
TRANSFORMATIONAL/SERVANT LEADERSHIP: A POTENTIAL SYNERGISM FOR AN INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP STYLE

STEVE ECHOLS

Abstract: Discovering optimum practices for beneficial leadership outcomes need not be hindered by the complexity of the attempt to find an all encompassing leadership theory. In regard to the crucially important leadership quality of inclusiveness, we can discover helpful approaches within the concepts of two major leadership theories: transformational leadership and servant leadership. The praxis of these two leadership stances in a complementary manner has the potential for producing an effective synergism in regard to an inclusive leadership style. This synergistic capability has especially significant value and application for leadership in the local church.

The Quest for an Effective Style

With a multitude of leadership challenges as well as leadership failures, the search for leadership concepts and practices which produce both better understanding and more successful outcomes has arguably become much more intense. However, in recent decades the proliferation of publications, consultancies, and even academic curricula unfortunately has not produced a strong consensus as to what actually constitutes effective leadership. James MacGregor Burns noted that “leadership is an expanding field of study that some day may join the traditional disciplines of history, philosophy, and the social sciences in scholarly recognition. Today, however, it remains in its growing stages; it has as yet no

Steve Echols is the associate dean and professor of leadership, occupying the Nelson L. Price Chair of Leadership, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, Atlanta, GA.

grand, unifying theory to provide common direction to thinkers and researchers.”¹ Likewise, Brien N. Smith, Ray V. Montagno, and Tatiana N. Kuzmenko opined, “For the last twenty years, the topic of leadership has become popular among scholars....However, there is still no comprehensive understanding of what leadership is, nor is there an agreement among different theorists on what good or effective leadership should be.”²

Perhaps no strong consensus on the definition and praxis of leadership exists because of the difficulty of predicting the effect of a particular leadership stance in combination with an incalculable number of random factors that make up the leadership moment. Given these obstacles, the prognosis for the results of a particular leadership stance in a moment in time and space would be more abysmally inaccurate than the local weather forecast—the inadequacy of contingency theory as noted by Robert Banks and Bernice Ledbetter being only one example among many.³ Yet, the complexity that hinders universality in both leadership theory and praxis need not prevent the possibilities of discovering optimum approaches for beneficial leadership outcomes. *I propose that in regard to the crucially important leadership quality of inclusiveness, we can discover such approaches within the concepts of two major leadership theories: transformational leadership and servant leadership.* In considering this proposition, we explore first the nature of an inclusive leadership style.

What Is an Inclusive Style?

Though few would deny the potential benefits of inclusiveness in leadership, the term is not frequently utilized in regard to the subject of leadership. Rather,

¹ James MacGregor Burns, *Transforming Leadership* (New York: Grove Press, 2003), 2.

² Brien N. Smith, Ray V. Montagno, and Tatiana N. Kuzmenko, *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 22 (March 2004): 1.

³ Robert Banks and Bernice M. Ledbetter, *Reviewing Leadership: A Christian Evaluation of Current Approaches* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2004), 51.

writers and practitioners often speak about *participative leadership*. For instance, Bernard Bass found evidence to support the notion that “participative leadership promotes the acceptance of decisions and agreement to a greater extent than does directive leadership.”⁴ Later Gary Yukl noted that “participative leadership offers a variety of potential benefits.”⁵

In breaking out the term *inclusive leader* from the more commonly used *participative leader*, some aspects need to be underscored. The inclusive leader influences and empowers constituents for the betterment of all without negative repercussions on the individual or particular groups. The aim is for universal participation of the populace and self-actualization of the individual by means of a commonly agreed upon goal or vision. The inclusive leader rejects the notion that certain groups have no place at the table in regard to decision making. Leaders who practice inclusion often believe it is not only morally wrong to marginalize certain groups within a constituency, but it is a grossly ineffective means of leadership that will minimize or even destroy the potential energy and creativity of any organization. In stark contrast to inclusive leadership, marginalization in leadership not only may produce enmity and factions but also may bring the unintended consequences of minimizing the ultimate outcome potential from related constituents or stakeholders. Multifarious factors such as all types of prejudice; the evolvment of issue-focused groups; factionist groups of every imaginable demographic stratum; and the depraved human will to dominate, control, and even exploit others make the implementation of an inclusive style no easy task. Therefore, it is important to have some understanding of specifically how inclusiveness is manifested in the practice of leadership.

⁴ Bernard Bass, *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*, 3rd ed. (New York: Free Press, 1990), 451.

⁵ Gary Yukl, *Leadership in Organizations*, 4th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1998), 124.

I propose that inclusion in leadership has at least five critical characteristics. *First, inclusive leadership brings the maximum number of individuals into participation.* As Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus noted, in the great-man theory of leadership “leadership skills were once thought to be a matter of birth. Leaders were born, not made, summoned to their calling through some unfathomable process.”⁶ Burns observed the demise of this archaic theory: “Just as Great Men often stumble, so did the Great Man theory. The noble achievements of history’s heroes were often shown to be morally flawed.”⁷ While the proponents of this great-man theory of leadership, chauvinistic even in its title, are virtually extinct as theorists, in practice elitism in leadership is still unfortunately more prevalent than we would care to admit.

Top-down, non-participative leadership creates a dichotomy of those who have power and those who do not, with little in between. The masses and not just the minorities are marginalized. Conversely, the *modus operandi* for inclusive leaders is for maximum involvement of the populace in the leadership process. Further, these leaders do not force participation. Instead, constituents are motivated based on each individual’s ability to perceive and embrace the personal reward in the achievement of corporate goals for the greater good.

Second, inclusive leadership empowers individuals to reach their full potential while pursuing the common good of the particular populace. The leader is challenged to balance the goal of self-actualization of individuals while bringing the organization into its full potential of alignment. As Banks and Ledbetter observed, leaders achieve alignment when they create coalitions with a common passion and aim. Such an organization is “powerfully positioned to excel.”⁸ Employing the concept of alignment is necessary in order to bring a united direction versus having various degrees

⁶ Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus, *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge* (New York: Harper and Row, 1985), 5.

⁷ Burns, *Transforming Leadership*, 11.

