

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SYNOPSIS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

#### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

As indicated in Chapter One, the main aim of this study is:

- to provide a theological base for relational leadership as an integral part of missional leadership, and
- to provide leadership development insights to help Church leaders improve their relational skills in order to successfully manage change and lead congregations and organisations to be missional and relevant.

The theological base for relational leadership as an integral part of missional leadership was thoroughly discussed in Chapter Two and is summarised in this chapter.

To illustrate and summarise the importance of Relational Leadership, this study uses the historic drama of the largest passenger steamship of its time, the *Titanic* and the story of the guided-missile destroyer, *USS Benfold* for the synopsis to give insights comparing the two leadership styles found there. Documentary videos produced by Discovery Channel, National Geographic and other documents were used to ensure a factual account of what happened. Researchers on the *Titanic* include: filmmaker, James Cameron, National Geographic Explorer-in-residence who completed 33 dives to the wreck, historians, naval architects and explorers who spent up to 40 years

investigating this ship and the tragic event. The story of the *USS Benfold* is mainly told by books, documents and websites about the warship and the commander of the *Benfold* from 1997 to 1999, Captain D. Michael Abrashoff.

## 5.2 TWO SHIPS, TWO LEADERS, TWO ENDINGS

**The question that comes to mind: Did hierarchical leadership sink the Titanic while relational leadership saved the Benfold?**

### 5.2.1 The *Titanic* – Atlantic Ocean, 1912

With the 100th anniversary of one of the most familiar and greatest stories of modern times, *THE TITANIC DISASTER*, historians are still arguing about what could or should have been done to prevent the sinking of the "unsinkable" *Titanic* and the drowning of more than fifteen hundred passengers and crew. Recent investigators are found to be less interested in the ship itself and focus more on the people who were aboard the *Titanic* on that fatal maiden voyage to New York (MacDonald 2012). The lack of good leadership surfaces more and more when the event is brought up in discussions.

On Wednesday the 10th of April 1912 the *Titanic* left Southampton Harbour for New York. At the time of its construction it was the biggest ship ever built, being almost 270 meters long, 20 stories high and weighing over 46,000 tons. Mechanically the ship was state of the art with 29 boilers and over 6,000 tons of coal filled the coal bunkers to fuel the 159 furnaces. It was built with 16 watertight compartments and would stay afloat if any two of the compartments were flooded, or even the first four compartments. According to its builders, even in the worst possible accident at sea the ship could not be inundated.

At 23:40 on the bitterly cold night of Sunday, the 14th of April 1912, Lookout Frederick Fleet, high in the crow's nest of the White Star Liner *Titanic*, clanged the warning bell thrice, picked up the phone to the bridge and the following conversation followed:

“What did you see?”

“Iceberg right ahead.”

“Thank you.”

Less than three hours later, the ocean liner sank to the bottom of the freezing North Atlantic. Of the 2,223 people on board, only 703 survived. The *Titanic* sideswiped an iceberg and disappeared under the water in an indescribable 2 hours and 40 minutes. It now lies 644 km off the coast of Newfoundland and 4 km beneath the surface of the ocean.

### **5.2.1.1 The Leaders**

#### **A. The Ship Owner**

Bruce Ismay was the managing director of the White Star Liner which built the *Titanic*. In a testimony before a congressional committee who investigated the whole ordeal, he identified himself as the ship-owner.

On the day of the disaster, Bruce Ismay walked the first class deck of the ship engaging in conversation with fellow passengers. In his pocket was a "wire" (telegram) passed on to him by the ship's Captain. It was from the Greek steamer “Athenai” reporting icebergs and a large quantity of field ice which they sailed passed the same day in latitude 41.51 N, longitude 49.52 W. This was directly in the direction the *Titanic* was heading.

According to witnesses, Ismay enjoyed showing the wire to others, because - as one witness later testified - "Mr. Ismay's manner was that of one in authority and the owner of the ship and what he said was law" (MacDonald 2012).

Ismay told Captain Edward J. Smith not to lower the speed or change course, and that it would be a fine achievement to arrive in New York one day earlier than expected. This early arrival would be a dramatic conclusion, firstly, to Captain Smith's career as this voyage was to be his last command; secondly, to the *Titanic's* maiden voyage; and thirdly, it would look fantastic on the resume of the White Star Liners.

