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In 1970, Robert Greenleaf published *The Servant as Leader*, which was his first in a series of essays which he wrote on the servant-leader concept. He was convinced that Leadership in the last half of the twentieth century demanded a different mindset. In the 1980s and 1990s several more individuals who were studying and writing on leadership emerged as proponents of servant leadership, including Bill Millard in California and Jim Laub in Florida. They were later to come together at IWU to continue their collaboration, building an undergraduate academic program leading to a major in Leadership—the major based on the principles of servant-leadership. Laub subsequently returned to Florida; Millard is still in Indiana.

Millard’s (1988) early writing contrasted servant leaders with authoritarian leaders, setting up a dualistic choice which contended that not only was servant leadership the more noble choice, but that it was also the more practical choice. Indeed the title for this essay was “Servant Leadership: Not Just a Pious Pursuit—It works!” In later editions of this first essay, he adopted the term “autocratic leader” rather than “authoritarian leader” to be more consistent with others who were writing in the field. As Laub and Millard started to collaborate more in their study of servant leadership, they began to uncover an interim leadership paradigm that existed between the two extremes Millard had contrasted in his early work. Millard described it as a state where leaders often assume their focus is as servant leaders but in practice exhibit a focus more like autocratic leaders. Laub believed that this in-between, somewhat self-deceived state was best identified as Paternalistic Leadership, characterized by an all-knowing parent-like leader directing the lives of the ignorant, dependent childlike led. When placed in the middle of Millard’s original autocratic-servant leadership continuum, this created what Laub continues to describe as the APS model (no relationship to the educational entity at IWU). Millard has shifted somewhat from that terminology, but this will address that issue a little later.

As Millard and Laub began to look at companies and organizations using this tri-paradigmatic lens, they found that leadership in many companies and organizations has tended to follow more on the AP side of the scale, adopting an autocratic or a paternalistic mindset that focused many times more on what was good for the leader than on what was good for those led. However, research now shows that many of these leaders may unknowingly have impeded productivity, effectiveness and efficiency in their organizations! Many of today’s prominent thinkers and writers in the area of leadership such as Belasco, Blanchard, Covey, Garner, Kouzes, Peck, Peters, Posner, Senge, Stayer and Wheatly, to name more than a few, agree upon and advocate the need...
to shift to a way of thinking that focus more on leaders serving those who are led—in other words, servant-leadership, even if that nomenclature is not used. What is being discovered is that servant-leadership is the optimum mindset for twenty-first century leaders—whether they are leaders of large corporations or smaller, fast-paced entrepreneurial endeavors.

Whether it was Greenleaf or any of the rest of those writing on servant leadership, the thinking in this area has been greatly influenced by the ideas set forth by Douglas McGregor in his book, "The Human Side of Enterprise" published in 1960. McGregor was a social psychologist, later became the President of Antioch College, and even later in his career became a professor of management at MIT. In leadership studies and organizational behavior, his name is linked most often with a model on the behavior of individuals in the workplace which he formulated into Theory X and Theory Y.

Of course McGregor, Greenleaf or the later writers are not the first ones to come up with such a “novel” concept. The concept can be found in early Hebrew literature and Chinese philosophy well before the time of Christ. But it was Jesus of Nazareth who so distinctly created the leadership contrast in his words:

"You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them (Theory X). Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be your slave (Theory Y)—just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many."  Matthew 20:25-28 NIV

The ironic outcome of this philosophy, however, is that the last of Jesus’ twelve associates had barely disappeared from the scene when the Christian church they founded quickly put this theory on the back burner. Somehow it just didn’t seem compatible with what it took to be a leader or to manage a church, let alone a business or a government. Edicts, fiats and inquisitions seemed the better choice.