⁸ Banks and Ledbetter, 18.

of chaos. Inevitably, alignment brings some measure of personal compromise. Nonetheless, inclusion does not sacrifice the well-being and self-actualization of those who may be otherwise marginalized. No end result, no matter how appealing, can justify the means of running roughshod over the self-actualization potential of individuals. Instead, an inclusive leadership style recognizes that individual development and personal growth generally do not hinder the synergistic potential of a populace but can actually enhance it. Apart from cooperative alignment toward a greater purpose, individuals will fail to reach their highest potential for development.

Third, those who practice inclusive leadership develop a culture that perpetuates the morality of the worth of the individual in such a way as to act as a preventive resistance against the ever-present possibility of despotism. Three common characteristics in organizational life necessitate diligence in the development of an inclusive culture. One is the gathering of power through proficiency and altruistic caring. The accumulation of power by leaders who are competent and genuinely compassionate is not necessarily intentional but is inevitable. John Acton's axiom "Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men" is, unfortunately, far too often true.⁹ Safeguards that check the abuse of power must be part of the DNA of an organization which holds leaders accountable. A second characteristic is the inevitable transition that occurs. No leader lasts forever. As leaders come and go, a transitional risk is always present. New leaders may have other agendas that do not align with original core values. Third, not only do leaders change, but so does context. Change may bring crises in which oppression can incubate. Aspiring despots are prone to use crises for seizing power. Inclusive leaders

⁹ John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, *Essays on Freedom and Power* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1949), 364.

must be vigilant in instituting safeguards around these personal, transitional, and contextual dynamics.

Fourth, inclusive leadership is intentional in the replication of today's leaders who model the above characteristics with a commitment to allow future leadership to emerge. Inclusive leaders do not attempt to institutionalize in such a way as to bring fossilization; rather, they work to keep the organizational structure somewhat fluid and dynamic. John Gardner observed that organizations, particularly large ones, "cannot function effectively unless leaders are dispersed throughout all segments and down through all levels."¹⁰ Therefore, inclusive leaders attempt to disseminate influence throughout the organization rather than hoard it. This dispersion allows for maximum replication of the most effective leadership practices and leader traits. The goal is accomplished through development of leadership that is trained and enabled to lead. In a holistic and organic concept, leadership is renewed from within as well as from new inclusion from without. Leadership is refreshed continually but not at the cost of integrity or values. Thus, the leadership stream flows with a cohesion maintained by principles rather than personal or positional authority.

Finally, inclusive leadership is manifested in the development of appropriate boundaries that maintain the integrity of the nature of the collective without marginalizing any of the populace. Obviously, it is impossible to have an organization or identifiable populace without boundaries. Nations, companies, and institutions of all types could not function without them. The question is always, What are the appropriate boundaries? Inclusive leaders do not espouse random association with no values or identity but instead look for the broadest possible reach for the maximum incorporation of people within the scope of the group's defined existence. For instance, if an organization were defined with a specific Christian purpose and populace, an inclusive leader would not allow exclusion or marginalization of those who meet the

¹⁰ John Gardner, *On Leadership* (New York: Free Press, 1990), ix.

criteria. An inclusive leader must be skilled not only in envisioning but also in correcting faulty, errant organizational identities that result in exclusion not related to the core reasons for its existence.

Having noted these aspects of inclusive leadership, we next should examine the potential contribution of some recent theories for producing inclusiveness in leadership. In this regard, the distinction between a manner of leadership style and the more substantive concept of a leadership stance is a significant aspect in the quest for understanding a theoretical base for producing leadership that is more inclusive.

The Potential for Inclusion in Some Recently Predominant Leadership Stances

In their classic work, Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus noted that “decades of academic analysis have given us over 850 definitions of leadership.”¹¹ Since that time, countless other concepts have been expressed in regard to what leadership is and what leadership does. Yet, Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko observed that “the most popular leadership theories currently being discussed include charismatic, transactional, transformational and servant leadership.”¹² Of these four, transformational and servant leadership have been particularly influential.

A. Gregory Stone, Robert F. Russell, and Kathleen Patterson noted that transformational leadership “has become a very popular concept in recent years.... Similarly, the concept of servant leadership...has received substantial attention in the contemporary leadership field.”¹³ Patterson posited further that “transformational leadership theory has been the theory of choice for the past several decades...and is sometimes considered the

¹¹ Bennis and Nanus, 4.

¹² Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko, 1.

¹³ A. Gregory Stone, Robert F. Russell, and Kathleen Patterson, “Transformational versus Servant Leadership: A Difference in Leader Focus,” *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 25(4) (2004): 349.

dominant theory.”¹⁴ In regard to the importance of servant leadership, influential writer Peter Senge declared, “For many years, I simply told people not to waste their time reading all the other managerial leadership books. ‘If you are really serious about the deeper territory of true leadership,’ I would say, ‘read Greenleaf.’”¹⁵

In addition to their notoriety, transformational and servant leadership theories are further distinguished in another aspect. In regard to the practice of inclusiveness, it is important to delineate between the descriptions of leadership qualities as illustrated in the multifarious examples of leadership styles and the more substantive leadership stances or theoretical concepts. Robert Dale noted that “a leadership *stance* [italics mine] provides a foundation, a basic position and reason for exercising leadership. *Style* [italics mine], on the other hand, is a leader’s manner of expressing initiative, a distinctive fashion of leading.”¹⁶ The latter has more potential individual permutations than the former, but nonetheless, it is the major and foundational leadership stances that are conducive to identifying the potential for inclusive leadership to occur. More than leadership styles, leadership stances strongly influence the presence or absence of inclusiveness in the individual leader’s practices. For example, employing leadership practices from the stance of servant leadership is likely a more substantive predictor of presence of inclusiveness than the observation that a leader fits the label of “visionary leader” or “coaching leader.” Servant leadership is far more substantive and broad based than just a single dimension of leadership which is often denoted as a style. It is a philosophy of leadership that permeates every function of a leader’s practices.

¹⁴ Kathleen Ann Patterson, “Servant Leadership: A Theoretical Model” (Ph.D. diss., Regent University, 2007), 1.

¹⁵ Peter Senge, “My History with Servant Leadership,” *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf’s Theory of Servant-Leadership Influenced Today’s Top Management Thinkers*, ed. Larry C. Spears (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1995), 218.

¹⁶ Robert D. Dale, *Pastoral Leadership* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1986), 34.