## **B. The Ship's Captain**

Edward J. Smith was the most experienced and highest paid Sea Captain in the world. In Captain Smith's career this voyage was to be his final command as he planned going into retirement when reaching New York. Ironically, this voyage was to be his very last trip.

Ismay told Captain Smith to finish the voyage in record time, and the captain gave the order to light the last two boilers so the ship would go faster in order to gain even more speed. No extra Lookouts were ordered in spite of all the iceberg warnings. Consequently, in the middle of that moonless night, the *Titanic* was racing at 22 knots through a known ice field with no increase in trouble-spotting abilities (Davis 2012).

Captain Smith was ultimately the responsible person with all the necessary experience needed to head the *Titanic* and sail the passengers and crew safely to New York. He was well aware of the icebergs which lay ahead of them

because he had heard one warning after the other from passing ships that day. Customary he knew, as night began to fall, captains would choose to drop the ship's anchors and remain in one place until dawn. But stopping was not a choice Smith was willing to make. Rather, he set a course ten miles south of the normal shipping lanes and, throughout the evening, maintained a speed of 22 knots, just a knot or two lower than the *Titanic's* top speed capability.

Why did Smith choose to do this? Perhaps it had to do with his confidence in his own experience, in the perceived "unsinkability" of this new ship, and the notoriety that might come to him if the *Titanic*, under his command, set a new trans-ocean speed record (MacDonald 2012).

Known to insist doing things his way in the past, Smith had a couple of near misses when he refused the assistance of tug boats helping him enter New York Harbour which caused some minor damages to vessels. "He had been fortunate, he got away with things" (Louden-Brown 2001). On the night of the 14<sup>th</sup> of April, he received several warnings that icebergs were spotted exactly where the *Titanic* was headed. He should have slowed down but the Press would be in the harbour at the advertised time of arrival and Smith commanded to keep on going at 22 knots while he went to sleep.

Many people today do not see Captain Smith as a hero on that dark night, but rather as the architect of the disaster because of his ineffectual management of a very dangerous situation. Smith gave orders down the ranks knowing that no one would dare doing something else but obeying his ruthless and dangerous command, and went to his cabin. In the Captains absence, First Officer William Murdoch had to make the decisions on the bridge: he turned the *Titanic* and helped launch lifeboats to get the passengers off the ship. Where was the Captain? The whole command structure fell apart.

At 24:05 the captain learnt the full extent of the damage and with five of the compartments taking in water, Smith knew that the ship was going to sink. After the collision with the iceberg, poor judgement, hesitancy, and lack of alignment amongst the officers of the *Titanic*, resulted in a lethal combination of inaction and confusion on the ship. "In the end, it was neither weak strategy, nor weak structure, nor weak technology that caused the *Titanic* to hit an iceberg and fifteen hundred people to die; it was weak leadership" (Davis 2012).

What might have happened if the leaders weren't over engaged in the idea of breaking the speed record over that distance, instead of focussing on the needs and safety of the passengers and crew? Is Davis correct? She said that the leaders on the ship could "neither make good decisions nor mobilise their crew and passengers effectively", and it is thus "doubtful whether a larger rudder or enough lifeboats for all, would have made much difference to the outcome" (Davis 2012).

### **5.2.2 The USS BENFOLD - United States Navy 1997 -1999**

The next story is not as well known as that of the *Titanic*, but it's a story of a Commander who "turned the ship around" with Relational Leadership. On June the 20<sup>th</sup> 1997, he took command of the guided-missile destroyer, the *USS Benfold* and watched appalled while the 310 men and women of the crew cheered raucously as his predecessor left the ship. It was suddenly clear to him that most of the problems on the *Benfold*, like low morale, terrible combat readiness ratings and low promotion rates, started at the top (Abrashoff 2009:Kindle 27-29). This story is not as dramatic as the first, but comparing these two leaders will show how Relational Leadership empowered and changed people to perform at their very best and achieve their goals, even though the story of the USS Benfold played out in the United States Navy which

maintains a very strict hierarchical order. Insights will be taken from these examples that confirm the Relational Leadership definition presented by this study.

At the age of 36, Michael Abrashoff was selected to become Commander of the *USS Benfold* (an Arleigh Burke class destroyer in the United States Navy). At the time, he was the most junior commanding officer in the Pacific Fleet and the challenges were staggering with exceptionally low morale and an unacceptable high turnover. Few thought that this ship could improve, but this Captain only became more determined and committed to make a success of his mission.

