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Introduction

In the summer of 2003 I received a Sabbatical Grant from the Louisville Institute, which allowed me to develop a theory of leadership rooted in the Decalogue. I perceive a general failure to appreciate the richness of these words, both inside and outside the church. More than a mere religious symbol or set of rules, the Decalogue can help leaders develop more creative, higher performing organizations.

People respond to the behavior of leaders. Leaders who have the courage to place their values in conversation with the Ten Commandments will discover a resource that will empower their own transformation, and the transformation of the people and organizations they lead.

After a brief look at how popular misunderstandings obscure the significance of the Commandments, I suggest how an appreciation of their Hebraic setting reveals opportunities for their application in organizations. Drawing on the insights of Martin Buber, John Macmurray and Daniel Elazar, I show how the Decalogue applies outside a religious setting. I conclude with discussion of a leadership typology based on what I call five Root Values that find expression in the Decalogue.

Certain obstacles prevent many from learning important lessons the Ten Commandments have to teach. People who cherish the Bible as a source of inspiration often visualize the Decalogue as two stone tablets. God’s Word carved in stone comes to represent moral traditions formed in a variety of settings remote from the rocky heights of Mt. Sinai.

Some find comfort in this reminder of God’s loving authority, but others feel at risk. They see the Decalogue as a symbol threatening individual freedoms. They fear
religionists who claim a supernatural justification for social institutions and norms. An appeal to sacred authority challenges the fundamental American value of the sacred individual.

This symbolic tug of war has recently moved into the courts. On March 2, 2005 the Supreme Court heard arguments related to a Commandments monument on the grounds of the state capitol in Texas and to displays of the Decalogue in two Kentucky courthouses. Justice Antonin Scalia described the Ten Commandments as "a symbol of the fact that government derives its authority from God."

"That seems to me an appropriate symbol to put on government grounds," he said. (New York Times, March 3, 2005)

But not everyone agrees.

On November 13, 2003 Alabama Chief Justice Roy Moore was himself removed from office for his refusal to remove a similar monument from the grounds of the Alabama Supreme Court. Of interest is Christopher Hitchens' commentary on the Moore debate posted on the Slate Magazine website, on August 27, 2003.

It's obviously too much to expect that a Bronze Age demagogue should have remembered to condemn drug abuse, drunken driving, or offenses against gender equality, or to demand prayer in the schools. Still, to have left rape and child abuse and genocide and slavery out of the account is to have been negligent to some degree, even by the lax standards of the time. . . . There are many more than 10 commandments in the Old Testament, and I live for the day when Americans are obliged to observe all of them, including the ox-goring and witch-burning ones.

Hitchens' unenthusiastic reading of the Decalogue reveals a common misunderstanding. People value or fear these words for their symbolic meaning. When they address the content of the Commandments, they treat them as laws or moral rules. Where conservative religionists embrace them as from out of the mouth of God, others reject them as laws that no longer apply. Lost is the genuine value of the Decalogue.

Covenant

Leadership at its best reflects a covenantal reality. Leaders lead within the context of relationships. Human identity itself is constituted by relationship. Persons enter fully into their humanity only in relationship with others. Understanding leaders enhance the performance of their organizations as they honor the dignity of the people they lead. Here one finds the relevance of the Ten Commandments for leadership.
Martin Buber was a Hasidic philosopher/theologian of the earlier part of the Twentieth Century whose treatment of dialogical encounter continues to have broad influence around the world. Covenant serves as the model of relationship in the Hebrew Scripture. Buber recognized the driving principle of community to be found in covenant keeping.

True community does not come into being because people have feelings for each other (though that is required too), but rather on two accounts: all of them have to stand in a living, reciprocal relationship to a single living center, and they have to stand in a living reciprocal relationship to one another. (Buber, I and Thou, p.94)

The “living center” to which Buber refers is of course God. What does it mean to be in relationship with God? How does my relationship with God inform my relationship with my neighbor? The Decalogue provides the first principles of covenant keeping. The Ten Commandments generate a social architecture that results in a community of a certain quality. (Paul Hanson, The People Called: The Growth of Community in the Bible. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986. Page 23.)

