If you want to understand a Christian organisation you need a Christian tool…don’t you?
Comparing the cultural relevance of OCAI and Aspire as research tools in the Christian Context

Lynn Caudwell, SIL Personnel Director for Eurasia Area

‘What makes an organization, what it does and the way it does it, ‘Christian?’ (Jeavons, 1994, p139)

This question will be explored and the resulting concepts used as a basis for comparing the strengths and weaknesses of OCAI and Aspire tools in relation to Christian culture. These findings together with brief reflections on using the OCAI tool in ‘SIL’, a faith-based non-profit organization will guide the conclusion.

Distinctiveness of the Christian Context

In the evolving organizational culture debate one definition states that group culture is;

*a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel...* (Schein, 2004, p17)

I could expand on those discussions. However in this paper the word ‘Christian’ means that we have to step further back. When an organization calls itself ‘Christian’ I suggest that it already has a distinctive culture. We are not talking about any set of assumptions learned by a random group, as in Schein’s definition. Christian organizations are made up of people who already come with a deeper set of basic beliefs that are shared to a greater or lesser extent by others who join them.

Using a variety of resources developed by the research-based ‘Best Christian Workplaces Institute’ (BCWI) which has used its questionnaire (ibid., Appendix B) to survey more than 50,000 employees across N America, Jeavons’ study of 10 successful Christian organizations, Handy’s work on voluntary organizations, the guiding principles of the World Evangelical Alliance Mission Commission’s study on missionary attrition:’ ReMAP II’ and some articles from ‘Evangelical Alliance’, I suggest that effective Christian organizations show some unique characteristics. It should be noted, however that all of the resources listed above are from a Western Christian viewpoint.

Christian organizations are where ministry and not just work takes place. ‘Few people work for the money; most feel called to the work’ (Schied and Dodrill, 2003). They bring with them an ‘unstated, often unconscious, psychological contract, never written down but nevertheless just like a formal contract in that they offer to give something of themselves in return for something given to them’ (Handy, 1990, p27). The result is a ‘co-operative agreement’ i.e. people are ‘there because they believe in the goals of the organization and the people who work there’ (p32). These goals are not just practical but are often seen as spiritual ministry, described by Jeavons as, ‘activity and involvement with others that is intended to make God’s presence and God’s love visible and tangible to others’. In effective Christian organizations this deep level of motivation is not the rhetoric of ‘mission statements and the comments of senior executives’ it will also be evident by most of the staff in the way ‘they
treat one another, those who they provide with services, and donors' (1994, p 140). These highly engaged staff don’t require extra motivation if they are ‘tied closely to the vision and purpose that drives their daily tasks’ (BCWP, 2007).

The workplace behaves to an extent as a Christian community involving both spiritual and practical aspects of work together. ‘In the examination of the most effective organizations what stands out is the depth and integration of faith and works’ (Jeavons, 1994, p 141). The BCWI emphasize ‘the importance of nurturing spirituality in the workplace as relationships with others based on our relationship with Christ are a crucial part of a Christians life and it must also be a crucial part of Christian ministries’ (Schied, 2005).

Effective Christian organizations acknowledge a dependence on God for the work they do relying on the wider Christian world for people and funding resources, making them accountable. ‘Most effective Christian organizations have been and remain program-driven, not funding-driven’ (Jeavons 1994, p143). High levels of integrity guide how funding is sought and used.

This biblical view of stewardship of resources extends to the way people are treated (Hay et al 2007 p,405). Managers have ‘a sense of responsibility to God’ (Werner, 2008) and so staff are valuable assets, given access to things like ‘Personal Development plans, resources for training, realistic workloads, fair compensation and benefits packages for all’ (Lopus, 2003). ‘They are empowered to be involved in decisions that affect them and free to make decisions’ (Schied, 2005). The workforce is diverse in background and skills reflecting the inclusive nature of the body of Christ (Jeavons, 1994, p 142).

Management styles match the cooperative nature of the psychological contact of the workforce and is ‘as informal as possible, as participative as is practical and (structures), in their shape, the flatter the better’ (Handy, 1990, p103). The leadership display trustworthiness, integrity and spiritual maturity, (Cheesman and Jones, 2006), leading to high levels of trust between staff and management which is reinforced by ‘consistently caring about people and modeling competence’ (Scheid, 2005).

The above describes what one would hope to find and can find in organizations with a strong Christian culture. However there are other shadow issues that can be seen across Christian organizations.