While it may be debatable whether some leadership theories are more about style than stance, there can be little question that transformational leadership and servant leadership are prominent and substantive leadership stances. One particularly important aspect of an inclusive leadership stance concerns whether it is person-centered or task-oriented. Task-oriented leaders are more likely to be concerned as to whether groups or individuals are directing energy and resources to produce outcomes that align with organizational purpose. They are less likely to invest effort that would ensure that all constituents have equal inclusion and opportunity for full self-actualization. Jeanine L. Parolini affirmed that servant leadership and transformational leadership “are people-oriented styles,” though the focus differs from the individual to the corporate.¹⁷ As a result, these leadership stances start with consideration of the human element rather than the product outcome. This perspective does not ignore the importance of outcome but measures it in relation to the empowerment of the constituents. This empowerment will lead to the realization of the maximum potential in the accomplishment of inclusive outcomes.

In seeking clues as to what can produce inclusiveness, both the distinctive qualities and the intersecting concepts of the four theories identified by Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko are worth noting. Interestingly, these theories—charismatic, transactional, transformation, and servant leadership—have apparent correlations and contrasts. For instance, as Richard Parrott and others have observed, charismatic leadership frequently has been linked with transformational leadership.¹⁸ Charismatic leaders often promise to empower followers and can produce astounding results.

¹⁷ Jeanine L. Parolini, “Investigating the Distinctions between Transformational and Servant Leadership” (Ph.D. diss. Regent University, 2007), 1.

¹⁸ Richard Parrott, “Transformational Leadership: Theory and Reflections,” *Ashland Theological Journal* 32 (2000): 64.

This influence intersects with transformational leadership in that followers are challenged to be like the leaders in a type of idealized influence. Indeed, transformational leaders are often charismatic.¹⁹ Yet, charismatic leaders represent more of a set of traits than a theoretical basis or stance and may be manifested in ways quite distinct from the general characteristics of transformational leadership. Charismatic leadership is practiced by those who have the traits of charisma. It would be difficult, if not virtually impossible, for a leader to decide to be charismatic without the inherent traits. As a result, a transformational leader may be charismatic, but not necessarily so. In addition, charismatic leadership can have a decisively dark side. Peter Drucker considered charisma to be “the undoing of leaders,” and Jay Conger maintained that for all of its often remarkable achievements, there also can be a number of dark side traits of charismatic leaders, including the tendency to construct an organizational vision that is a “monument to themselves.”²⁰ Therefore, a charismatic leader may not necessarily be transformational in the positive manner that Burns and others have understood the very nature of transformational leadership to be. Charismatic leadership tends to be focused on the agenda of the leaders rather than the development of their followers. As a result, the potential for inclusiveness from a charismatic leader is often quite low.

Transformational leadership is also often contrasted with transactional leadership. James MacGregor Burns is chiefly credited with bringing the transformational idea of leadership to the forefront. In his seminal book *Leadership*, Burns contrasted transformational leadership, which “seeks to satisfy higher needs...engages the full person...converts followers into leaders and moral agents,” with task-centered transactional leadership,

¹⁹ Stone, Russell, and Patterson, 357.

²⁰ Jay A Conger, *The Charismatic Leader: Behind the Mystique of Exceptional Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1989), 137-38.

which centers on “exchanging one thing for another.”²¹ Burns’s attempt to define transformational leadership in contrast to transactional leadership proved to be a key in understanding the former. Burns firmly established transformational leadership as being a people-centered stance. Transactional leadership, on the other hand, is less of a substantive leadership stance than a pragmatic managerial technique. As Abraham Zaleznik observed, managers are transactional leaders, and they do not grapple with the deeper questions in regard to the goals of their organizations.²² Parrott asserted that “the transactional leader does not consider the needs of each individual. Transactional leaders do not focus on personal development.”²³

Bernard Bass also championed the importance of transformational leadership as opposed to transactional leadership: “Most experimental research, unfortunately, has focused on transactional leadership...whereas the real movers and shakers of the world are transformational leaders.”²⁴ Exactly how these two leadership theories should be juxtaposed is the subject of debate. Speaking of his difference with Burns in this regard, Bass wrote, “He sees transformational leadership as the opposite end of a single continuum from transactional leadership. Conceptually and empirically, we find that leaders will exhibit a variety of patterns of transformational and transactional leadership. *Most leaders do both but in different amounts.*”²⁵ Marshall Sashkin and Molly Sashkin interpreted the implications of Bass’s research as thinking of transformational leadership and transactional leadership in terms of two different dimensions of

²¹ James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 4.

²² Abraham Zaleznik, “The Leadership Gap,” *Washington Quarterly* 6(1) (1983): 32-39.

²³ Parrott, 66.

²⁴ Bass, *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, 22-23.

²⁵ Benard M. Bass, *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations* (London: Free Press, 1985), 22.

leadership that should be measured on different scales rather than polar opposites.²⁶

Regardless of how transactional and transformational leadership are juxtaposed, transformational leadership has much greater likelihood for inclusiveness. Transactional leaders can gain compliance through offering followers what they want or need, but such leaders have difficulty motivating a creative passion that brings out the highest potential of their constituents. Transformational leadership, on the other hand, can bring a commitment to strive toward a superlative excellence.²⁷ In *Transforming Leadership*, Burns asserted that “transforming leaders champion and inspire followers....Followers might outstrip leaders. They might become leaders themselves. That is what makes transforming leadership participatory and democratic.”²⁸

Much of the notoriety of servant leadership theory and therefore its high potential for influence as a factor in regard to inclusiveness in leadership is the result of the writings of Robert Greenleaf. Greenleaf put forth the concept that the leader should be seen first as a servant and secondly as a leader. One leads out of a desire to serve. Mark L. Russell stated that “Greenleaf only used the term servant leadership for purposes of economy and simplicity” and preferred “the phrase, the servant as leader, because, in this phrase, the subject is the servant and the predicate is the leader.”²⁹ Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko observed that Greenleaf “did not provide any definitions of servant leadership. Instead, he focused on specific behaviors of a servant leader, and on influence a servant leader has on followers.”³⁰ This theoretical stance

²⁶ Marshall Sashkin and Molly G. Sashkin, *Leadership That Matters* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2003), 36.