Not to make excuses for the Christian church or all the other organizations that pursued leadership paradigms contrary to servant leadership, but for most of its history, servant leadership has been long on inspirational instinct and short on systematic theory. It really was not until Laub’s (1999) groundbreaking doctoral research that an empirical and systematic approach was employed for the first time to identify a working model for servant leadership. Laub (1998) subsequently developed a tool from this model to assess the level of servant leadership in organizations. Based on the results from the assessment, organizations are placed into six different categories of organizational health (Laub, 2006). The categories range from “Toxic” at the low end to “Optimal” at the high end. Laub uses an exponential typology in identifying these categories. Org1 (“Toxic Health”) and Org2 (“Poor Health”) would fit in what Laub and Millard earlier identified as autocratic led organizations. Org3 (“Limited Health”) and Org4 (“Moderate Health”) would fit into paternalistically led organizations. Finally Org5 (“Excellent Health” and Org6 (“Optimal Health”) would fit into servant led organizations. Based on the results from the usage of this tool by a variety of researchers (including both of the presenters today), the majority of organizations studied to this point have fallen into a category of leadership characterized as paternalistic rather than servant leadership.

A quick side trip to explain a recent divergence in Laub’s and Millard’s terminology. Millard has concluded that Autocratic-Paternalistic-Servant Leader continuum does not capture what was really trying to be conveyed in describing servant-leadership as the optimal paradigm. A case can be made that there is an appropriate place for a parental leadership style implied by the term “paternalistic”. There may also be occasions when a leader has to act in an “autocratic” unilateral style. As a result, Millard (2006) has relabeled the continuum as Egocentric-Patronizing-Servant Leader. The following chart contrasts the three paradigms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View of Leader</th>
<th>Servant</th>
<th>Patronizing</th>
<th>Egocentric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View of Followers</td>
<td>Steward</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Preeminence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characterized by...</td>
<td>Counterparts of leadership equation</td>
<td>Dependent on the leader’s direction</td>
<td>Primarily to serve the leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader considers position a...</td>
<td>Mutual Respect</td>
<td>Condescension</td>
<td>Dictatorial acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship of Leader to Led</td>
<td>Trust to faithfully carry out</td>
<td>Podium for imparting wisdom</td>
<td>Throne for imposing edicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interconnected with led</td>
<td>Elevated above led</td>
<td>Isolated from led</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As you see all three paradigms described in this chart, there is never a place for either “egocentric” or “patronizing” mindsets in good leadership.

Now back to the OLA findings. The latest OLA cumulative data show the same trend in Christian churches and organizations—the paternalistic (or what Millard now calls patronizing) paradigm predominates. Ironically, this seems to ignore the fact that Jesus did not offer servant-leadership as one theory among many to choose from. It was a mandate concerning leadership handed by Jesus to those who claim to lead in his name. This paradoxical situation has led the authors of this paper to ask the question “why?” In looking for the answer to that question, the authors have been drawn back to the earlier statement that much of contemporary servant leadership thought has been greatly influenced by the ideas set forth by Douglas McGregor in his Theories X and Y (McGregor, 1960). The authors wonder if the Christian doctrine of the original depravity of humanity prevalent in most evangelical Christian theology finds itself in conflict with McGregor’s Theory Y. This paper looks at the classic understanding of this doctrine, articulates a clear understanding of McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y, and then discusses if the doctrine and McGregor are in conflict or not.

**Christian doctrine of the original depravity of humanity**

The minutia surrounding the aged debate of the depravity of human beings is not the topic of today’s discussion, but is certainly subject matter for future research as it relates to McGregor’s Model of Theory X and Y. What is believed to be biblically supported by Evangelical Christians (and even that term is not precisely understood in our modern culture) is the reality of original sin resulting in the depravity of the human race—whatever this may mean. The intended focus of this paper is the effect of that belief among evangelicals on their acceptance of McGregor’s Theory Y. A place to start is trying to get a hold on what is meant by the term “depravity” or at least commonly understood among evangelicals. And even there some problems are encountered:

Fred Klooster, a Reformed theologian formerly at Calvin Theological Seminary wrote:

> Augustine maintained that man became totally depraved by the Fall, and that the will therefore, was also corrupt and hence unable to initiate or cooperate in the work of grace. Pelagius rejected this view as too pessimistic, and maintained that man had the ability to perform whatever the Gospel required of him...Seeking a middle road between Augustine and Pelagius, a semi-Pelagian position acknowledged a will weakened by sin but still able to cooperate in the work of redemption. While there have been many variations, these three positions have reappeared throughout history. Pelagianism came to the force in Socinianism during the Renaissance and again in Liberalism. Semi-Pelagianism became the prevailing Roman Catholic position and reappeared within the Reformation churches in the Arminianism of the seventeenth century. Augustine’s basic position has continued to prevail among orthodox, evangelical Christians. (Klooster, 1964 p. 155)

First, the paper will start with what Calvin and Wesley themselves had to say about human depravity. From the Reformed perspective, John Calvin wrote:

> First, we must begin with it sense of individual wretchedness, filling us with despondency as if we were spiritually dead. This effect is produced when the original and hereditary depravity of our nature is set before us as the source of all evil—a depravity which begets in us distrust, rebellion against God, pride, avarice, lust, and ill kinds of evil concupiscence, and making us averse to all rectitude and justice, holds us captive under the yoke of sin; and when, moreover, each individual, on the disclosure of his own sins, feeling confounded at his turpitude, is forced to be dissatisfied with himself, and to account himself and
all that he has of his own as less than nothing; then, on the other hand, conscience being cited to the bar of God, comes sensible of the curse under which it lies, and, as if it had receive a warning of eternal death, learns to tremble at the divine anger. This, I say, is the first stage in the way to salvation, when the sinner, overwhelmed and prostrated, desairs of all carnal aid, yet does not harden himself against the justice of God, or become stupidly callous, but, trembling and anxious, groans in agony, and sighs for relief.

Now, see how sadly this doctrine has been perverted. On the subject of original sin, perplexing questions have been raised by the Schoolmen, who have done what they could to explain away this fatal disease; for in their discussions they reduce it to little more than excess of bodily appetite and lust. Of that blindness and vanity of intellect, whence unbelief and superstition proceed, of inward depravity of soul, of pride, ambition, stubbornness, and other secret sources of evil, they say not a word.

From a more Arminian perspective, John Wesley wrote:

We are not so guilty by nature, as a course of actual sin afterward makes us. But we are, antecedent to that course, “children of wrath;” liable to some degree of wrath and punishment. Here, then, from a plain text, taken in its obvious sense, we have a clear evidence both of what Divines term, original sin imputed, and of original sin inherited. The former is the sin of Adam, so far reckoned ours as to constitute us in some degree guilty; the latter, a want of original righteousness, and a corruption of nature; whence it is, that from our infancy we are averse to what is good, and propensity to what is evil (Wesley, Works, 9:420).

In spite of the Augustinian-to-Semi-Pelagian-to-Pelagian continuum proposed by Klooster, Calvin’s and Wesley’s points of view are not that much different. In fact, here is what Klooster himself wrote:

Adam is now spiritually dead. He is polluted in every area of his being. Sin takes possession of his heart and makes it exceedingly corrupt. Like a cancer sin permeates the whole person, body and soul...The presence of God is now fearful to him; anxiety and dread fill his soul. He is at enmity even with himself. His knowledge becomes darkened. His will is no longer free but bound as the slave of sin. Thus God’s image in man is corrupted and polluted....As the physical head of the entire human race, Adam also passes on a polluted or depraved human nature to his children. (Klooster, 1964 p. 154)

Former editor of Christianity Today Kenneth S. Kantzer, who along with Carl Henry stood as a staunch guardian of evangelical orthodoxy, wrote