Abrashoff continued to see his mission as nothing less than the re-orientation of a famously rigid 200-year-old hierarchy. His aim: to focus on "purpose" rather than "chain of command". He reasoned that when you shift your "organising principle" from obedience to performance, the highest boss might no longer be the guy with the most stripes, but the sailor who does the work. "There's nothing magical about it," he said from his stateroom on the *Benfold*. The solution was a system of beliefs which he called "GrassRoots Leadership". This is a process of replacing command and control with commitment and cohesion, by engaging the hearts, minds, and loyalties of workers - a belief that Abrashoff achieved with conviction and humility.

Soon after arriving at this command, he realised that the young folks on this ship were smart and talented and that his job was to listen aggressively - to pick up on all the ideas that they had on improving the operating system (Abrashoff 2002:43). "The most important thing that a captain can do is to see the ship from the eyes of the crew", he said (Labarre 1999). This meant interviewing every single person on the ship, from the most senior officer to the lowest recruit. It was an experience that began to generate invaluable ideas, often from unexpected sources.

I didn't know where I was headed when I started the interviews; I just knew I was desperate to set a different tone. I started with very basic questions: their names; where they were from; their marital status. Did they have children? If so, what were their names? Then I asked about the *Benfold*: What did they like most? Least? What would they change if they could?

I tried to establish a personal relationship with each crew member. I wanted to link our goals so that they would see my priority of improving the *Benfold* as an opportunity for them to apply their talents and give their jobs a real purpose (Abrashoff 2002:45).

Something happened in me as result of those interviews. I came to respect my crew enormously. No longer were they nameless bodies at which I barked orders. I realised that they were just like me: They had hopes, dreams, loved ones, and they wanted to believe that what they were doing, was important. And they wanted to be treated with respect (Abrashoff 2002:46).

The reaction of the crew to captain Abrashoff's interest in them, were unmistakably seen in the *Benfold's* performance which suddenly set new standards. For the next two years, the ship's "readiness indicators" have featured the lowest count of "mission degrading" equipment failures and the highest gunnery score in the Pacific fleet. The crew also completed the Navy's predeployment training cycle in record time. That process normally required 22 days in port and 30 days under way. The crew of the *Benfold's* achievement: 5 days in port and 14 days under way to complete the cycle.

Yet the most compelling sign of Abrashoff's success might be the smooth interaction that developed amongst the ship's company. The *Benfold's*

experienced department heads, its divisional officers (most of them fresh out of the naval academy or ROTC), and its enlisted sailors, all showed a deep appreciation of the ship's relaxed discipline, its creativity, and its pride in performance. Commander Abrashoff made the *USS Benfold* a working example of Relational Leadership.

The *USS Benfold* became regarded as the finest ship in the Pacific Fleet, winning the prestigious Spokane Trophy for having the highest degree of combat readiness. "My crew became so possessive that they busted their butts to make *Benfold* the best ship in the entire U.S. Navy. Given where they started, it was miracle enough that they made her - by official citation - the finest ship in the Pacific Fleet" (Abrashoff 2004:Kindle 289-91).

Abrashoff's (2002:32-186) advise to future leaders are typically relational:

- Lead by example
- Listen aggressively
- Communicate purpose and meaning
- Create a climate of trust
- Look for results, not salutes
- Generate unity
- Improve your people's quality of life

**TABLE 5.1 Comparing the two leadership styles of the above.**

<b>TITANIC</b> <b>Hierarchical Top-Down Leadership</b>	<b>BENFOLD</b> <b>Relational Leadership</b>
<p>The one in authority and the owner of the ship ...</p>	<p>Re-orientation of a famously rigid 200-year-old hierarchy. His aim: to focus on purpose rather than on chain of command.</p>
<p>Captain and owner in command</p>	<p>Highest boss might no longer be the guy with the most stripes, but the sailor who does the work</p>
<p>Others were not taken into consideration</p>	<p>He realised that the young folks on this ship are smart and talented</p>
<p>In a hierarchical structure the views and input of the subordinates are not asked for</p>	<p>"And I realised that my job was to listen aggressively - to pick up all of the ideas that they had for improving how we operate"</p>
<p>The Captain and owner worked towards their goals and the notoriety that might come to them if the <i>Titanic</i>, under their command, set a new trans-ocean speed record</p>	<p>The most important thing that a captain can do is to see the ship from the eyes of the crew</p>
<p>No extra Lookouts were ordered to watch out for icebergs</p>	<p>"I consider it my job to improve my little 300-person piece of society"</p>
<p>Ismay's manner was that of one in authority and the owner of the ship and what he said was law</p>	<p>A process of replacing command and control with commitment and cohesion</p>