Consider the fundamental challenge of organizational development. How does one create structures to provide order, while increasing the generative capacity of the organization? Order serves justice. But creativity is a function of freedom.

In all social environments, freedom tends toward the concentration of power that puts justice at risk. In a free environment people of greater ability gain advantage over others. The weak acquiesce to the demands of the strong in exchange for security. The breakdown of equality results in a loss of justice.

As injustice grows, organizations become unsustainable. Loss of personal mutuality leads to interpersonal friction. This erodes creative capacity. The Hebrew Scripture tells story after story illustrating the challenge of managing the fragile polarity between justice and freedom.

How does a conscientious leader manage a complex system without stripping people of their creative initiative?

The Decalogue shapes personal and corporate values that inform the norms and behaviors of common life. A law or moral code is static. Because the Decalogue informs personal values, it generates flexibility in a dynamic system without the loss of essential structure.

As a guide to covenant keeping the Decalogue can inform a leader’s stewardship of such a self-regulating social system. How might it invite the creative contribution of people of unequal ability, but who share an equal dignity in pursuit of a common
purpose? Can an organization become a self-regulating system based on mutuality in relationship? Can individuals of unequal power learn to live and work together in a way that honors each?

**Taking the World Personally**

Much of the contemporary debate swirling around the Ten Commandments involves their association with religion in a secular society. But the Commandments may not be religious at all. Although they provide the foundation of the religion of ancient Israel, they also provide the foundation for its political and economic life as well. Compare the terse, minimalist style of the Decalogue to the liturgical instruction found in the book of Leviticus. The Commandments do not establish religious practices.

To appreciate the Decalogue one must get behind contemporary misunderstandings and hear them in their Hebraic context. John Macmurray was Professor of Moral Philosophy at the University of Edinburgh from 1944. While not addressing the Decalogue directly, Macmurray provides insight into why the Decalogue seems so remote.

Macmurray argued the contemporary West misrepresents the nature of human experience. Western culture has been shaped primarily by the modern philosophical tradition, which defines a human being as one who *thinks*. The self stands apart from the world. Critical objectivity gives a *thinker* the ability to understand and to control the thing known. In this tradition other people become objects to be apprehended by an independent mind.

Macmurray rejects the modern philosophical tradition. He argues a human being must be defined as one who *acts*. Deeds, not ideas, constitute the world of human experience. The aim is not to understand other people, but to share life with them.

When Macmurray rejected modern philosophy he turned to a fundamentally Hebraic conception of personhood. The whole person is constituted by and through relationships. The world of human experience is a personal world. Agents continually engage one another shaping the environments in which they live. Action in the world, not ideas in the mind, are the proper starting place to truly appreciate persons in relation.

Leaders know the importance of the personal dimension of leadership. Leadership involves honoring the subtleties of relationship. James MacGregor Burns makes this clear in his classic treatment of leadership.

> To control *things* – tools, mineral resources, money, energy – is an act of power, not leadership, for things have no motives. Power wielders may treat people as
One hears echoes of Martin Buber here. Buber characterizes the self as living in one of two modes of existence, I-It or I-Thou. In the I-It mode the self maintains objective distance from things. In the I-You mode the self encounters other selves. In the I-You relation the self sees the world through interaction with others. The only genuine knowledge of other people comes not through objective analysis, but through encounter, the I-Thou relation.

That most people today think of rationality as an intellectual quality suggests how deeply our culture is shaped by the modern philosophical tradition. This also explains why the Decalogue is so broadly misunderstood. The Commandments do not address Mind as an independent part of the human experience apart from Body. The Decalogue addresses behavior, action in the world, as determined by a certain intention to engage relationship with others. Each commandment assumes a relational context.

The Hebrew prophets did not understand rationality as an intellectual category. They spoke of wisdom over and against folly. Their interest was not the true and the false, but the right and the wrong. Hebraic faith emphasizes righteousness – right deeds, over orthodoxy – right thinking. Hebrew literature relates its lessons in a narrative form that enables the reader to observe people in action in relationship with others.

