its analysis of the collected data. Finally, in his sixth chapter, the researcher clarified the implications and limitations and made recommendations resulting from this study.

Recalling the problem statement, scholars have indicated that “leadership became a topic of academic introspection” and study in the beginning of the 20th century (Northouse, 2013, p. 2). Additionally, the university system of higher education has its roots in the medieval cathedral schools and monasteries. As such, we can understand that leadership, as an academic discipline, is relatively recent to the world of higher education. Kouzes and Posner (2012) held that which makes a good leader is timeless. Therefore, the Church should be able to look to its own tradition and find evidence of contemporary leadership models that are studied in current higher education leadership programs.
This proof-of-concept dissertation applied a contemporary model of leadership theory, namely Kouzes and Posner’s (2012) 5-point model of transformational leadership, to an historical figure. Saint John Fisher was a priest, an academic, a diocesan bishop, a cardinal, and a martyr. His life and leadership earned him a place among the “great cloud of witnesses” (Hebrews 12:1), and was therefore included in the canon of saints. Now, scholars of leadership can consider Saint John Fisher a witness and can include him in a canon of transformational leaders.
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Appendix A

Rites of the Catholic Church