²⁷ Bass, *Leadership and Performance*, 32.

²⁸ Burns, *Transforming Leadership*, 26.

²⁹ Mark L. Russell, “The Secret of Marketplace Leadership Success: Constructing a Comprehensive Framework for the Effective Integration of Leadership, Faith, and Work,” *Journal of Religious Leadership* 6 (Spring 2007): 93.

³⁰ Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko, 2.

is by its very nature inclusive. Greenleaf insisted that servant leaders “have empathy and an unqualified acceptance” of those they serve.³¹ Servant leaders care deeply about what others think. Greenleaf believed “that only a true natural servant responds to any problem by listening *first*.”³²

Servant leadership is quite distinct from transactional or charismatic leadership. Marilyn J. Bugenhagen observed that “Greenleaf’s way of conceptualizing leadership seems to leave little room for a transactional leader where relationship between leader and follower finds the leader pursuing the ends with little concern for others.”³³ Likewise, “servant leaders do not rely on charisma” but rather “servant leaders rely upon service, and in so doing, they endear the followers to the leaders in reciprocal relationships.”³⁴

In contrast to its distinctiveness from transactional or charismatic leadership, servant leadership has potential for a positive intersection with the inclusive aspects of transformational leadership. Paul J. Boumbulian, S. Sue Pickens, and Ron J. Anderson in “Managing the In-Between through Servant Leadership” noted that “one of the basic premises of servant leadership is that there is an interdependence among people, communities, and institutions. The success of each is dependent on the success of the other.”³⁵ Thus, “synergistic benefits are gained by the community through the coordination of its assets.”³⁶ If servant leadership alone can have synergistic

³¹ Robert K. Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* (New York: Paulist Press, 1977), 21.

³² Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 17.

³³ Marilyn J. Bugenhagen, “Antecedents of Transactional, Transformational, and Servant Leadership: A Constructive-Development Theory Approach” (Ph.D. diss., University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 2006), 20.

³⁴ Stone, Russell, and Patterson, 357.

³⁵ Paul J. Boumbulian, S. Sue Pickens, and Ron J. Anderson, “Managing the In-Between through Servant Leadership,” *Building Leadership Bridges 2004*, eds. Nancy S. Huber and J. Thomas Wren (College Park, MD: International Leadership Association, 2004), 70.

³⁶ Boumbulian, Pickens, and Anderson, 70.

potential in developing the relationships of interdependence among constituents of a populace, could there be an even greater potential for such synergism when the inclusive aspects of transformational and servant leadership are brought together in a new synthesis? To answer this question, we will need to explore some of the ways that servant leadership and transformational leadership have been compared.

Some Recent Attempts of Comparing Servant Leadership and Transformational Leadership

In recent years, a number of efforts, including several doctoral dissertations, have explored the relationship between transformational leadership and servant leadership. In a key article, Stone, Russell, and Patterson noted that “a cursory glimpse of transformational leadership and servant leadership leaves the perception that the concepts are rather similar. In fact, some individuals question whether there is any real difference between the concepts.”³⁷ Responding to this debate, Rynetta R. Washington opined that “these questions may stem from the thought that both theories describe people-orientated, moral, and inspirational approaches to leadership...that emphasize the importance of valuing, mentoring, and empowering followers.”³⁸

Common ground between the theories is apparent in Greenleaf’s transformational-like admonition that servant leaders should help constituents “to grow taller than they would otherwise be.”³⁹ Likewise, transformational leadership theorists such as Burns advocate a servant spirit-like devotion to eradicate world poverty with a new army of “freedom leaders—who would live close to the poor, hear and understand their wants and needs,” and

³⁷ Stone, Russell, and Patterson, 349.

³⁸ Rynetta R. Washington, “Empirical Relationships among Servant, Transformational, and Transactional Leadership: Similarities, Differences, and Correlations with Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment” (Ph.D. diss., Auburn University, 2007), 20.

³⁹ Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 21.

mobilize resources to meet those needs.⁴⁰ The analysis of Stone, Russell, and Patterson of the attributes of these two theories revealed “that transformational leadership and servant leadership have relatively analogous characteristics....Both transformational leadership and servant leadership emphasize the importance of appreciating and valuing people, listening, mentoring or teaching, and empowering followers.”⁴¹

Though there are strong similarities between transformational leadership and servant leadership, there are some significant differences. Parolini proposed five important distinctions: a moral focus of the collective good versus sacrificial service, collective goals versus individual followers, a motivation by mission versus a motivation by egalitarianism, development of followers who have similar values to the leader versus autonomous agents, and an influencing process based on the charisma or persuasive skills of the leader versus a persuasion based on trust that results from service.⁴²

In some respects, servant leadership and transformational leadership have a different cognitive focus. Bugenhagen noted that “servant leadership encourages a more complex way of leading in first not leading, but serving the needs of others...and then choosing to lead while simultaneously encouraging and growing others to serve.”⁴³ Yet, Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko insisted that this unorthodox approach “does not account for the intellectual stimulation component of transformational leadership.” By “intellectual stimulation” they were referring to “a leader’s behavior that encourages followers’ creativity and stimulates innovative thinking.”⁴⁴

A strong consensus among some comparisons of transformational leadership and servant leadership is that

⁴⁰ Burns, *Transforming Leadership*, 238.

⁴¹ Stone, Russell, and Patterson, 354.

⁴² Parolini, 9.

⁴³ Bugenhagen, 20.

⁴⁴ Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko, 2.

the primary distinction is found in the focus on what is best for the corporate whole rather than for the individual person. Summarizing earlier work by Bass, Parolini wrote that servant leaders go “beyond transformational leaders in selecting the needs of others and serving others as the leader’s main aim, whereas transformational leaders aim to align their own and others’ interests with the good of the group, organization, or society.”⁴⁵ Likewise, Stone, Russell, and Patterson declared, “Transformational leaders tend to focus more on organizational objectives while servant leaders focus more on the people who are their followers. This tendency of the servant leader to focus on followers appears to be the primary factor that distinguishes servant leadership from transformational leadership.”⁴⁶ This area of distinction is an important factor in the potential for the two leadership stances to provide a complementary mix of traits that can result in a more inclusive leadership style.

