Reducing Groupthink: An Exegetical Research Analysis of 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25

Benjamin Stoffel
Regent University

This article examines 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25 through an inner textural exegetical analysis (Robbins, 1996) towards a better understanding of how the apostle Paul addressed in-group cohesiveness among the church members at Corinth. The findings of the exegetical analysis are discussed in relation to the organizational behavior construct, "groupthink" (Janis, 1972). The research is framed around the following question: How can leaders reduce groupthink? As a construct of group behavior, researchers have correlated groupthink with reduced group and organizational performance (Janis, 1972). Researchers have positively correlated group cohesiveness with groupthink and have referred to a group member's desire to remain in the group (Dailey, 1977). Group cohesiveness - the desire to remain in a group – can negatively impact the group member's ability to share or involve outside opinions that contradict the in-group culture (Sims & Sauser, 2013). Ignoring the input of outsiders has been associated with groupthink and has led researchers to suggest adding a group role that intentionally adopts an outsider's view or bringing in an outside consultant (Andrew Sai, 2005; Burdon & Harvey, 2016; Schütz, & Bloch 2006). This article posits that in the pericope of 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25, Paul is the outside consultant, writing to an in-group – the Christians at Corinth.

In this article, the organizational behavior construct entitled, "groupthink" (Janis, 1972), is examined. This article utilizes an exegetical research study to analyze a pericope of Scripture to elucidate possible findings towards reducing groupthink. The research is framed around the following question: How can leaders reduce groupthink? In seeking the answer to that question, this research was conducted utilizing Robbins (1996) socio-rhetorical criticism to analyze the pericope of 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25. As a construct of group behavior, researchers have correlated groupthink with low group and organizational performance (Janis, 1972). This exegetical study explores Paul's words and phrases to examine behaviors that can break through in-group cohesiveness and expand thinking towards more open communication and behavior. Although one could

argue that Paul's words are popularly about "love" in 1 Corinthians 13, this research explores a possible correlation to Paul's words and in-group cohesiveness. To accomplish this exegetical analysis, a socio-rhetorical analysis is employed to better reveal the context and audience as possibly referring to expanding a group by breaking through in-group patterns; thus, serving as a model of reducing groupthink.

The Problem

In a brief overview of the extant literature on groupthink, no research was discovered that had utilized the Bible as a key resource or ancient text. Among the various methods of incorporating textural analysis utilizing Scripture, is Robbins' (1996) "socio-rhetorical criticism". This article utilizes Robbins' methods to analyze the pericope of 1 Corinthians 13 and place the pericope in conversation with the key antecedents or underlying causes of groupthink: a) "group cohesion, b) directive leadership, and c) ideological homogeneity" (Ben-Hur, Kinley & Jonsen, 2012, p. 713). 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25 is a salient pericope due to the nature of the context of the issues that Paul was addressing at the time this pericope was written. In 1 Corinthians chapters 12 and 14, on either side of the pericope, Paul addressed the church at Corinth in their use of spiritual gifts and order in worship (Patterson, 2009). Paul addressed the in-group proclivity of Christians to utilize spiritual gifts in a way that precluded "outsiders or unbelievers" (1 Corinthians 14:23 English Standard Version) from participating. Group cohesion has referred to a group member's desire to remain in the group (Dailey, 1977). The desire to remain in the group may negatively impact the group member's ability to share or involve outside opinions that contradict the in-group culture (Sims & Sauser, 2013).

Ignoring the input of outsiders has been associated with groupthink and has led researchers to suggest adding a group role that intentionally adopts an outsider's view or bringing in an outside consultant to help expand the in-group thought processing and group behavior outcomes (Andrew Sai, 2005; Burdon & Harvey, 2016; Schütz, & Bloch 2006). In 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25, Paul is the outside consultant, writing to an in-group, the Christians at Corinth. Paul acknowledges the in-group excitement to utilize spiritual gifts (1 Corinthians 14:1,39), but warns the Christians at Corinth not to be so focused on those behaviors that it resulted in ignorance related to the utilization of spiritual gifts (1 Corinthians 12:1) and ostracizing those whom the church was on mission to reach (1 Corinthians 14:23). The group cohesion may have played a role in the excitement to utilize spiritual gifts to prove allegiance to the Christian group at Corinth, but that excitement and in-group cohesiveness was preventing the church at Corinth from accomplishing its mission of making new disciples. Paul centers his intervention via the text in 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25 on the elements that will allow the church at Corinth to increase its group performance and addresses the near-sightedness of in-group behaviors that were reducing group performance by driving away the people that the church was called to reach (1 Corinthians 14:23). This article presents 1

Corinthians 13:11-14:25 as an exegetical research study in how Paul addressed in-group cohesiveness and groupthink among the church members at Corinth. In the following section, groupthink is further defined and the extant literature on reducing groupthink is reviewed.