The fall of our first parents brought moral depravity upon the whole human race. It is total in the sense that it pervades the entire human personality—intellect, will and emotions. No aspect of the human psyche remains pure and uncorrupted by the fall. Accordingly, humankind is now incapable of achieving its own ultimate good. Left to himself, man is morally helpless. Moreover, his depravity has so corrupted his moral sense that he often prefers the bad and does not lie what is good. His natural inclinations, therefore, are no reliable guide to what is really right or wrong or what is good or bad for him. (Kantzer, 1990 p. 1999)

Orton Wiley (a leading twentieth century theologian in the Church of the Nazarene) offered a perspective from a vantage point directly in the tradition of evangelicals associated with the operation of Indiana Wesleyan University (IWU), (IWU’s place in the evangelical community is most often placed in a quartet comprised of the Church of the Nazarene, The Wesleyan Church, the Free Methodist Church, and the Christian Missionary Alliance).

Wiley stated:

We believe that original sin, or depravity, is the corruption of the nature of all the offspring of Adam, by reason of which everyone is very far gone from original righteousness of the pure state of our first parents at the time of their creation, is averse to God, is without spiritual life, and is inclined to evil, and that continually (Wiley, Christian Theology, 2:121).

The overlap and reinforcement of these perspectives is far more evident than any difference. Wesleyan theologian Leslie Wilcox summarized this into five points that can be used as a rather broadly held evangelical understanding of what is meant by the depravity of humanity:
(1) Scripture states that the human heart is universally wicked. Genesis 6:5 states, “The Lord saw how great man’s wickedness on the earth had become, and that every inclination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil all the time” (NIV). In the eighth chapter of Genesis, following the Great Deluge, God said in His heart, “Never again will I curse the ground because of man, even though every inclination of his heart is evil from childhood” (Genesis 8:21a, NIV). Wilcox (1985) states, “A corrupt heart as a universal fact, a race-wide straying from God, a persistent, continual wickedness can only be explained in one way—a race-wide inheritance of depravity, just as the scripture asserts, (p. 448). Paul clearly defines the universal impact of sin in Romans 5:15. “Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all men, because all sinned” (NIV). Wesley adds, “As by one man...Sin entered into the world”—Actual sin, and its consequence, a sinful nature, ‘And death’—with all its attendants. It entered into the world when it entered into being; for till then it did not exist” (p. 539). Sin is not simply presupposed by scripture alone, but by the reality of human choice revealed in actions; actions that betray his nature he so longingly seeks to hide. It is this same ability to choose that empowers him to participate in the act of redemption.

(2) Scripture proclaims that “all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God” (Romans 3:23, NIV). Earle (1989) adds, “Actually, the first verb is in the aorist tense, “sinned,” and the second is in the present tense, “are falling short.” Not only is it true that all have sinned in the past; it is also true that all (apart from the grace of God) fall short, here and now, of God’s glory as He wishes it to be manifested to them and through them” (p. 153). This does not eliminate the element of choice, suggesting that man sins without choice or that he incapable of choosing to do good as a result. A boy standing on a railroad track with a train approaching in the distance may choose to do something good, like share a piece of candy with his friend. The approaching train may not deter the boy from doing something good, but the good deed does not remove the pressing danger. The good and the danger intersect in the same life, but unless the boy is remove from the tracks, unless there is a saving force, danger will prevail. The statement “all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God” does not preclude the possibility of good being realized within a life.

(3) There is a universal need for regeneration. Wilcox (1985) again iterates that “[t]he ground of this necessity lies in a native quality, of our nature” (p. 448). In John 3, Jesus confounds the wisdom of the Pharisee Nicodemus when states that a person must be born again. As Jesus unravels the meaning in this statement, it becomes clear that he is speaking of a regenerative process that brings to life a dead inner being and not a rebirth of the physical being. Kenneth Kinghorn, as cited by Carter (1983), states, “There is no precise biblical definition of sin. The Bible is concerned more with the remedy for sin than with a definition of sin” (p.237).