<p>No sign of any relationship with crew</p>	<p>Engaging the hearts, minds, and loyalties of workers</p>
<p>Known to insist doing things his way, he had had a couple of near misses when he refused the assistance of tug boats helping him to enter New York Harbour and causing some minor damage to vessels</p>	<p>"I wanted to link our goals, so that they would see my priority of improving <i>Benfold</i> as an opportunity for them to apply their talents and give their jobs a real purpose"</p>
<p>Inaction and confusion on the ship.</p>	<p>Smooth interaction now exists among the ship's company.</p>
<p><u>All about the Captain and organisation.</u>  This early arrival would have been a dramatic conclusion, firstly, to Captain Smith's career; this voyage was to be his last command, secondly, to the <i>Titanic's</i> maiden voyage, and thirdly, it would look fantastic on the resume of the White Star Liners.</p>	<p><u>All about the crew.</u>  "My crew became so possessive that they busted their butts to make <i>Benfold</i> the best ship in the entire U.S. Navy"</p>
<p>Smith gave orders down the ranks knowing that no one would dare do something else but obeying his ruthless and dangerous command, and then went to his cabin</p>	<p>The reaction of the crew to Captain Abrashoff's interest in them, were unmistakably seen in the <i>Benfold's</i> performance which suddenly set new standards</p>
<p>Less than three hours later, the ocean liner sank to the bottom of the freezing North Atlantic</p>	<p>The <i>USS Benfold</i> became regarded as the finest ship in the Pacific Fleet</p>

Taking the above examples of the *Titanic* and the *Benfold* into consideration, the *Titanic* is a clear example of a leader who views the matter more important than the man, which is in total contradiction with the *missio Dei* in view of this dissertation's study of Missionalty and Relational Leadership.

***Hierarchical leadership sank the Titanic, and Relational Leadership saved the USS Benfold.***

This dissertation is not about ships, it is about God's Church; about Relational Leadership helping the Church to be missionally more effective and successful. The researcher therefore wants to make the emphatic statement: Relational leadership unleashes the power and potential of the individual and the organisation, through relationships and should be valued and endeared to develop and expand the Missional Church's understanding of a more biblical based model of leadership and thus assist the Church to change to the missional character of God.

### **5.3 SUMMARY AND INSIGHTS GAINED THROUGH THIS STUDY**

#### **5.3.1 The theological base for relational leadership as an integral part of missional ecclesiology**

1. God's revelation to us is an illumination of the actual being of God. God appears to us as a Trinity and we observe God as a Trinitarian God.

2. With the focus of this research on relationships, it is important to discuss the Trinitarian relationship, as the community of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit becomes the prototype of the human community.
3. In the Trinity there exists an eternal, complementary, and reciprocal interchange of divine life, divine love, and divine fellowship.
4. The Church accepts Jesus as God's self-revealing gift to His people through the eyes of the Bible which not only tells the story about God's love and relationship with His creation but also reveals the Trinity to the world.
5. The only way to know God is through God's self-revelation. God's self-revelation deals by definition with God's love relationship with his creation (the so-called economic Trinity) and inevitably exposes the character and who God is.
6. "God is love" surely is missional but first of all it is a relational characteristic of the Trinity, within the Trinity and from the Trinity to the creation. Love is firstly a relational issue from which His missionality evolves. This love-relationship with the world belongs to His eternal being.
7. Missionality is fuelled by nurturing relationships, love-driven by the Holy Spirit from the heart of God. God loved the world enough to send His Son on a mission to build a redemptive relationship with His creation.
8. The Church, as a Christian community is a missional community that lives in communion with the Triune God that is constantly reaching out to a lost human world with a human understanding of being Father, Son and Spirit to this world.
9. Mission cannot be successful without building relationships with those not living within Christianity or even opposing Christianity.