The high levels of motivation shown by Christian workers in some cases can make people vulnerable to what Farnsworth calls ‘spiritual abuse of workers leading to low trust, compromised ethics and broken faith in dysfunctional Christian organizations’. These high levels of motivation can also lead to ‘Dissonance reduction’ (Handy, 1990, p35).

No-one can voluntarily stay in a group and disapprove of its ultimate aims and values. As a result there is much less criticism of the organization from within than you might find in other places. It does not mean that they are better, however.

The cooperative nature of the contact means that ‘people push themselves’ and this can lead to ‘burn out’ of staff and leaders (Beasley-Murray, 2011).

Farnsworth, (Schied and Dodrill, 2003) highlights ‘perceptions that Christian managers can’t compare to managers in the highly profitable and demanding business world’. Jeavons (1994, vii) finds that most management resources are for organizations whose primary purpose is to make a profit. ‘As a result, Christian managers often turn to non-biblical principles in the secular world for management training’ (Schied and Dodrill, 2003).
‘Christian organizations have every reason to be the best run, most innovative places in the world’. However, ‘many workers disagree that the Christian workplaces offer the best places to work’ (Schied and Dodrill, 2003).

There is a need to find an effective way to assess Christian organizations to prevent this disconnect between possibilities and reality.

I turn now to the two tools being examined.

**Strengths of the OCAI tool in relation to Christian Culture**

Cameron and Quinn see that the problems of organizational change go deeper than structural issues and state that; ‘the most frequently cited reason given for failure was a neglect of the organizations culture’ (2006, p1). This should appeal to Christian organizations as culture means dealing with our biggest resource, people.

The book claims to ‘provides a framework, a sense making tool, a set of systematic steps, and a methodology for helping managers and their organizations adapt to the demands of the environment’ (P2).

The Competing Values Framework or OCAI is based analysis of Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) of the major indicators of effective organizations and has two dimensions. One differentiates flexibility and dynamism from stability order and control the other differentiates internal integration and unity from external differentiation and rivalry. These form 4 quadrants that represent competing assumptions, named Clan (collaborative), Adhocracy (creative), Market (competing) and Hierarchy (controlling) (Cameron and Quinn 2006, p34-35) (ibid., Appendix A, i).

Christian organizations have used this tool and have made some discoveries.

Obenchain and Johnson (2004), in their study of Christian education institutions found that ‘the majority of Christian institutions report a dominant culture type of clan’ (p32). Of those that reported a dominant culture type of adhocracy ‘such institutions are often described as innovative, aggressive, adaptable and entrepreneurial’ (p33). ‘Christian higher education institutions may well benefit from understanding and implementing operating values and processes that prepare them for innovation’ (p36).

Similar findings were reported by Boggs and Fields (2010) on their study of churches. ‘Clearly there are opportunities for churches to improve performance by redirecting organizational culture towards that of adhocracy’. The survey results that I collected and collated (ibid., Appendix A, ii and iii) also suggest similar findings. SIL’s, Global Personnel Leadership Team (GPLT) perceive the mission as a strong clan with a desire to become slightly more of an adhocracy.

This is not a surprise as the clan culture is described as ‘organizations that focuses on internal maintenance with flexibility, concern for people and sensitivity to customers’ (Cameron and Quinn, 2006, p67). The adhocracy culture looks outwards with a focus on flexibility and individual creativity and so would be a positive influence on a Christian institution. Hierarchy with a focus on stability and control and Market emphasizing competition seem less relevant to Christian organizations.

OCAIs main strength it seems is that it is consistent as a tool in suggesting that Christian organizations often come out as strong clans with evidence that dynamic organizations display characteristics of the adhocracy culture.
Weakness of using OCAI for Christian organizations

OCAI assumes that all cultures are relative and so changing a culture is a valid aim if the result is a more efficient smooth running organization.

‘It focuses less on the right answers than it does on the methods and mechanisms available to help managers change the most fundamental elements of their organization’ (p2).

I would question that statement when considering Christian organizations. Most come out as clans and to a lesser extent adhocracy cultures because these are the closest to the Christian culture. Many would agree with Alan Wilkins (1989, cited in Cameron and Quinn, 2006, p93) where he ‘identifies the importance of building on what he termed corporate character in any organizational change effort…and capitalizing on the core competencies, the unique mission, and the special organizational identity that has been created over time’.