The Potential for Synergism in the Utilization of Transformational and Servant Leadership Stances

Thus far, it has been posited that servant leadership and transformational leadership have much potential for producing an inclusive leadership style because the theories have a great deal in common. The commonality between the two theories is significant enough to produce compatibility, particularly in the context of being people-centered rather than outcome-based (transactional) or leader-centered (charismatic). Thus, in terms of practice, a leader can be a hybrid of transactional leadership and servant leadership without an inherent contradiction. At the same time, the differences in the two stances that do exist do not necessarily produce opposite poles of behavior but rather complementary qualities that bring balance. Many have

⁴⁵ Parolini, 1.

⁴⁶ Stone, Russell, and Patterson, 349.

noted the importance of an adaptable leadership style, especially in today's context of a cauldron of change. Daniel Goleman has demonstrated that flexibility in leadership style is further enhanced when two or more styles are combined, such as visionary and democratic styles, for example.⁴⁷ Likewise, the distinctions between transformational and servant leadership have complementary potential. On the other hand, the compatibility of these two stances allows for a hybrid that results in an effective synergism with a strong promise for producing an inclusive outcome. The strengths of both of these stances tend to offset the weaknesses of the other. This balance is actually an aid in bringing forth a more inclusive leadership style.

Being able to utilize practices of both servant leadership and transformational leadership is of significant aid to the leader. In reality, no leader is likely to fit neatly into one particular type of leadership theory or stance. Even those who espouse such theories as superior do not always agree on the exact characteristics of that stance. While there may be general understandings of what transformational leadership and servant leadership are, specific aspects in terms of emphasis certainly would vary. By no means do all authors on transformational leadership necessarily align with Burns or Bass, who do not even agree on some points. Similarly, Yvonne Bradley maintained that biblical understandings of servant leadership are somewhat distinct from Greenleaf or others in regard to servant leadership.⁴⁸ These distinctions in understanding the theoretical bases for these two stances imply some fluidity in leadership which Goleman and others consider healthy. For instance, a leader could generally fit the

⁴⁷ Daniel Goleman, "Leadership That Gets Results," *Harvard Business Review* (March-April 2000): 78-90; Daniel Goleman, Richard Boyatzis, and Annie McKee, *Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2004).

⁴⁸ Yvonne Bradley, "Servant Leadership: A Critique of Robert Greenleaf's Concept of Leadership," *Journal of Christian Education* 42(2) (September 1999): 49.

description of a servant leader but also might exhibit modifications of the servant-leader stance in order to relate more effectively to the context. These modifications might align more with the qualities of a transformational leader, or conversely, transformational leaders might alter their actions in a way that would more closely reflect servant leadership.

Transformational/Servant Leadership and Inclusive Leadership Outcomes

With a flexible mode in mind as described above, the following are some proposals for how the compatible and complementary aspects of transformational leadership and servant leadership can be carried out in conjunction with the five critically important characteristics of inclusion. The local church is an especially appropriate application because the concept of servant leadership is well established in the teaching of Jesus, as is the idea of a transformational salvation in such passages as 2 Cor. 5:17. It has been forcefully argued that servant leadership⁴⁹ and transformational leadership⁵⁰ are the dominant leadership concepts in the New Testament. As a result, in this application the locus of the individual church congregation is frequently, although not exclusively, employed. Therefore, at this point, a review of the five characteristics of inclusion and how servant leadership and transformational leadership provide praxis for inclusive leadership outcomes would be helpful.

First, inclusive leadership brings the maximum number of individuals into participation. The characteristics of servant leadership are particularly valuable in this regard. Servant leadership by its very nature is inclusive. The one who seeks to serve is not inclined to exclude. Greenleaf warned against prejudgment of constituents. He believed

⁴⁹ Ken Blanchard and Phil Hodges, *Lead Like Jesus: Lessons from the Greatest Leadership Role Model of All Time* (Nashville: W. Publishing Group, 2005).

⁵⁰ Leighton Ford, *Transformational Leadership: Jesus' Way of Creating Vision, Shaping Values and Empowering Change* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1991).

followers would grow and develop “when those who lead them empathize and when they are accepted for what they are.”⁵¹

Servant leaders can foster more participation in the leadership process because they develop trust. It is one thing to declare that everyone has a place at the table. It is another thing to get them to come to the table. Not everyone is going to respond to the grand visioning of a transformational leader. Ironically, even positive change sometimes can meet resistance from those it would benefit the most. Those who have been marginalized may so distrust past leadership that it is difficult for them to accept as genuine invitations to be included, even when the leadership approach differs markedly from its antecedent. The default assumption may be that it is a manipulative tactic. Servant leaders develop trust because they care about those they lead, and over time this quality becomes evident. Building on the research of Stone and Winston, Paul T. P. Wong observed that servant leadership differs from either the X or Y theory of MacGregor or even a synthesis known as Z theory. The servant leadership alternative called theory S “emphasizes the importance of leadership motivation and postulates that most workers will respond positively to leaders who seek to serve and to empower them.”⁵² Therefore, Greenleaf’s insistence that leaders be servants first can be an effective prescription for overcoming the challenges of bringing together existing antagonistic dichotomies into an inclusive and holistic relationship. Churches long splintered into conflicting factions may find a healing balm in a servant leader who develops trust through a consistent ministry that demonstrates care and concern.

⁵¹ Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 20.

⁵² Paul T. P. Wong, “An Opponent-Process Model of Servant Leadership and a Typology of Leadership Styles,” based on a presentation given at the Servant Leadership Roundtable and the ensuing discussions at Regent University, VA, 16 October 2003, 1; available at <http://www.twu.ca/academics/graduate/leadership/servant-leadership/servant-leadership-roundtable-typology.pdf>.