Groupthink Literature Review

Groupthink Defined

Janis (1972) originally published material on groupthink which was related to why groups make poor decisions that lead to poor group and organizational outcomes. Janis (1972) defined groupthink as "a mode of thinking that people engage in when deeply involved in a cohesive in-group, when the members' strivings for unanimity override their motivation to realistically appraise alternative courses of action" (p. 9). Due to the success of Janis' work, more research was produced on groupthink by Janis (1982, 1989) and other researchers (Chapman, 2006). Groupthink, as a construct, has remained a popular construct in group behavior research (Esser, 1998). Henningsen, Henningsen, Eden, and Cruz (2006) summarized Janis' (1972, 1982, 1989) construct of groupthink utilizing a "five-step causal model: antecedents of groupthink, concurrence seeking, symptoms of groupthink, decision-making defects, and poor decision outcomes" (p. 37). Although a framework like Henningsen et al.'s model is helpful, a singular key factor listed by Janis has the greatest impact on groupthink: "group cohesiveness" (Janis, 1972, p. 9). Therefore, the Bible could hold a valuable key to reducing groupthink, revealed in the advice of Paul in 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25. The following section details the extant literature on behaviors that reduce groupthink.

Behaviors That Reduce Groupthink

In this section of the literature review, articles are clustered by the main objective of offering practical suggestions to managers and group leaders to perform behaviors that lead to a reduction in groupthink. Several salient ideas are presented in the following section including three behavioral levers, a ladder of influence, an organizational culture of character and types of functional board members. This section offers practical suggestions for overcoming the poor group performance associated with groupthink.

Behavioral levers. Ben-Hur et al. (2012) provided a helpful summation of Janis' (1972, 1982) three layers of groupthink: a) "underlying causes, b) symptomatic behaviors, and c) decision-making flaws" (p. 713). Within these three layers are subcategories of groupthink related to each layer. Ben-Hur et al. stated that the "key causes included group cohesion, directive leadership, ideological homogeneity" (Ben-Hur et al., 2012, p. 713). Symptomatic behaviors are comprised by "overestimation of group capabilities, close-mindedness and pressures for uniformity" (Ben-Hur et al., 2012, p. 713). The third layer of groupthink, decision-making flaws, has referred to "inadequate contingency

planning, insufficient information search, biased assessment of risk" (Ben-Hur et al., 2012, p. 713). Since culture is changed through behaviors, Ben-Hur et al. identified three "behavioral levers" (p. 715) to help sculpt an organizational culture that combats groupthink. Lever one relates to "Knowing – understanding impact on information flow and creating psychological safety and improving information flow" (Ben-Hur et al., 2012, p. 715). This lever is concerned with how the leader or manager limits or allows information to flow between team members and departments. The second lever is concerned with making sure that team members can talk when appropriate. For team members to speak out, they must be assured that they will not be punished for sharing information or raising issues (Ben-Hur et al., 2012). The final lever relates to sustaining or "ensuring sustainability through mindfulness" (Ben-Hur et al., 2012, p. 718). This third lever can also be understood as a means to "develop executive group members' mindfulness in order to ensure the sustainability of these interventions" (Ben-Hur et al., 2012, p. 720). Together with the extant literature on groupthink, the three levers provide a practical and solution-oriented set of behaviors that can adjust poor group performance by enhancing factors related to group decision-making. Notable in this study was the emphasis on the influence of an executive coach to help formulate and implement the three levers.

Ladder of influence. Tompkins and Rhodes (2012) presented a ladder of influence that depicted the process of decision-making into action-taking. The process starts with raw data and experience and then narrows to "select data and experience, affix meaning, assumptions, conclusions, beliefs and actions" (Tompkins & Rhodes, 2012, p. 85). This ladder was utilized to visualize and explain how people form into groups and how group behavior is influenced by the cohesiveness of individuals at the top rung of the ladder – beliefs and actions. Tompkins and Rhodes stated that individuals that operate out of shared, deeply held beliefs are often close-knit with others at the same conviction, which gives rise to in-group thinking and "groupthink can develop, which tends to provide insulation from differing patterns of belief and opportunities for conflict with dissimilar ladder-based groups" (p. 86). Thus, Tompkins and Rhodes (2012), addressed groupthink from the more foundational perspective of how groups are formed and considered that the narrowing process of voluntary group formation often binds individuals through deeply felt beliefs, such as in political party or candidate rallies. Due to this emotional and perhaps spiritual connotation and connection with beliefs and actions, Tompkins and Rhodes stated that "healthy dialogue reduces groupthink and increases opportunities for groups and organizations to be responsive to new data" (p. 87). This statement is reminiscent of tolerance and mutual understanding. To this end, Tompkins and Rhodes concluded that emphasis must be placed on instructing group members to more "effectively travel on the Ladder" (p. 89) and thus decrease groupthink and the associated problems of poor team performance. Introducing the ladder of influence adds to the extant literature on groupthink and

allows for a clear understanding of how easily groupthink can form among like-minded groups with shared beliefs.