Many of the staff feel ‘called’ to the work they are doing and this may colour their judgment when answering the questions about the organization that is helping them to ‘fulfill desires to live out their perception of God’s call on their lives’ (Boggs and Fields 2010, p324). They already had their values before they joined and the organization is often seen as a channel to live out those values. In a sense they chose the organization and not the other way around.

Gray (2009, p111) questions the ethics behind the idea of changing a culture by quoting Kunda, ‘the idea is to educate people without them knowing it. Have the religion and not know how they got it’. Grey (p72) also highlights Pascal and Athos’ view that organizational culture change is more than just managing culture, they saw ‘shared values as one of the ‘levers’ of management and they clearly believed that culture could be treated as if it were part of an organizational machine in which controls were manipulated at the whim of managers’. This, if true, would conflict with Christian values of integrity and respect for the people who work in the organization.

What lies beneath? According to Grey (p72) ‘Culture management imagines a world in which shared values are directed towards the goal of productivity…and where employees accept that their efforts must be directed towards the goals of the company’. The terms, competitive, aggressive, market, no-nonsense and smooth-running efficiency are used in the questions (ibid., Appendix A, iv). Cameron and Quinn (2006, p3) give it away when they talk about top performers who have ‘blown away the completion in financial returns’ and have ‘made a killing’ by supposedly creating organizational cultures. These would be viewed as much lesser goals than those already held by the wider Christian sub-culture.

Strengths of Aspire in relation to Christian Culture

Aspire is a tool that has been recently developed by The Christian Distinctives Trust (CDT), a group of people who are concerned to see Christian Organizations reflecting the best of Christian culture (CDT, n.d., a). They state;

In defining a Christian organisation it is helpful to consider what defines an individual as a Christian. We would suggest that the individual's relationship with the living God in Jesus is the one core factor that distinguishes the Christian from the non-Christian. This life choice, belief and relationship in turn affect the inspiration and motivation for everything we do. The belief gives rise to values that we choose to apply in all we do as a way of expressing our belief in action (n.d., b).

This recognizes from the beginning the unique attitudes and values of Christians. There is an assumption that Biblical values will be at the heart of Christian organizations reflecting the
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...desires of people who choose to work there. Far from wanting this culture to be changed in order to become more efficient or competitive for limited gain, the staff would want to strengthen and build on this basic foundation of Biblical principles (ibid., Appendix D).

Aspire aims to help, ‘Christian organisations to be more spiritually passionate, professionally excellent and distinctively Christian. ‘We want Christian organisations to glorify God’ (n.d., c).

Two strands of ideas come together in this statement; ‘spiritual’ and ‘professional’. Strong Christian organisations will have both aspects evident in healthy balance and so the questions in the tool reflect that two pronged approach.

_It focuses on the organisational areas of Leadership, Relationships, Development, Resourcing, Recognition and the Foundations of the organisation. In parallel, it also examines the values of Christ-Centeredness, Individual-Awareness, Inclusivity, Interdependence and Integrity (n.d., c)._

By weaving in the traditional best organizational practices with deeper level Christian values Aspire aims to assess whether the organization is a balanced and safe place as well as working from a highly motivated Christian foundation.

Looking back at the distinctive aspects of healthy Christian organizations described earlier this dual focus would complement those findings. They would also go a long way to addressing some of the shadow issues of Christian Organizational culture. The tool would be able to point out whether the high levels of motivation of the staff are being taken advantage of or being protected and valued. It could also be able to provide information about how the organization is doing as a spiritual community. This kind of information is not available from standard assessment tools.

Another powerful aspect of the tool is that it is confidential but very detailed, acting as an organizational 360 review, ‘enabling you to obtain internal feedback on your organisation and to monitor the effectiveness of your Christian values in the workplace’. (n.d.,d)

Again this can begin to address the issue of ‘Dissonance Reduction’. The questions are framed in such a way as to help people give constructive rather than critical feedback. Instead of having to translate terms to be relevant to Christian organizations (Jeavons, 1994 vii) the questions speak for themselves and make it easier for staff to be honest. This invaluable feedback has been difficult to get in the wider Christian world.

Finally it has been noted (Jeavons, 1994 vii) that there is a critical need to develop management ‘best practices’ that line up with Christian values. Aspire asks detailed questions and generates comprehensive reports related to management practices in the organization and show up areas of weakness that can be tackled.

The Christian organizations that have used this tool have given very positive feedback on its effectiveness (CDT, n.d., e).