10. Leadership and the associated relations are thus conceived from the Trinity – the relationship between the persons in the Holy Trinity (the use of "persons" is used in the human frame of reference, trying to describe an undefinable God).
11. The loving relationship shared amongst the Persons of the Trinity and the Trinitarian relationship with the world, offers a model for human relationships and leadership.
12. The fundamental love and relationship coming from the Father is the inspiration of the Church to reach out to the world. "God so loved the world" is followed by the missional act of giving, caring, touching and saving. The Church is the extension of "God so loved the world" to the lost.
13. Leadership grounded in Christ as Messiah is kenotic -a life and ministry filled with sacrificial service. Comprehending something of the cross and resurrection, helps leadership cope with the paradoxes and ambiguities of the postmodern world.
14. While prayerfully discerning the will and command of God for the present context, the Church must also distinguish the applicability and relevance of historical events and writings on the current life drama.
15. To empower the Church to live a God-incarnated life on earth, the Holy Spirit was sent to comfort, teach, remind and guide the Church. The Holy Spirit leads by empowering and seen in context of a teacher and comforter, suggests an on-going relational leadership.
16. As the Triune God exists in relationship, it is impossible to think about church leadership without thinking about relationships.
17. With the Church being a relational and missional community, there is no doubt that the leadership must have the same focus. The

understanding of missional leadership must be rooted in the understanding of the Trinity.

18. Seeing God as the King of kings and Leader amongst leaders, the Trinity sets the example for leadership, and this especially in his Church. The equality, missionality and relationality sets the example and model on which the Church should function. The loving relationship shared amongst the Persons of the Trinity and the Trinitarian relationship with the world, offers a model for human relationships and leadership.
19. The essence and core of relational leadership that functions within God-given relationships and not with hierarchical authority.

### **5.3.2 Leadership**

1. The Classical leadership paradigm has its origins traced to the 1970s.
2. The Transactional paradigm rose as a result of the demand for change and had a short lifespan till the mid 1980's.
3. Visionary leadership emerged with an emphasis on follower commitment to a vision of the future, till about 2000.
4. Organic leadership developed because of a distributed, fast-moving, global environment. The focus is on the group, who share the sense-making and responsibility.
5. It is important that each person should discover the importance of the specific gifts bestowed on him/her by God, to be a leader in the Church in a way that God intended.

6. In the context of missional leadership and especially moving towards relational leadership as seen in the Trinitarian paradigm, it is important to realise that people with a dictatorial-, self-serving- and managerial inclination can not be missional leaders.
7. It is important for the Church to distinguish between the skills and characteristics of a manager and a leader. This can help the Church to return to God's *missio Dei* and Relational Leadership as modelled in the Trinity and demonstrated through Jesus on earth.
8. The role of a leader is never to organise people, but to help them through the processes of change in their personal lives, the workplace and the world, whilst a manager focuses on tasks and results. In an organisation, both skills are needed, but the Church, the people of God, needs Relational Leaders.

### **5.3.2.1 Relational Leadership**

1. Relational leadership is being attuned to and involved in the intricate web of inter- and intra-relationships that exist within an organisation.
2. Relational leadership seen from an ecclesiastical viewpoint is built on the loving relationship within the Trinity shared with the world: from the God of love through Jesus Christ the son, by the Holy Spirit, touching and changing the world in love.
3. Relational Leadership refers to a leadership model that focuses on creating and establishing positive and effective relationships within an organisation and to empower people to reach their true potential.

The result: satisfied people with good self-esteem, proud workers and job satisfaction.

4. The relational behaviour of the leader is the extent to which the leader engages in relational communication with the individual or group. This includes activities such as listening, providing encouragement and coaching.
5. The reality of the relational world we live in demands a leadership strengthened with relationships.
6. Relational intelligence (RI) is the ability to learn, understand, and comprehend knowledge as it relates to interpersonal dynamics.
7. Relational intelligent leaders move away from a positional mind-set to a mind-set of relationality; if they wish to expand their influence, leaders must make sure that a good foundation of RI is built.
8. It is highly possible that there is a direct connection between the success of a missional community or organisation and the RI of its leadership.
9. Pursuing RI is a discovery process that requires attention, focus, and intentionality if leaders desire to grow in it.
10. To improve in this arena, leaders must develop the ability to recognise new dimensions of interpersonal dynamics and become smarter in their responses and applications of RI with others.
11. The five Pillars of the Relational Leadership Theory:
  - Leadership is a Function
  - Leadership is Contextual
  - Leadership is Shared and interdependent

- Leadership is a relationship
- Leadership is Balance

12. The relational leader is a person who is doing all he/she can to be as competent in relationships as possible.

13. Eldership is Relational Leadership

14. Relational consciousness is the power behind successful missionality and what moves the Church beyond the “task” of evangelism.