Character culture. Sims and Sauser (2013) studied the correlation and impact of received wisdom on the construct of groupthink. For Sims and Sauser, "received wisdom" (p. 75) was defined as the common understandings about things and situations that those within an organization have accepted as true - this represents a type of folk wisdom. A more formal definition follows: "the set of beliefs and standards (norms) that people have come to accept as true in a given organization" (Sims & Sauser, 2013, p. 76). Notably, the non-scientific information, regarded as received wisdom, is derived from two factors: a) tenacity – the continual representation of the information, and b) authority – the level of credibility related to the source of the information (Sims & Sauser, 2013). The power of received wisdom is not to be ignored; individuals may present such wisdom as fact, and can hold to it even in light of overturning evidence. In group scenarios, the impact of received wisdom can allow for poor decision making, and unethical group behaviors. Sims and Sauser were interested in how received wisdom and groupthink impacted organizational culture. Sims and Sauser identified four kinds of moral organizational cultures: a) "defiance, b) compliance, c) neglect, and d) character" (pp. 83-84), and illustrated how received wisdom would likely operate within each organizational culture. A positive example is the character culture wherein the constituents would receive wisdom that centers on integrity – knowing, valuing, and performing what is right (Sims & Sauser, 2013). Sims and Sauser stated that the most important thing that a leader could do to create a character culture was to "lead by example and to empower every member of the organization to take personal action that demonstrates the firm's commitment to ethics in its relationships with suppliers, customers, employees, and shareholders" (p. 86). The process of removing the impact of received wisdom and replacing it with integrity behaviors can take time and intentionality. Sims and Sauser added to the extant literature on groupthink by exploring the dynamic of organizational folklore and the impact of leaders with integrity setting an organizational culture of integrity that challenges past wrong assumptions which led to groupthink and poor performance.

Functional board members. Maharaj (2008) defined the occurrence of groupthink as "when a person's thought process and decision-making capabilities become heavily influenced by peer pressure" (p. 75). Maharaj conducted in-depth interviews with twenty board chairs, CEO's, board members and members of top management. The interviews consisted of the same nine questions and were centered on collecting a better understanding of how boards make decisions. The interviews were then compared to the extant literature and three findings were extracted related to factors that influence how boards make decisions: a) "knowledge of the directors, b) values of the board members, and c) groupthink — board members' ability to interact or the groupthink mentality of board members and the level of engagement and questioning of board

members" (p. 72). These three factors represent two broad categories of the board of directors: a) knowledge and b) behaviors. The values and groupthink factors relate to the behaviors of the board of directors. The relationship of power is heavily weighted to the behaviors rather than the knowledge. Maharaj stated that "values and groupthink have a dominating effect on knowledge in predicting decision-making" (p. 77). According to Maharaj, board members can often ignore the bigger picture of how their company operates in the world, in favor of focusing on "their own dialogue (groupthink)" (p. 78).

Maharaj (2008) went on to list the types of board members that enable a functioning and healthy board of directors. The first type of functional board member is the change agent – one who can initiate and advocate for fundamental change. The second type of board member that functions at a high capacity is the challenger – one who will ask the most salient questions regardless of how difficult the question may be to answer. The counsellor is the third type of operational board member. This person is known to possess "persuasive skills, high credibility and the ability to work individually with a variety of people, both inside and outside the company" (Maharaj, 2008, p. 81). The fourth and final constructive board member is the consensus-builder. A consensus-builder is characterized as having excellence in conflict-resolution and utilizing those skills "to ensure that there is sharing of information" (Maharaj, 2008, p. 82). These four types of board members constitute a dream-team of decision-makers that would break through the box of groupthink in any organization. Maharaj's focus on constructive board members adds to the extant literature on groupthink by employing in-depth interviews centered on the strengthening of the decision-making process for members of a board of directors. The value of this research should not be understated as many decisions that impact everyday life are relegated to a few people in roles such as a board of directors (Maharaj, 2008).