**Weaknesses of the Aspire Questionnaire**

‘Christian Distinctives’ states that, ‘We want to see the inner transformation of Christian organisations lead to outer transformation of our communities, society and world’. (n.d.,a)

This indirect approach to outward engagement is reflected in the questions. There may be a place for more focus on creativity and innovation as Christian organizations engage with the...
outside world. This would seem to be backed up by the OCAI results. Apparently Aspire has the flexibility to build questions into the questionnaire depending on the needs of each organization (Beecham, 2011).

The HR focus of the tool, while being highly practical, could make it difficult to ‘sell’ to leaders with preconceived ideas of where HR fits in the overall strategy of organizational success. Developing guidelines to introduce the tool to leaders as an essential, strategic way to strengthen Christian organizations would be very useful.

It is worth noting that both tools are very Western centric. However I expect that Christians in other parts of the world would also desire the underlying Biblical principles in Aspire. There is more work to be done to see how relevant each tool would be in wider cultural contexts.

**Conclusion**

When using the OCAI tool to assess the culture of SIL, participants struggled to see the relevance of some of the questions to a Christian organization.

‘ ‘Profit’, ‘product’ and ‘market’ probably get negative reactions from us in the non-profit world’ (Crockett, 2011). Also when it came to writing up the results there were many questions but few answers (ibid., Appendix A, ii). It seems that we do not want to change culture but would rather improve at what we already do. That will require another tool.

The Aspire survey reports, detailed feedback and expert advice (CDT, n.d., e) would help an organization know where they should focus in order to become more effective and professional.

The conclusion I draw from this comparison is that Aspire is a much more culturally relevant and effective assessment tool for Christian organizations. As Jeavons (1994, viii) states;

> ‘There are values - moral values if you will - that need to be honoured and expressed in the decisions and actions of a religious organization that are frequently of little concern in a secular organization’.

Aspire and not OCAI is the tool that addresses that concern.
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Appendix A (i)

OCA I Survey Results for SIL Global Personnel Leadership Team

Competing Values Framework and the 4 Culture Types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAN</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCRACY</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKET</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERARCHY</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking the average result of the GPLT for all 6 questions then CLAN is the dominant culture and we would like to see that get even stronger or maybe just more effective. Ways to see this happen could be by emphasising more mentoring, development and nurturing of staff, focusing on increasing our ability to work in teams and by facilitating consensus and participation of all staff in making decisions. HR practices will play an important role if we are to become a more effective CLAN.

There is a desire to see an increase in ADHOCRACY. Empowerment of the workforce is the important principle to focus on here. This would mean getting better at taking up new opportunities and encouraging innovative ways of working. It could also mean encouraging our staff to take a few more decisions and risks. [Interestingly most Christian organizations come out as strong CLANs BUT the most effective Christian organizations also have developed an ADHOCRACY culture alongside the CLAN culture.]
There is a move away from being MARKET focused (not very strong anyway). This may be because the language of this particular set of questions was more suitable for business organizations. We should probably not ignore this section but may need to reframe the targets to match our Christian type of goals. [The words market and competition were picked up as not relevant to our organization.]

The GPLT acknowledges that there is currently a certain amount of HIERARCHY guiding our culture and we would like to see that decrease. This means we would have less overall binding policies and rules. I guess that this reflects the move from central policy setting where one size fits all towards recognition that we will need more locally set guiding principles if we are going to become more flexible as an organization. The interesting question will be, realistically how little hierarchy can we do without in such a large complex organization?

**GPLT Results of each set of questions in Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Characteristics</th>
<th>Description of the Culture Type</th>
<th>GPLT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>The organization is a very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot of themselves.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>The organization is a very dynamic entrepreneurial place. People are willing to stick their necks out and take risks.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>The organization is very results oriented. A major concern is with getting the job done. People are very achievement oriented.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>The organization is a very controlled and structured place. Formal procedures generally govern what people do</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GPLT see the importance of CLAN but would be prepared to sacrifice some of the CLAN and MARKET culture to become more of an innovative ADHOCRACY Culture. This lines up with the culture of some of the best Christian workplaces having both a strong CLAN and ADHOCRACY culture. (As suggested before, the focus on business language may have influenced against the MARKET culture and could account for the significant decrease in scores).

GPLT recognize that there needs to be a certain amount of HIERARCHY to keep the show on the road.