(4) Actual sin is universal. By actual, it means not inherited but what is committed by the individual as a result of present depravity. Wilcox (1985) adds, “No race, no tribe, no family of men have ever appeared in any generation of the world’s history, who have not been sinful” (p. 449). Sin is the universal source resulting in the depravity of the human race as a whole. Wilcox (1985) goes on to add that man is totally depraved. “By doing this [defining depravity] we do not mean: (1) that every man is as bad as he can be; or (2) that there is no good in any man; or (3) that all are equally sinful; or (4) that each is given to the commission of all sins; or (5) that there has not been, or are not, good men” (p. 449). Simply stated, man, in his deprived state, is capable of sinning, and, without the redeeming work of Christ, will remain in an eternal state of sin.

(5) For mankind there is a universal tendency to sin. This tendency is not a suggestion that all are guilty of the same sins, but that all humans share the same tendency to commit actual sin. Simply illustrated, an acorn planted in Indiana will produce the same tree if the exact same acorn were to be planted in Yorkshire, England. The environment in which the tree grows may impact the tree differently, causing it to develop in different ways, but the end result is still an oak tree. The same seed of depravity is evident in every individual, though it may be revealed in different ways.

It is very clear that there is a common thought about depravity among evangelicals. The question is how does this effect their view of leadership? Does it make it easier to embrace a Theory X rather than a Theory Y view?

McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y

McGregor’s postulation of Theory X and Theory Y has been examined extensively in the fields of leadership, management and organizational behavior. What we want to present here are descriptions of the elements directly from McGregor’s The Human Side of Enterprise (1960). Here is his characterization of leaders who operate within Theory X concerning how they view those they lead:
1. The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.

2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.

3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above all.

In the following chart, the first column separates these ideas into single elements. The second column then uses single words to characterize the thought that comes to mind when the description is heard.

| 1. Have an inherent dislike of work | Lazy |
| 2. Will avoid work if they can. | Deceitful |
| 3. Must be coerced, controlled, directed, and/or threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives | Rebellious |
| 4. Prefer to be directed | Immature |
| 5. Wish to avoid responsibility | Irresponsible |
| 6. Have relatively little ambition | Apathetic |
| 7. Want security above all | Selfish |

As the reader reflects back on what was summarized in the doctrinal discussion of human depravity, the reader can start to see why someone holding that view of human depravity might also be drawn to Theory X thinking about workers.

But one must take another look at McGregor’s Theory Y. Once again start first with the description directly from McGregor’s The Human Side of Enterprise (1960). Here is his characterization of leaders who operate within Theory Y concerning how they view those they lead:

1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.

2. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.

3. Commitment to objective is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.

4. The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility.

5. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.

6. Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized.

At first glance one might be tempted to apply Calvin’s observations that this is an attempt to explain away this fatal disease [human depravity]; for in their discussions they reduce it to little more than excess of bodily appetite and lust. Of that blindness and vanity of intellect, whence unbelief and superstition proceed, of inward depravity of soul, of pride, ambition, stubbornness, and other secret sources of evil, they say not a word.

After considering this, the temptation is to dispose with Theory Y and return to Theory X thinking. Before doing this, however, one must take a closer look at Theory Y. In this next chart, the first column identifies seven single elements (matching the Theory X chart). The second column relates the element to a specific kind of potentiality in people.
1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest. | Work potentiality

2. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. | Motivational potentiality

3. People will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which they are committed. | Purpose potentiality

4. Commitment to objective is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. | Consequential potentiality

5. The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility. | Servanthood potentiality

6. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population. | Giftedness potentiality

7. Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized. | Human potentiality

The key here is the word potentiality. If you read all of McGregor's discussion in *The Human Side of Enterprise*, your really get a sense that potential is what he is talking about. He is not saying that workers are already this way in all situations—whether they be Theory X or Theory Y situations. Instead, he is saying that deep within the human soul the potential to be Theory Y workers resides. His challenge is to become Theory Y leaders and liberate the Theory Y qualities in the workforce.