Another significant reason that servant leaders can develop trust was noted by Greenleaf: “Servants by definition are fully human. Servant-leaders are functionally superior because they are closer to the ground—they hear things, see things, know things, and their intuitive insight is exceptional. Because of this they are dependable and trusted, they know the meaning of that line from Shakespeare’s sonnet: ‘They that have power to hurt and will do none.’”⁵³ The awareness of the context that a servant leader has can result in a competency of leadership that develops a feeling of confidence from the constituents. Bugenhagen labeled this quality in servant leaders as “wisdom (awareness and foresight).” From her research, she concluded that it produced a positive correlation in the ranking of leaders with their followers.⁵⁴

The transformational leader also may inspire trust through competency and achievement of group goals. The longer the transformational leader can sustain success in this manner, the greater the opportunity will be for developing a deeper level of trust. Yet, that trust can be lost if the transformational leader becomes authoritarian. However, since the servant leader, as Greenleaf noted, does not abuse the power, the trust is not violated. Therefore, this bestows a staying power for servant leadership. The process of inclusion is not usually quick. Barriers that have existed for some time are often resistant to change in the short run. Similarly, James A. Autry warned that “the transition to a culture of servant leadership cannot be made overnight.”⁵⁵ Again, the longevity of servant leadership is an asset in producing inclusive leadership. Therefore, leaders whose primary leadership stance is transformational would benefit in regard to their ability to bring the maximum number of

⁵³ Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 42.

⁵⁴ Bugenhagen, 158.

⁵⁵ James A. Autry, *The Servant Leader: How To Build a Creative Team, Develop Great Morale, and Improve Bottom-Line Performance* (Roseville, CA: Prima Publishing, 2001), 50.

the populace into full participation by exhibiting the above qualities of servant leadership.

Second, inclusive leadership empowers individuals to reach their full potential while pursuing the common good of the particular populace. Empowering individuals while pursuing the common good is a challenging task. The characteristic of concern for the individual in a servant-leadership stance is generally an asset when it comes to empowering individuals. Gerald Bernard asserted that “the servant led organization provides an environment where people can grow closer to their full potential as human beings.”⁵⁶ Yet, in some cases, a servant leader’s focus on the individual good can overlook the need to challenge not only the individual but also the collective group. One of the criticisms of servant leadership is that it may underestimate the need for leaders to hold followers accountable. Speaking of servant leadership, Chris Lee and Ron Zemke opined that “there’s sort of a glibness to it that masks psychological realities.”⁵⁷

In the local church setting, a common occurrence among pastors illustrates the potential shortcoming of servant leadership. Let’s call our subject Brother Bob. Brother Bob is loved by his parishioners because he is truly a servant. He is always there with needed pastoral care. Brother Bob goes to the extreme in meeting the most minor of needs and even ministers to the relatives and friends of church members whenever he is called upon. Brother Bob is great at pastoral care but only fair in his preaching because he lacks the time to have the highest level of sermon preparation. Though everyone loves Brother Bob, there is a problem. The church is in slow decline because of a lack of leadership.

⁵⁶ Gerald Bernard, “Servant Leadership and Transformational Leadership as Predictors of Follower Trust and Satisfaction” (Ph.D. diss., University of Vermont, 2007), 34.

⁵⁷ Chris Lee and Ron Zemke, “The Search for Spirit in the Workplace,” *Training* 30(6) (June 1993): 27.

The Brother Bobs and their female counterparts, the Sister Sues, should not become the scapegoats for the decline in Protestant worship attendance in the United States. In many respects, they are the heroes who have prevented even further decline. Yet, well intended as they are, they miss the mark by forgetting the importance of a transforming leadership. Transformational leaders motivate in a direct fashion. They challenge constituents to get involved and to come onboard. Servant leaders rely on more of an indirect approach, believing in the power of example. While transformational leaders do not discount the power of example, they are willing to go beyond example and hold followers accountable. Parrott noted that at the appropriate times the transformational leader must have the “moral courage” to confront the opposing personalities and obstacles.⁵⁸

Bradley warned that it would be difficult to predict whether a “leader attempting to display ‘servant’ characteristics would be perceived to have a servant nature or simply to be weak and indecisive.”⁵⁹ The transformational leader would not as likely be misinterpreted as weak. Yukl defined transformational leadership as the “process of building commitment to the organization’s objectives and empowering followers to accomplish these objectives.”⁶⁰ In this definition, the individual’s need for empowerment would be balanced by the consideration of the well-being of the entire populace. Transformational leaders are focused on the greater good and are generally unwilling to detour its fulfillment for individual pampering. At this point, transformational leadership does not contradict servant leadership but goes to the next step. Transformational leaders realize that it sometimes takes more than just a good example to motivate and empower followers. Motivating constituents often requires holding them

⁵⁸ Parrott, 74.

⁵⁹ Bradley, 52.

⁶⁰ Yukl, 324.

accountable in a way that a servant leader may not be inclined to do.

On the other hand, servant leadership has the potential for maximizing empowerment participation because it supremely values the importance of each individual. Servant leadership is the antithesis of marginalization. Once again the qualities of servant-leadership and transformational-leadership stances have the potential for compensating for weaknesses of each other.

Third, those who practice inclusive leadership develop a culture that perpetuates the morality of the worth of the individual in such a way as to act as a preventive resistance against the ever-present possibility of despotism. Concerning this characteristic, once again servant leadership and transformational leadership have a symbiotic relationship. Balancing a potential weakness of transformational leadership, servant leadership is a critically important check against authoritarianism in church leadership as well as in other venues of leadership.

Transformational leaders seek to empower people to reach a goal that is mutually beneficial to the collective group. As has been observed, transformational leadership sometimes can be closely tied with charismatic leadership, but in actuality it is more broadly connected with a visionary leadership style. This connection comes because the transformational leader who effectively casts a vision can powerfully motivate followers to pursue the greater corporate good. As early as 1989, Lyle Schaller noted the difference that such leadership was making in church revitalization and growth. He wrote that “the transformational leader is driven by a vision of a new tomorrow, wins supporters and followers for that vision, and transforms the congregation.”⁶¹ Similarly, Daniel Goleman, Richard Boyatzis, and Annie McKee observed that “not surprisingly, the visionary mode comes naturally to ‘transformational’ leaders—those who seek to radically

⁶¹ Leith Anderson, *Dying for Change* (Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1990), 188.

change an organization.”⁶² Indeed, it would be hard to imagine that a transformational leader could be effective without extensive use of a visionary style of motivation.

Goleman’s research demonstrated that visionary leadership was the most effective style of those which he sought to measure. Nonetheless, one of the weaknesses of visionary leadership is that it can become hyper-visionary leadership. Visionary leadership has the potential for morphing into aggrandized ambitions. If power can corrupt, so can success. Once the visionary leaders have achieved their goals, there can be an insatiable desire to find the next goal, which usually is a greater challenge than the previous one. Inevitably there is overreach, resulting in a more authoritarian leadership style.