**Questions:**

- How can we become more dynamic and entrepreneurial as an organization?
- What implications will more risk-taking have on our current HR procedures i.e. recruitment reviewing of staff etc?
- What will member care look like in a more innovative risk-taking organization?
- Why are the scores for MARKET or results so low? How does this affect our relationship with partners?
1. Organisational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the Culture Type</th>
<th>GPLT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify mentoring, facilitating, or nurturing.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify entrepreneurship, innovating, or risk taking.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify a no-nonsense, aggressive, results-oriented focus</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify coordinating, organizing, smooth-running efficiency.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GPLT see the need for the prevailing leadership style to become stronger at the softer skills of mentoring, facilitating and nurturing. Maybe we are asking for leaders to become more involved with the staff. It sees that the leaders themselves do not have to become more able to take risks than they are already doing. This could mean that the growth in entrepreneurship needs to be encouraged at lower levels. This matches the ADHOCRACY philosophy of empowerment and more decisions being made by lower level staff. GPLT are prepared to risk some efficiency in favour of empowerment of lower level staff. GPLT would like leaders to be less concerned with results and (maybe) more concerned with development of staff.

Questions:
- What kind of leadership training do we need in order to see a growth in these mentoring and nurturing skills in our leadership?
- How do we encourage empowerment at the grass roots level?
- 

2. Management of staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the Culture Type</th>
<th>GPLT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL The management style in the organization is characterized by teamwork, consensus, and participation.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD The management style in the organization is characterized by individual risk-taking, innovation, freedom, and uniqueness.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK The management style in the organization is characterized by performance evaluation, high demands, and achievement.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI The management style in the organization is characterized by security of employment, conformity, predictability, and stability in relationships.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GPLT considers that we already have a CLAN type of management style but that it could be strengthened and improved quite significantly. Maybe if team work, mentoring, consensus and participation were encouraged then empowerment would follow. The GPLTs neutral result for ADHOCRACY in management maybe reflects an opinion that managers are not the ones to take risks but are there to empower others to take risks. It seems that managers could improve in their techniques for evaluation of performance. The whole area of stability and predictability of employment or role is seen by the GPLT as a big area of focus for change.

Questions:
- What accounts for the big shift towards more flexibility in role or employment?
- Do we think that people are relying too much on their sense of tenure and not being encouraged to take new risks and develop more skills?
- Does this reflect the fact that we are seeing more short term candidates coming into the workforce?
- Is the nature of the task changing with new expectations about how we actually do the job?
- How do we encourage a move towards teamwork and away from individual results?
- What kinds of new management skills will be required to see this shift?

3. Organisational Glue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the Culture Type</th>
<th>GPLT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL The glue that holds the organization together is loyalty and mutual trust. Commitment to this organization runs high.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD The glue that holds the organization together is commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being on the cutting edge.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK The glue that holds the organization together is the emphasis on achievement and goal accomplishment. Success is a common theme.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI The glue that holds the organization together is formal rules and policies. Maintaining a smooth-running organization is important.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GPLT would like to see even more trust for each other growing (CLAN) and less rules and regulations (HEIRARCHY) holding us together. We would also like to see that strong sense of togetherness being encouraged to try new things with less emphasis on old style achievements and results. We would like to see more local/team mutual accountability.

Questions:
- How can we see increased levels of mutual trust and commitment to each other and the goals of the organisation?
- How can we encourage team accountability and empowerment to make decisions?
- Less rules means that we have spiritually mature staff who can be trusted to work issues out with guiding principles...how can we see this grow?
- How do we measure success? What are the new results to be celebrated?
4. Strategic emphases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the Culture Type</th>
<th>Eurasia All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization emphasizes human development.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High trust, openness, and participation persist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization emphasizes acquiring new resources and</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creating new challenges. Trying new things and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prospecting for opportunities are valued.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization emphasizes achievement. Providing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services which enable progress towards the organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends is dominant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization emphasizes permanence and stability.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency, and control and smooth operations are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvement of the HR functions emphasized in the CLAN culture are seen by the GPLT as the most significant strategic emphasis. This strong CLAN score linked with the desire to see a reduction in stability, efficiency and control represents quite a shift in behaviour. The low score in the ADHOCRACY boxes could suggest that we think empowerment will naturally follow if we improve the people type functions and reduce central control.

Questions:

- How can we ensure that by placing more strategic emphasis on developing people we also empower them to be more innovative and creative?
- Should we be concerned that there is such a low score in the MARKET/ results box. Is this significant?
- If the CLAN activities are the area that is most strategic do we have the resources we need in HR to see the improvement in the people processes?