The evangelical might argue that such potentiality only exists after a salvation experience. Therefore, at best Theory Y only works with saved Christians. The authors would contend that a biblical understanding does not support such a position. The authors believe there are number of supporting evidences for this in scripture, but will focus on just one—Romans 5:6-8:

You see, at just the right time, when we were still powerless, Christ died for the ungodly. Very rarely will anyone die for a righteous man, though for a good man someone might possibly dare to die. But God demonstrates his own love for us in this: While we were still sinners, Christ died for us.

It is the authors’ contention that the message of salvation, so zealously championed by evangelicals, IS a message of potentiality and restoration. It is a plan put into place based on two clear realities:

1. The absolute right, power and willingness of God to save humanity

2. The belief in God that the image of God in which humanity was originally created retained enough of that potential to be saved and restorable.

Now neither of the authors is going to try to convince the readers that McGregor’s true intent in Theory Y was to undergird management and leadership with the message of salvation. McGregor was a humanistic psychologist. But as the apostle James said in verse 17 of the first chapter in his epistle, “Every good and perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of the heavenly lights.”

If, then, Theory Y is primarily a paradigm of potentiality and restoration, challenging the leader to become the liberator of potential and the restorer of human promise, then it would seem that it is the perfect basis for servant leadership and coincides precisely with Jesus’ mandate to lead in this manner as outlined on the following page. Jesus set before us two paradigm choices, and he contrasted each of these choices in three components: 1) How do we view the position? 2) How do we use the position? And 3) What do we expect in return for our leadership? The contrast is very dramatic and clear. What we do with it is not so much a need to understand it more as it is a need to make a choice.
This paper closes with the following: Theory X may resemble the depraved condition of humanity because of the Fall, but Theory Y certainly resembles the potential for human kind based on the good news of Jesus (that’s the meaning of the word evangelical) central to the New Testament, and it better resembles the mandate for leadership given to us by Jesus. The authors contend then that it is time for evangelical leaders to move on from what Laub characterized as Paternalistic or what Millard characterizes as Patronizing leadership and fully embrace Servant Leadership as the only true leadership paradigm for Christians.
A SERVANT-MINDED PARADIGM FOR LEADERSHIP

“The kings and rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them and then call themselves Benefactors. But you are not to be like that. Instead, the greatest among you should be like the youngest. Whoever would be your ruler should be your servant. And whoever would be first should be a slave of all.” - Jesus of Nazareth, c. 30 AD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Original Greek Meaning</th>
<th>Leadership Manifestation</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Original Greek Meaning</th>
<th>Leadership Manifestation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITION FOCUS</td>
<td>lord it over</td>
<td>lord and master of everything</td>
<td>self-exalting position adopted that considers the leader as most important and entitled to singular power and control over the led</td>
<td>youngest</td>
<td>least honorable position in a firstborn/birthright-oriented society</td>
<td>selfless position adopted that considers the frontline led as the most important and seeks to empower them in their efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION FOCUS</td>
<td>exercise authority</td>
<td>tyrannize</td>
<td>self-serving actions taken that exploit the position to obtain the desires of the leader regardless of the needs and desires of the organization or those led</td>
<td>servant</td>
<td>actions expected to meet the needs and desires of those served with precedence over personal needs or desires</td>
<td>selfless actions taken that fulfill the position by meeting the needs and desires of those led and the organization with precedence over personal needs or desires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPECTATIONS FOCUS</td>
<td>Benefactor</td>
<td>title of princes and other outstanding persons</td>
<td>self-centered expectations of recognition, title, dependence, honor and awe</td>
<td>slave</td>
<td>selfless position where nothing is expected in return for the services required and rendered</td>
<td>selfless expectations of what is best for those led and for the organization rather than what’s in it for the leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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