Macmurray brings forward this Hebraic perspective when he defines rationality as, “the capacity to act, and only in a secondary and derivative sense the capacity to think. . . .” (Persons in Relation, pg 26) Thinking serves a purpose beyond itself. Good thinking empowers right action.


Dante once wrote that “the hottest places in hell are reserved for those who, in a time of great moral crisis, maintain their neutrality.” Few leaders ever encounter moral crisis on a societal level. But they all are called upon every day to face hard realities, to cut through the conflicting currents and ambiguities and to stake out clear positions. And the people who succeed, the winners, are the ones who have edge. (Tichy and Cohen, pg 152)

“Edge” is the willingness to act. Action always involves interaction with others. To act alone, without reference to others — their feelings, their hopes, their dreams, their
fundamental needs and motives — is to act irrationally, without wisdom. The Decalogue helps leaders appreciate relationships. They establish behavioral norms by which people may encounter one another in a way that honors the dignity of each.

When allowed to inform the fundamental values of the leader, the Commandments prevent reduction of the personal other to an object that lacks self-determination. It safeguards the I-Thou relation. The Decalogue provides a school of leadership by which a person, through the application of the fundamental principles of covenant, learns wisdom.

**Personal Logic in Action**

Before turning finally to the Ten Commandments and the leadership typology it is helpful to review Macmurray’s treatment of personal logic.

Personal logic is for Macmurray a way of thinking about a personal world. This, not the world of the modern philosophical tradition. The personal world is the world we live in, a world shaped by people who live and work together every day. His treatment provides the key to building a leadership typology grounded in the Ten Commandments.

According to Macmurray there are three unique approaches to understanding the nature of reality. One he calls the Material World, a second, the Organic World, and a third, the Personal World. Each world operates differently and each has a corresponding logic, or way of grasping its essential nature.

The Material World functions mechanically. Entities are simple, atomistic, uncomplicated, unchanging, and whole. It is the world of rocks.

The Organic World functions dynamically. Unlike minerals, plants and animals change and grow. They consist of biological systems; they react to stimulus; they live in complex environmental systems and react with other organic beings as well as with the Material World. The Organic World is dynamic but without, of course, the freedom of choice.

Human beings exist in the Personal World. The Personal World involves autonomous individuals who live in mutual life giving relationships with others. Their individuality makes possible a communal inter-dependence which is necessary not only for their survival, but for the formation of their individual identities as well. Where the Organic Word is **reactive**, the Personal World is **intentional**.

Material logic emerged as philosophy strove to understand the Material World. This represents thought from the time of the pre-Socratic philosophers through the British Empirical School of the 18th century. Thus, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Adam Smith understood human nature in materialistic terms: as an atomistic, self-intereste,
and self-serving individual. Applied to the Personal World, the limits of material logic appear in how it discounts the importance of community.

In the 18th century a new logic began to emerge as interest turned from the nature of the Material World to the nature of organisms. Pioneers of an organic logic included Fichte and Hegel. But this new style of thinking comes to full flower in Charles Darwin in the field of biology and Karl Marx in his singular interpretation of economic history.

Organic logic describes how advanced states of being transcend earlier stages of development in the resolution of tension between an organic system and its environment. Unlike the Material World, which is unchanging, the Organic World is dynamic and reactive.

For Darwin, natural selection describes a change in species in reaction to changes in its environment. For Marx, economic class conflict leads to the development of economic history. The limits of organic logic when applied to the Personal World, however, appear in the reduction of personal initiative. In evolutionary processes, either biological or economic, the individual surrenders his or her personal identity to the collective consciousness (or identity) of the group, an idea rendered a policy of state by Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky.

Both material and organic logical fail when applied to understanding a Personal World. Personal logic describes people in relationship with others. It emerges in infancy and takes form in the process constituted by the infant’s dependency upon the mother.