5. Criteria of Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the Culture Type</th>
<th>GPLT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of the</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of human resources, teamwork, employee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment, and concern for people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of having</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the most unique or newest products. It is a product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leader and innovator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delivering services which are more in demand than those</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available from other organisations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiency. Dependable delivery, smooth scheduling and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low-cost production are critical.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GPLT measures success by the development of people. We seem to think that if we give attention to the workforce we will naturally be successful. We do not seem to value the products, results or efficiency as much as we value the people producing the products and results.

Questions:
- Is it true that if we look after and empower the people that the results will look after themselves?
- How do we make sure that as our workforce becomes more mentored and empowered that we do not become too inward looking but rather use these skills to keep making progress in our overall mission and goals?

Comments:
- Looking at overall results and resultant graph (see attachment) it seems that the difference between our “now” and “preferred future” is very slight. We don’t want to see our organizational culture change too much. However I think that because this system of measurement asks us to compare different cultures, what we get is a description of what our organizational culture is most like. We are more of a CLAN than we are a HIERARCHY. No real surprises there. What it does not say is how well we are doing at being a CLAN.
- Given that most Christian organizations come out as strong Clans do we gain anything?
- We can at least state clearly that our strength lies in the motivation and loyalty of our people.
- We can also see that we have a slight desire to become more of an ADHOCRACY. If this is encouraged then we will join with other current successful Christian organizations that fall into the CLAN/ADHOCRACY segments.
- At least we are not starting off with an organization that is strong in HIERARCHY and MARKET. These are signs of an aging organization and require a huge amount of effort to change.
- Maybe our success will lie in building on our strong foundations of the CLAN culture, focussing on good people development of all staff. At the same time we should make sure that we look carefully for ways to encourage the ADHOCRACY type functions of innovation and empowerment at local levels.
- This could be the way we begin to see some of the ‘reinvention’ goals being met...skilled and motivated people freed to try new things at local levels while being supported by effective, involved management and leadership.
- The MARKET segment needs more attention in case it is significant in how we relate to our partners. It could be that by strengthening the CLAN and ADHOCRACY functions and becoming more relational and open to new innovative ideas that our overlap with partners will improve naturally. It seems that our strengths in dealing with partners will be in the realm of relationships and empowerment rather than by
focussing on products. However we may need to have more discussion on this because of the unhelpful terms used in the MARKET questions.

- Although we want to see a decrease in the HIERARCHY function we will need to bear in mind that larger organizations do need a certain amount of routine processes in order to survive. The question is how much is enough?

A (iii)

**The Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OACI)**

Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument
Appendix A (iv)
Instructions for completing the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI).

The purpose of the OCAI is to assess six key dimensions of organizational culture. In completing the instrument, you will be providing a picture of how our organization operates and the values that characterize it. No right or wrong answers exist for these questions, just as there is no right or wrong culture. Every organization will most likely produce a different set of responses. Therefore, be as accurate as you can in responding to the questions so that your resulting cultural diagnosis will be as precise as possible.

You are asked to rate your organization in the questions. To determine which organization to rate, you will want to consider the organization that is managed by your boss, the strategic business unit to which you belong, or the organizational unit in which you are a member that has clearly identifiable boundaries. Because the instrument is most helpful for determining ways to change the culture, you’ll want to focus on the cultural unit that is the target for change. Therefore, as you answer the questions, keep in mind the organization that can be affected by the change strategy you develop.

The OCAI consists of six questions. Each question has four alternatives. Divide 100 points among these four alternatives depending on the extent to which each alternative is similar to your own organization. Give a higher number of points to the alternative that is most similar to your organization. For example, in question one, if you think alternative A is very similar to your organization, alternative B and C are somewhat similar, and alternative D is hardly similar at all, you might give 55 points to A, 20 points to B and C, and five points to D. Just be sure your total equals 100 points for each question.