Observation of successful ministries demonstrates that vision overreach is not rare. New ventures are launched and buildings may be built without a direct connection to the bedrock mission of the organization. Where does this leave transformational leadership that employs visionary leadership to accomplish the group goals? Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee maintained that visionary leadership is not effective when constituents “view a leader expounding a grand vision as pompous or simply out of step with the agenda at hand.”⁶³ This unproductive aberration is similar to the earlier noted “dark side” of charismatic leadership. At this point, the leader may modify the vision that accompanies the transformational agenda or begin to assert a more authoritarian stance. The rationalization for the leader to take such a stance goes as follows. “As leader, I know best what the big picture is and how everyone needs to fit into the grand scheme. In the long run when everyone assumes their roles, they will be empowered to realize their full potential.” The despotism that results is the polar opposite of an inclusive leader. Those who initially may have been transformational leaders but who

⁶² Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee, 59.

⁶³ Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee, 59.

morphed into a hyper-visionary style ultimately exclude and marginalize everyone else but themselves.

Servant leadership can serve as a check against the temptation for the transformational leader to become authoritarian. The very focus for the servant leader is in the followers and serving their needs, not in pursuing the leader's vision. Servant leaders do not aspire to be leaders but are in a sense drafted into the role in order to serve. Ironically, the idea of servant leadership has not struck a favorable chord with many because of the very nature of the term. Larry Spears observed, "For some people, the word servant prompts an immediate negative connotation, due to the oppression that many workers—particularly women and people of color—have historically endured. For some, it may take a while to accept the positive usage of this word *servant*. However, those who are willing to dig a little deeper come to understand the inherent spiritual nature of what is intended by the pairing of *servant* and *leader*. The startling paradox of the term *servant-leadership* serves to prompt new insights."⁶⁴ Greenleaf expressed his hope for the outcome of servant leadership when he asked, "What is the effect on the least privileged in society; will (they) benefit, or, at least...not be further deprived?"⁶⁵

It is unfortunate that the idea of servant leadership in its intended form has been violated by those who have adulterated its meaning. Wong speculated that this aberrant view of servant leadership among Christian leaders is the result of misguided logic which includes the following ideas:

- They are chosen of God and therefore have the right to impose authority.
- They are servants of God but not to the people.

⁶⁴ Larry Spears, "Tracing the Growing Impact of Servant-Leadership," *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's Theory of Servant-Leadership Influenced Today's Top Management Thinkers*, ed. Larry C. Spears (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1995), 10.

⁶⁵ Robert K. Greenleaf, *The Servant as Leader* (Newton Center, MA: Robert K. Greenleaf Center, 1970), 7.

- They are accountable only to God and not to the people.⁶⁶

The above suppositions could not be more opposed to the teachings and example of Jesus, who identified himself as a servant and called for his followers to be servants. In Mark 9:35, Jesus declared, “If anyone wants to be first, he shall be last of all and servant of all.” True servants, Jesus said, “would be last of all.” By this, Jesus was admonishing leaders, those who naturally would be inclined to desire to be first, to realize that they would need to put others ahead of themselves and therefore be last of all. They would do so through service. Such is the converse of what has been caricatured falsely as servant leadership. Jesus had no intention of servant leadership keeping the oppressed down, but rather reversing the entire paradigm in which love and service break down barriers. The kingdom egalitarian ethic was to be based on volitional service, not oppressive servitude. Likewise, that which Greenleaf espoused is not an instrument of despotism but rather a preventive for it.

Fourth, inclusion in leadership is intentional in the replication of today’s leaders who model inclusiveness with a commitment to allow future leadership to emerge. Both servant leadership and transformational leadership stances have good potential to promote the replication of inclusive leadership. Replication of leadership is one of the main aims of Greenleaf, who proposed that a true servant leader would enable followers to “grow as persons” and “while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants.”⁶⁷ Greenleaf’s concept of servant leadership rested partly on the concept that it was contagious. He believed that the power of servant leadership was enough to permeate influence that would produce new leaders. Leaders would be developed by “lifting them up.”⁶⁸ This “lifting up” is the very heart of what a servant leader does and

⁶⁶ Wong, 2.

⁶⁷ Greenleaf, *The Servant as Leader*, 7.

⁶⁸ Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*, 21.

inevitably would produce more servant leaders. People want to be like those they admire. The altruism of servant leadership is sure to attract a number who wish to emulate it. Though their first desire, as Greenleaf outlined, would not be to become leaders, it would only be natural that they will become leaders through the development of influence that such service often brings. Despite the possibility that transformational leadership can become hyper-visionary and lead to a more authoritarian style, this outcome is far from the intent of its proponents. Noel Tichy and Mary Anne Devanna echoed the thoughts of many who espouse transformational leadership: “Transformational leaders are not dictators. They are powerful yet sensitive of other people, and ultimately they work toward the empowerment of others.”⁶⁹ As Tichy and Devanna further noted, transformational leaders “believe in people.”⁷⁰ This view is precisely that of Burns, who posited that the transformational purposes which the group would pursue would empower people to “transform themselves.”⁷¹ In other words, transformational leadership empowers constituents in a way that allows a self-metamorphosis. All of this produces a natural tension which Burns described this way: “As leaders encourage followers to rise above narrow interest and work together for transcending goals, leaders can come into conflict with followers’ rising sense of efficacy and purpose. Followers might outstrip leaders. They might become leaders themselves. That is what makes transforming leadership participatory and democratic.”⁷²

Though transformational leadership and servant leadership are conducive to the replication of inclusiveness among emerging leadership, they do so in

⁶⁹ Noel M. Tichy and Mary Anne Devanna, *The Transformational Leader* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1990), 273.

⁷⁰ Tichy and Devanna, 273.

⁷¹ Burns, *Transforming Leadership*, 26.