Infant dependency leads to a psychological dynamic Macmurray calls “withdrawal and return.” It centers on the infant’s cry for help, and the parent’s delay in response. In the absence of the parent the infant withdraws into herself, experiences isolation and fears abandonment. Parental response restores fundamental trust. The infant returns from isolation and the self is constituted once again in relationship with the parent.

When the parent requires the child to do for herself, as must be done in the process of raising children, the child’s motivation may be positive (centered in love for the parent) or negative, (centered on fear of abandonment). (Persons in Relation, pg 95-101) As the infant matures this polarity between “love” and “fear” becomes the driving motive in human action. Macmurray defines love as heterocentric (other-centered), and fear as egocentric (self-centered). (Persons in Relation, pg 71)

Personal logic helps explain how leadership behavior influences organizational systems. The egocentric motivation intends security. This results in one of two modes of existence Macmurray calls, “Pragmatic” or “Contemplative.” In the “Pragmatic Mode” the self seeks security by controlling the external world. One becomes a dominator or tyrant. In the “Contemplative Mode” the self seeks security by withdrawing from the external world. One becomes a hermit who escapes into the interior world of the
imagination. Contrasted with these is the heterocentric (other-centered) motivation, which always intends community. Macmurray calls this the “Communal Mode.” *(Persons in Relation, pg 112)* Where the Pragmatic Mode seeks to dominate others, and the Contemplative Mode seeks to avoid others, the Communal Mode seeks healthy engagement with others.

Out of these three fundamental motives emerge “three types of disposition” Macmurray calls “modes of morality.” I believe these modes of morality describe three types of spirituality – when one defines spirituality to mean the relationship of the self to others. This forms the basis of my leadership typology. Thus, I identify three leadership spiritualities: of the Tyrant, of the Hermit, and of the Intentional Leader.

**Organizations: Hierarchical, Organic, and Covenantal**

Daniel Elazar was a political scientist at Temple University who spent much of his time working to understand the role the biblical notion of covenant plays in modern democracies. He describes three basic ways organizations and societies come into existence. These correspond remarkably well to Macmurray’s work.

According to Elazar society may be organized hierarchically, organically, or covenantally. *(Daniel Elazar, *The Covenant Tradition in Politics: Covenant & Polity in Biblical Israel* Vol. 1. Transaction Publishers. New Brunswick, 1998. pg. 35-36).* *(See TABLE 1.)* The hierarchical model is established through conquest and the concentration of power. The organic model involves the concentration of power as well, only taking place over time as power increasingly flows to elites in the absence of more intentional organizational structures. The covenantal model is established by mutual consent.

Macmurray’s three modes of morality (what I am calling three spiritualities) correspond to Elazar’s three types of organizations. The Tyrant (a pragmatic leadership spirituality) will tend to develop hierarchical organizations, even if the organization is as small as a three or four member task group. The Hermit (a contemplative leadership spirituality) will develop an organic organization as power flows to its “natural” place concentrating among those willing to take advantage of a leadership vacuum. An Intentional Leader (a communal leadership spirituality) will foster covenantal communities — organizations shaped by intentional design and the mutual consent of its members.

The modern corporation can manifest all of these organizational types as leaders make their mark on organizational culture. But a dominating style will prevail depending upon the norms and behaviors modeled by its senior leadership. A leader’s spirituality determines the type of organization he or she will develop. The leader as Tyrant, Hermit or Intentional Leader, by his or her behavior, establishes the norms to which everyone else in the organization will react or respond. The Decalogue guides the Intentional Leader into a covenantal leadership spirituality that helps him or her to
nurture healthy relationships with others and to establish organizational values, norms and behaviors that encourage others to enter into healthy relationships with one another.

Root Values

Many traditions have long identified the Decalogue as consisting of “two tablets.” The first has to do with one’s relationship to God, the second with one’s relationship to one’s neighbor. I place the two tablets of Commandments side by side. Each tablet corresponds to the other at the level of a value expressed. Five Root Values emerge out of each paired commandment. Here are five values oriented to two subjects: God and Neighbor. The value becomes one commandment when addressed to God, a different but related commandment when addressed to the Neighbor.