Note, that the first pass through the six questions is labelled “Now”. This refers to the culture, as it exists today. After you complete the “Now”, you will find the questions repeated under a heading of “Preferred”. Your answers to these questions should be based on how you would like the organization to look five years from now.
### The Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Dominant Characteristics</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The organization is a very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot of themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The organization is a very dynamic entrepreneurial place. People are willing to stick their necks out and take risks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The organization is very results oriented. A major concern is with getting the job done. People are very competitive and achievement oriented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The organization is a very controlled and structured place. Formal procedures generally govern what people do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Organizational Leadership</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify mentoring, facilitating, or nurturing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify entrepreneurship, innovating, or risk taking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify a no-nonsense, aggressive, results-oriented focus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify coordinating, organizing, or smooth-running efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Management of Employees</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The management style in the organization is characterized by teamwork, consensus, and participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The management style in the organization is characterized by individual risk-taking, innovation, freedom, and uniqueness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The management style in the organization is characterized by hard-driving competitiveness, high demands, and achievement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The management style in the organization is characterized by security of employment, conformity, predictability, and stability in relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Organization Glue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The glue that holds the organization together is loyalty and mutual trust. Commitment to this organization runs high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The glue that holds the organization together is commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being on the cutting edge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The glue that holds the organization together is the emphasis on achievement and goal accomplishment. Aggressiveness and winning are common themes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The glue that holds the organization together is formal rules and policies. Maintaining a smooth-running organization is important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Strategic Emphases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The organization emphasizes human development. High trust, openness, and participation persist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The organization emphasizes acquiring new resources and creating new challenges. Trying new things and prospecting for opportunities are valued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The organization emphasizes competitive actions and achievement. Hitting stretch targets and winning in the marketplace are dominant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The organization emphasizes permanence and stability. Efficiency, control and smooth operations are important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Criteria of Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment, and concern for people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of having the most unique or newest products. It is a product leader and innovator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The organization defines success on the basis of winning in the marketplace and outpacing the competition. Competitive market leadership is key.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The organization defines success on the basis of efficiency. Dependable delivery, smooth scheduling and low-cost production are critical.
Appendix B

Engage! Missionary Survey

Overall
1. Internationally, my organization is well managed.
2. I would recommend my organization to others as a great place to serve in the future.
3. I would rate my organization as a great place to work.
4. I would prefer to remain with my organization even if a comparable assignment were available in another organiz
5. My organization has a global strategy for lasting, high-impact service
6. Over the past year, my organization has improved for the better.

Servant Leadership
7. I can count on my organization during times of crisis.
8. My organization conducts itself openly and honestly in decision-making.
9. My organization's leaders practice fairness and integrity.
10. My organization actively promotes a culture of devotion and fellowship
11. At my organization, people are responsible and held accountable for doing what they say they will do.
12. My organization's leaders demonstrate compassion for people at all levels.
13. There is a high level of trust at my organization between senior leadership and employees.

Personnel Practices
14. My organization recruits and selects highly qualified field staff who are called and gifted for cross-cultural work
15. My organization retains highly effective field staff in positions of effectiveness.
16. My organization helps ineffective field staff become effective
17. My organization makes effective leadership placements
18. My organization has effective ways of preventing and resolving conflict among field staff
19. My organization has effective policies and practices for home assignments
20. My organization uses administrators and support staff appropriately and effectively
21. My organization values diversity of cultural backgrounds, personal styles, and ideas among our employees.

Missionary Preparation
22. My organization's orientation process does a good job of preparing candidates to become effective field staff
23. My organization has effective language acquisition policies and practices.
24. My organization has effective policies and practices for cross-cultural adaptation
25. My organization adequately prepares candidates for personal family challenges they may face on the field.

Field Functioning
26. In my country/area, my organization is well managed
27. In my country/area, field staff have good relationships and effective teamwork with nationals
28. My colleagues are highly committed to effective, relevant service
29. In my country/area, field staff work effectively with one another
30. In my organization, field staff in varied areas of service work together effectively
31. My organization has an effective strategy in my country/area for lasting, high-impact service
32. My organization's values are clearly understood and practiced by field staff

Purpose & Progress
33. My current assignment is a good match with my skills and gifts
34. I have a passion for what I do
35. I have challenge in my work
36. Clear progress is being made toward my work goals
37. My work serves a valuable purpose.
38. I am performing competently
39. I have the resources I need to accomplish my work assignment
40. In the past year, my organization provided access to the training and resources I need to improve my effectiveness
41. My daily work is connected to an exciting and important vision
42. I know what is expected of me in my work assignment.

**Engage! Missionary Survey**

**Freedom in Work**
43. I have the decision-making authority I need to be effective in my work
44. I have a sense of freedom in what I am doing
45. I can make mistakes in my work without fear of punishment or reprisal
46. Employees at my organization are encouraged to experiment and to be innovative.
47. My organization provides a safe environment for field staff to receive confidential counsel about personal and work

**Involvement in Decisions**
48. Field staff in my country/area feel free to voice their opinions openly about work issues
49. My organization has effective communication between the U.S. office and field
50. My organization’s leadership explains the reasons behind major decisions.
51. My organization seeks the suggestions of employees.
52. My organization acts on the suggestions of employees.
53. My organization involves employees in decisions that affect them.