15. Church is God’s people being in-dwelted by the Holy Spirit within a relational life; it is a person, family or families within a faith community who share God’s grace in an informal leadership relationship, each functioning in their specific gifts and anointing as a part of the body of Christ in the great *missio Dei* of God.

#### **5.4 THE RESEARCH QUESTION**

Can relational leadership develop and expand the Missional Church’s understanding of leadership and assist it to be missional?

The researcher’s submission is that relational leadership will develop and expand the Missional Church’s understanding of a more biblical based model of leadership and thus assist the Church to advance to maturity in missions.

If the uncompromised relationships as modelled in the One-ness of God are displayed and nurtured in God’s church – no one higher in rank than the other, God’s intention of reaching the world with His love, will be visible to the world (John 13:35). God loved the world so much that He sent His Son to build a

redemptive relationship with His creation. Mission cannot be successful without building relationships with those not living within Christianity or even opposing Christianity, for God expressed His love through Jesus on the cross to the whole world even “while we were God’s enemies” (Romans 5:10). Missionalism is fuelled by embracing love-driven relationships through the Holy Spirit.

## **5.5 SHORTCOMINGS AND LIMITATIONS**

The following shortcomings are worth mentioning:

Writing this dissertation in English was not easy as English is my second language. By choosing not to write in my home language, the whole process was slowed down. I am very glad I did it though, as it makes the contents available to so many more students and other readers. I also learnt a lot by doing so.

The researcher would have liked to interview more leadership groups but was hamstrung by the red tape of congregations and assemblies with regard to the availability of their leadership for focus group sessions.

With Relational Leadership and Relational Intelligence being relatively new topics, there are only a few books and articles available on this subject.

## **5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

The purpose of this study was to provide leadership and relational development insights to encourage and help the Church to re-think and improve their

relational skills in the community they find themselves in and to understand the importance of being missional, relational and therefore, relevant.

1. Peer assessments would be welcomed either personally or through positive critique in further research or written articles.
2. The central issues raised in this study should be taken to relevant leadership bodies of the different denominations in order to make the Church aware of the paradigm change and the effects on practical church life.
3. It is the researcher's hope that the different churches and congregations would be encouraged to invest time and attention to improve the relational intelligence of pastoral leaders and other believers.
4. The researcher hopes and desires that in time the church will seek the specific guidance of the Holy Spirit in connection with relational leadership so that the Church can really be missional in their life and work.

## **5.7 CONCLUDING REMARKS**

This study acknowledges that mission does not happen in a vacuum; people are involved. Firstly it is God's mission, expressed through the life of the Trinity. Missions is all about relationships; relationships within the Trinity, the Trinitarian relationship with the world, the world's relationship with the Trinity, the relationship within the Church and the relationship of the Church with the world. This study is a study of the Trinitarian relationship and how the Father, Son and Holy Spirit redeemed and healed the broken relationship between

humanity and God (Chapter Two); it also focuses on the Church of Jesus Christ being sent out to live this restored relationship in order to call all people to be reconciled and united with God.

The discussion of the Trinity, especially a relational Trinity, reveals the core understanding of the researcher's viewpoint of missional ecclesiology and leadership. The Triune God of love is a relational and missional God. As a result of the total “oneness” of God, there is no hierarchical order in the Godhead and as such the Church should operate with the Trinity as model and example.

As planned, this study provides leadership and relational development insights to encourage and help the Church to re-think and improve their relational skills in order to successfully change and lead congregations and organisations to be missional, relational and relevant. It puts together the researcher's relational leadership theory described with examples and organisational structures of a relational leadership style.

Missionality is more than a project or task to accomplish, it is a relational lifestyle that will demonstrate the love of God towards His creation that will set the captives free, provide hope for the hopeless and discouraged, heal the sick, provide a home for the homeless and belonging for the lonely.

The researcher believes that a deepened understanding of leadership is built on relationships, and that the quality of these relationships, reflects the quality of leadership.

This dissertation presents a new Relational Leadership Theory and organisational structure. The researcher hopes that this leadership style will become the norm in congregations and organisations around the world.