⁷² Burns, *Transforming Leadership*, 26.

different ways. Servant leadership's potential is in the example of modeling from the leader. The act of service produces admiration and emulation that brings forth new servant leaders. Likewise, they are equally committed to empowering and inspiring others to become servants and eventually servant leaders. In this sense, the servant leader models true transformation in regard to the core values of the leadership stance. For transformational leaders it is different. Though modeling is always a cogent factor, transformational leadership theorists see leader replication as more of the natural outgrowth of the transformational purpose that is embraced by the group or populace. As they develop a passion to be transformers, they become transformed. Once again these differences in the approach of servant leadership need not reflect contradiction in a leader who may have characteristics of both. Instead, these leadership stances are congruent enough to allow coexistence and are divergent enough to have the potential for an effective synergism.

Finally, inclusive leadership is manifested in the development of appropriate boundaries that maintain the integrity of the nature of the collective without marginalizing any of the populace. A healthy tension often exists within various leadership stances in regard to the needs of the populace versus the individual, and transformational leadership and servant leadership are no exceptions. Parrott observed that "transformational leadership is a balancing act" in that the leader "must focus on the greater good of the organization" while also being concerned with "each individual's needs." The transformational leader "must focus on motivating beyond the realm of self-interest yet attend to the personal fulfillment of each person who works in the organization."⁷³

One of the most challenging examples of such tension is determining where an organization should draw its boundaries. Boundaries are an enigma for any organization or populace. Organizations must have them,

⁷³ Parrott, 68.

but they must be permeable. Even proponents of “boundaryless organizations” have noted the need for a careful balance. Advocates Ron Ashhenas, David Ulrich, Todd Jich, and Steve Herr wrote, “Given the necessity of boundaries, the boundaryless behavior we describe does not mean a free-for-all removal of all boundaries. That would be silly. Instead, we are talking about making boundaries more permeable, allowing greater fluidity of movement throughout the organization.”⁷⁴ If boundaries are non-existent or if they are too permeable, then the struggle for identity becomes a civil war. As a result, the strongest factions win at the exclusion of the weaker ones, or the identity simply dissolves along with any meaningful existence of the organization or populace. If boundaries are impenetrable, then stagnation and death will result. These realities are starkly apparent in the health of a local congregation. For this reason, Jackson W. Carroll, Carl S. Dudley, and William McKinney urged local churches to be “open systems” with “permeable boundaries” that exhibit a healthy flow between congregation and community.⁷⁵ In the congregational setting, the ideals of servant leadership and transformational leadership offer a potential synergism for producing just the right balance between openness and integrity.

The issues of boundaries for entities as varied as nations, corporations, and communities of all sorts are far too complex for this discussion. However, in the context of the local church, an application can be more simply noted. One of the factors that can lead to rigid boundaries in a local congregation is the failure to see that the church does not exist to serve itself but to serve others. Many feel excluded when the church exhibits what is perceived as narcissism. Typical are the criticisms

⁷⁴ Ron Ashhenas, David Ulrich, Todd Jich, and Steve Herr, *The Boundaryless Organization; Breaking the Chains of Organizational Structure* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995), 4.

⁷⁵ Jackson W. Carroll, Carl S. Dudley, William McKinney, *Handbook for Congregational Studies* (Nashville: Abingdon, Press, 1986), 48.

of a University of Georgia student in an opinion article in the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* in regard to why his generation was leaving the church. He asserted that they had not left the church but the church had left them (exclusion). He used his former church as an example with its development of opulent and self-indulging facilities which included state-of-the-art equipment for worship and vast resources devoted to recreational uses. He wrote, “Think of what they cost—in pennies and people. The pennies could have bought clothes for the naked or food for the hungry. The people could have given help to the helpless or given care to the sick.”⁷⁶ Though this is an old pat criticism of the church that is seldom completely true or fair, nonetheless it represents an area in which the practice of servant leadership can make a difference.

Transformational leadership reinforces the priority of an organization to remember its mission. This reminder can be especially important in the church congregation. The institutional church needs constant reformation to be reminded of its purpose. The gospel is a perpetual new wine that breaks the old wineskins that have become brittle and inflexible from the weathering of the self-preservation of institutional rot. Transformational leadership fits well with the radical nature of the gospel if it stays on purpose of the great commission. No greater transformational vision has ever been proposed than that of Matt. 28:19-20. The inclusion is the entire world and the only boundary is to become disciples. No greater vehicle for reaching the vision has ever been given than the example of the ultimate servant leader, Jesus Christ.

Summary and Conclusion

Our current inability to encapsulate the complexity of leadership in a single universal definition does not mean that we cannot discern important leadership outcomes

⁷⁶ George Louie Brogdon IV, “I Love God, Not Church Greed,” *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, April 1, 2009, A12.

through the examination of the interaction of leadership stances. A critically important outcome in this regard is inclusiveness. Two prominent leadership theories that are particularly helpful in fostering inclusiveness in leadership are transformational leadership and servant leadership.

Transformational leadership and servant leadership are compatible enough so as not to create contradiction but are distinct enough to be complementary. In each of the five critical qualities of inclusiveness, potential exists for transformational leadership or servant leadership or both to be a boon to this goal. Yet, the use of both leadership stances is more than just employing the right leadership tool for the context. One can be both a transformational leader and a servant leader at the same time. As a result, a synergistic effect for seeing the realization of an inclusive leadership style occurs in that the complementary employment of the two theoretical stances also keeps them in concert with each other.

Transformational leadership is the mission of the church and servant leadership is the mode. For this reason, both should be employed simultaneously in church leadership. The modifications necessary from either stance are not difficult but are not likely to happen without an informed and intentional effort. The resulting combination is not a synthesis of opposites but an alliance of concepts that more effectively manifests biblical ideals. The outcome is a maximization of the inclusive mission of the church and the minimization of the potential of dichotomous antagonistic factions within the church.

Transformational leadership that neglects the servant mode is in danger of losing its soul. Equally precarious, servant leadership without a transforming purpose becomes somewhat devoid of transcendent meaning and ultimately may be enacted as merely dutiful actions without passion.

If Christians fail to proclaim and practice the inclusive gospel in the manner set forth by Jesus Christ, the church is in danger of being both a perpetrator and a

victim of marginalization. When the church does not practice orthodox inclusion and dismisses the marginalized groups as irrelevant, as a perpetrator, it reinforces secular prejudice and disenfranchisement. Ironically, in this mode the church also becomes a victim in that it loses its ability to be salt and light and, therefore, is marginalized as irrelevant.