**Feedback & Supervision**
54. In the last 12 months, someone in my organization has given me valuable feedback on my work progress
55. We realistically measure progress and make changes as needed
56. My organization consistently celebrates progress, even "small wins".
57. In the last 12 months, someone in my organization has talked to me about my personal goals and development
58. I am satisfied with the recognition I receive for doing a good job.
59. My supervisor cares about me as a person.
60. My supervisor helps me to solve work-related problems.

**Network Support**
61. My organization helps me develop and sustain adequate financial support
62. I have strong endorsement and support from a home community

**Friendships**
63. I have developed life-long friendships at my organization
64. My colleagues help make my work more meaningful

**Family**
65. My organization values spouses and provides appropriate opportunities for them to serve effectively
66. My organization has effective policies and practices to support strong marriages.
67. I effectively balance family needs and ministry demands on the field.
68. My family life plays a valuable role in my work outcomes.
69. My organization values children and provides appropriate opportunities for them to develop.
70. The members of my household have effective ways of preventing and resolving conflict.
71. In the past year, my organization provided access to resources I need to strengthen my family life.

**Salary/Benefits/Finances**
72. My organization provides an appropriate salary/support structure
73. My organization has effective policies and practices for accounting of finances
74. I am satisfied with my medical or health plan.
75. I am satisfied with my paid time off (vacation, sick leave).
76. I am satisfied with my retirement plans (pension, 403(b), 401(k), RRSP etc.).
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The Organisational areas focussed on are:

- **Foundations** – is Christ central to everything you do, thereby acknowledging God's sovereignty?

- **Leadership** – a leadership team who endeavour to lead in a Christ-like manner? A Godly approach, that communicates, cares, has strength and a Godly character ....

- **Relationships** – is there commitment to developing and maintaining relational ways of working for all involved that are based on Biblical principles drawn from the Christian's relationship with God? Looking at the quality of relationships – up, down and across, conflict resolution, communication ....

- **Development** – is there commitment to ongoing professional, personal and spiritual learning and development at all levels of the organisation; both of the staff and of the organisation as a whole. Looking for a holistic approach, encouragement of spiritual development, a strategic approach, with effective training and induction, helpful performance reviews ....

- **Resourcing** – are there systems and procedures that resource the organisation effectively and honourably? Looking for fairness, transparency, diversity, equal opportunities, effective training in recruitment ....

- **Recognition** – is there a valuing, honouring and rewarding of staff aligned with the Christian ethos? Is it fair, transparent? Is there also non-financial recognition, a remuneration review process....

For a theological background to the values assessed by Aspire, please see the document ‘Values – a Biblical basis’ at www.aspirewebsite.org or contact the CDG.

- **Christ-centredness** – having Christ at the heart of all that is done as an organisation. This value expresses itself in areas such as seeking direction from God through worship and a reliance on prayer; showing dependence on God in our work, as we seek to put him first and placing value on a personal relationship with him through Jesus Christ.

- **Individual awareness** – valuing each person as being uniquely made in God’s image and recognising the importance of treating people as individuals while at the same time acting with impartiality. This value expresses itself in valuing relationships and treating individuals well: Treating them fairly, with compassion and understanding and supporting their holistic development.

- **Inclusivity** – treating staff without favouritism or prejudice, while valuing their diverse gifts, experience and perspective. This value expresses itself in open communication, seeking input and feedback from all staff and involving them in the heart of the organisation, particularly as it relates to their lives. Bias will not be evident in the availability of training, or advertising of positions.

- **Interdependence** – recognising the need we have for one another and seeing this worked out in developing healthy relationships. This value is expressed through effective teamwork, healthy team relationships, and through an attitude of togetherness within a mutually supportive environment.

- **Integrity** – a consistency between the espoused Christian values and mission, and the actual attitudes and behaviours of the organisation's leaders. This applies both externally, in the organisation's relationships with its customers and other stakeholders, and internally, in how the organisation is run and how staff are treated. The leaders are people of character and worthy of respect. The organisation's representatives are known to act with integrity in all that they do.

Please Note: The views expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the position of Redcliffe College.

This and other articles can be downloaded from the Encounters website (www.redcliffe.org/encounters).