Remember Macmurray’s insight into the nature of the individual as one constituted as a person in relation. That the universe exists as the act of a personal Other who acts as the intentional agent of creation requires that that personal reality be addressed in personal terms. The Decalogue provides consistent principles of relation to both the Other who is God and the Other who is Neighbor. In the poetic language of Martin Buber: “Extended, the lines of relationships intersect in the eternal You.” (I and Thou, pg 123)

What then are the root values expressed in the Decalogue that inform a leadership style that contributes to the formation of healthy communities and higher functioning organizations? One simply asks, “What value captures the essence of the shared principle manifested in each pair of commandments?” (See TABLE 2.)

The first and sixth commandments have to do with the value of personal identity. To have another “god before God” is to deny God’s personhood, God’s relational character. It reduces God, at least within the scope of one’s own experience, to non-being. Obviously to take the life of one’s neighbor reduces the neighbor to non-being.

The second and seventh commandments have to do with the value of commitment. It defines a process of healthy interaction. The prophets commonly associate idolatry with adultery. Adultery violates mutually agreed upon expectations between covenant partners. It erodes the bond of trust, which serves as the only genuine link between personal agents who would share life together.

Commandments three and eight hold up the importance of personal boundaries. Taking the name of the Lord in vain fails to honor God’s autonomy. It attempts to access God’s power apart from relationship with God. In a similar way, stealing attempts to access the power of one’s neighbor outside of relationship with the neighbor. It fails to respect the neighbor’s personal authority.
The value expressed in the fourth and ninth commandment is more subtle. Sabbath keeping is both a call to community as well as a challenge to remember and to speak the truth about the nature of reality. The justification for Sabbath keeping in Exodus 20 centers on God's role in creation. In Deuteronomy 5, Sabbath justification centers on God's role in redeeming the Hebrew people from slavery in Egypt. In both instances, the Sabbath invites the community to perceive the world from the perspective of the creating, redeeming God. To bear false witness is to misrepresent the human experience. The truth is made known as each bears witness to what they perceive. Thus, the common value shared between each commandment is an orientation to the Truth that is communal in nature and explored in the dialogue with others.

The value expressed in the fifth and tenth commandment is also rather subtle. To honor mother and father is to honor the bearers of tradition, the history of the family and the community. It expresses a certain orientation to the past. Covetousness also expresses a certain orientation to the past, one's personal past. It honors the parent of the present moment, if you will. Longing or dissatisfaction over one's present condition seeks in someone else's experience what one wishes for one's self. This dishonors one's personal history. It refuses to embrace and to learn from the past, preferring to nurture resentment for not having had the opportunity to be possessed of the experience of another. The common value shared here is an appreciation for the past as a source of wisdom.

How then do these five Root Values inform a leadership spirituality? (See TABLE 3.)

The first Root Value has to do with people. How one relates to others shapes the kind of leader one becomes. When leaders use people to serve material ends, they fail to appreciate that each person comes with dreams, goals, and responsibilities that lie beyond their work. How leaders relate to people as people becomes a habit that shapes their leadership style.

Applying Macmurray's categories, the Pragmatic Spirituality seeks security by controlling the external world. A Tyrant will tend to use people as means to ends.

The Contemplative Spirituality seeks security by escaping to an internal world, the world of ideas. A Hermit will tend to overlook the unique value each person brings to a project.

The Covenantal leadership spirituality seeks to establish relationships of mutuality with others. The Intentional Leader engages each person and nurtures relationships of genuine respect.

The second Root Value has to do with process. Leaders call people to action. They invite shared participation in common projects. Leaders cannot force anyone to do anything. They can only invite commitment. The Tyrant will tend to influence others
through intimidation or through enforcement of policy. The Hermit will tend to influence others passively. This type of leader relies heavily on the motive force of institutional inertia. “We have always done it this way.” An Intentional Leader will invite commitment.

The third Root Value has to do with partnering. Leaders connect with others in ways that respect their personal autonomy. The Tyrant will control others and overrun personal boundaries. This leadership type may have expectations that other people be a certain way and express disapproval when they fail to fulfill that expectation. The Hermit will either avoid others or tend to merge with others in a co-dependent fashion. Such a leader may not genuinely connect with people at all. He or she may hide behind a mask or create a false persona. The Intentional Leader respects other people as they are. Indeed he or she encourages them to express their unique giftedness and individuality, while freely sharing the richness of his or her own life.

The fourth Root Value has to do with perception. One of the leader’s biggest challenges is to perceive and understand “what’s going on.” When a leader believes he or she knows the truth exclusive of other points of view he or she is operating out of a Pragmatic or Contemplative Spirituality. The Tyrant will attempt to force his or her perspective on others, or act independently of others. The Hermit will discount the perceptions of others in more passive ways. This unilateral orientation to truth denies life’s complexity. Even contradictory perceptions have value. Often the truth exists as a dynamic polarity between opposing views. The Intentional Leader genuinely listens and is open to the perspectives of others. Indeed this leadership style actively seeks other points of view believing that the truth can be discerned in no other way.

The final Root Value has to do with one’s orientation to the past. The Intentional Leader learns the lessons of the past, but is not enslaved to it. A Tyrant may ignore the past. Institutions and conventions originating in the past will imprison a Hermit.

The Root Values challenge leaders to think carefully about their behavior and their motives. They help leaders to be constructively self-critical and to learn new behaviors that rise out of awareness of one’s orientation to others. Leaders may use the Root Values as a means to assess their own limitations at foundational levels of their own identity.

One may also use this typology to diagnose dysfunction in an organization. (See TABLE 4.). Leadership coaches may use this system to encourage greater wisdom in the leaders they serve, or as a diagnostic tool to address issues that limit more effective organizational performance.

Despite contemporary misapplication of the Decalogue, an appreciation of the Hebraic setting of the Ten Commandments provides important insight into the nature of
leadership. However the typology is used, the Decalogue will help leaders develop organizations that truly respect the dignity of every human being.
### TABLE 1

Leadership Spiritualities and Organizational Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Founding</th>
<th>The Tyrant and Hierarchical Organizations</th>
<th>The Hermit and Organic Organizations</th>
<th>The Intentional Leader and Covenantal Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Conquest</td>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Informed Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergence</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Oligarchic</td>
<td>Distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Domination</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Hierarchical (power flows down from above)</td>
<td>Concentric (power flows to an emerging elite, influence determined by proximity to the center)</td>
<td>Frame and Cell, (self-differentiated units linked in mutual relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2

**The Root Values of the Decalogue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of God</th>
<th>Root Value</th>
<th>Of Neighbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You shall have no other God’s before me.</td>
<td>Of Persons&lt;br&gt;The value of Persons</td>
<td>You shall not kill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You shall not make a graven image and bow down and worship it.</td>
<td>Of Process&lt;br&gt;The value of Commitment</td>
<td>You shall not commit adultery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You shall not use the name of the Lord your God in vain.</td>
<td>Of Partnering&lt;br&gt;The Value of Autonomy.</td>
<td>You shall not steal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You shall remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy.</td>
<td>Of Perception&lt;br&gt;The Value of Multi-lateral Perspectives</td>
<td>You shall not bear false witness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You shall honor your father and you mother.</td>
<td>Of the Past&lt;br&gt;The Value of Legacy</td>
<td>You shall not covet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3
The Root Values Related to Leadership Spiritualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pragmatic Spirituality</th>
<th>Contemplative Spirituality</th>
<th>Covenantal Spirituality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of Persons</strong></td>
<td>Individuals are valued as means to ends. Employees find themselves in subordinated positions and hierarchical relationships. There may be turf wars. They know their primary value to the organization is what they can do.</td>
<td>Individuals are undervalued. They may not feel that their true talents are appreciated or even understood. They may feel that they are known in a sentimental kind of way. Relationships lack genuine depth.</td>
<td>Individuals are ends in themselves. They are valued for who they how are beyond what they bring to the organization. They know that their talents are appreciated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of Commitment</strong></td>
<td>Tasks are assigned. Outcomes are measured. People do their work because they know someone is going to check up on them.</td>
<td>Tasks may or may not be assigned. There may be one or two people on the team or over functioning covering for the lapses, or irresponsibility of others on the team. Outcomes are rarely measured.</td>
<td>People commit to tasks. Outcomes are measured. Feedback is given to people in the constructive way to improve performance. This feedback is appreciated and seen as genuine help. People do what they say they're going to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of Autonomy</strong></td>
<td>People on the team are highly individualistic, even atomistic. They may not know each other well. Many will exhibit Hermit behavior in response to the controlling nature of the boss.</td>
<td>There may be codependent relationships in the organization. Personal boundaries are vague. The relationships have a sentimental quality. Conflict avoidance is an issue. Broken relationships or unhealthy relationships are ignored. Tyrants will emerge and tend to dominate their turf.</td>
<td>People on the team have a very clear sense of personal identity. They value being in relationship with others. Conflict is managed directly and creatively. Reconciliation regularly practiced leads to greater trust and more authentic communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of Truth</strong></td>
<td>The boss lets everyone know what the truth is. People do not need to think for themselves.</td>
<td>The truth is not really talked about. It is assumed that everyone just “knows” what the priorities are, what the status is, what the resources are.</td>
<td>Everyone on the team is involved in discerning the truth. People have access to information and talk freely about priorities, resources, and status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of Legacy</strong></td>
<td>Legacy is overlooked. No one seems to care about the history of the organization or the personal experiences of those on the team.</td>
<td>Legacy rules. The organization is a prisoner to the past. “We have never done it that way before” ends all discussion.</td>
<td>Legacy is valued but does not hold the organization captive. People learn the lessons of the past. Organizational history generates new ideas. Values from the past that continue to bear fruit are carried forward. Values from the past that no longer have relevance are archived.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4

**Signs of Pragmatic, Contemplative and Communal Modes in Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pragmatic Spirituality</th>
<th>Contemplative Spirituality</th>
<th>Covenantal Spirituality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Employees complain of lack of freedom.</td>
<td>Employees complain of lack of direction.</td>
<td>Employees experience structure and freedom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The boss dominates all processes.</td>
<td>The boss waffles.</td>
<td>The boss is perceived as a leader/partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Employees are inhibited by fear.</td>
<td>Employees are inhibited by frustration.</td>
<td>Employees take initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The boss tends to give negative feedback without support.</td>
<td>The Boss tends to give positive feedback without providing constructive criticism.</td>
<td>The boss gives positive feedback with constructive criticism and invites feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Violation of the rules leads to material consequences.</td>
<td>Violation of the norms tends to be ignored.</td>
<td>Violation of norms is addressed to encourage reconciliation and a higher functioning team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>It is a controlled environment.</td>
<td>It is a permissive environment.</td>
<td>Sufficient structure provides order with sufficient freedom to encourage creativity at every level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The organization is built on a mechanistic model, that is, it feels like the machine. It is highly a bureaucratic.</td>
<td>The organization is organic, that is, insiders seem to know how to get what they want. Newcomers to the organization may have a hard time understanding how things work.</td>
<td>The organization is an intentional community. People dialogue regularly about the purpose and mission of the organization. Everyone in the organization takes responsibility for processes and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The organization is held together by external forces. For example, financial incentives, enforced rules, and litigation.</td>
<td>The organization is held together by inertia, habit.</td>
<td>The organization is held together by a mutual and shared desire to perform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Problems are addressed mechanically; solutions are handed down from above.</td>
<td>Problems are not addressed directly; they “resolve themselves.”</td>
<td>Problems are addressed directly by those involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The mind of the boss is clear; his will is everywhere understood.</td>
<td>People feel like they don't really know the boss. The boss may seem to be playing a role.</td>
<td>The boss as the capacity to be collaborator and guide without surrendering ultimate authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>