The literature provided great ideas and solutions for reducing groupthink, however, some gaps also emerged. For example, there doesn't appear to be any research on groupthink that has focused on the Bible as a key resource for understanding this dynamic of group behavior. Schnall and Greenberg (2012) conducted research on the Sanhedrin – a religious group that shows up in the Bible in various passages. However, Schnall and Greenberg did not actually employ an exegetical research method to a pericope from the Bible. Therefore, a gap exists between the extant literature on groupthink and the potential of exegetical qualitative research from the Bible as a key ancient text. Robbins (1996) introduced a path forward for scholars that were looking to merge the wealth of exegetical data with social science. Robbins' solution was a framework for exploring Scripture through the process of a "socio-rhetorical" critique or analysis.

Socio-Rhetorical Analysis and Inner Texture Criticism

Robbins (1996) "socio-rhetorical criticism" is a socio-cultural method of sacred textural analysis. Researchers that choose an exegetical research method look for ways to connect passages of the Bible with the social and cultural context of the past and present (Robbins, 1996). Among the many goals, Robbins' method of socio-rhetorical criticism is utilized to "set specialized areas of analysis in conversation with one another" (p. 3). Robbins' socio-rhetorical analysis incorporates five broad types of textural analysis: a) inner, b) inter, c) social-cultural, d) ideological, and e) sacred textural analysis (pp. 40-42). This article utilizes the research methodology of inner textural analysis. Robbins stated that inner textural analysis provides researchers five kinds of inner texture to explore: a) "repetitive-progressive, b) opening-middle-closing, c) narrational, d) argumentative, and e) aesthetic" (p. 46). Utilizing these inner textures allows for an informative look at the words, text-patterns and designs, as well as literary devices within the text (Robbins, 1996). This exegetical article utilizes each of these five kinds of inner textural analysis applied to the pericope of 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25. The layout of this exegetical article includes sections for each of the five inner textural methods and then transitions to compare the exegetical analysis with the organizational behavior construct of groupthink. The final section of this article discusses the results of this application of exegetical research to groupthink, addresses limitations and lists some possibilities for future research that could utilize exegetical analysis to contribute to the construct of groupthink.

Repetitive-Progressive Texture in 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25

Inner texture analysis focuses on the language of the text itself (Robbins, 1996). Repetitive-progressive textural analysis focuses on the patterns of words that are utilized multiple times within the same passage, as well as ideas that progress or advance in complexity or meaning throughout the passage (Robbins, 1996). The words and phrases related to the idea of "child(ish)" in the New International Version of the pericope is represented nine times. This clear pattern of repetition is charted in Table 1. In this chart, each time that the word was utilized in the pericope, the associated pronouns, prepositions, and tense of the statements were also recorded in respective columns of the table. Table 1 also highlights the example of what Paul once was (a child), what he is now (a man), and what Paul is calling the people (brothers at Corinth) to stop doing (thinking and acting childishly).

Table 1. Repetition and Progression of "Child"

Verse	Pronoun	Verb	Preposition	"Child"	Tense
13:11a	I	Was		Child	Past

13:11b	I	Talked	Like	Child	Past
13:11c	I	Thought	Like	Child	Past
13:11d	I	Reasoned	Like	Child	Past
13:11e	I	Became		Man	Past
13:11f	I	Put behind me		Childish Ways	Past
14:20b	[Brothers]	(In regard to evil) be		Infants	Present
14:20c	[Brothers]	(in your thinking) be		Adults	Present

Table 1 reveals some clear connections. First, the action of being like a child is past tense for Paul, but present tense for the group that Paul is addressing. In some places in Scripture being childlike is commended (Matthew 19:14); however, here Paul is admonishing the group of Christians to not be overly simple in their Christian behavior concerning meeting together and how their behavior is impacting their mission. The "brothers" listed in the pronoun category of Table 1 refers to the collective group of Christians at Corinth. Paul commands the group to stop thinking like children, then agrees that concerning evil the group should be even less than children; "infants". However, Paul contrasts "children" and "adults" as behavior and thinking that is more fitting to a maturing Christian group. This part is clear; however, determining what thinking and behavior Paul is addressing requires more exegetical analysis. Table 2 introduces the main subject for which Paul is concerned that the Corinthians are acting and thinking about childishly.

Table 2. Repetition and Progression of "Outsider"

Verse	Subject	Verb	Terms for "Outsider"	Object	Result
14:11a	I	am	Foreigner	Speaker	Not Grasp the Meaning
14:11b	Speaker	is	Foreigner	Me	Not Grasp the Meaning
14:16a	(how can) Someone Else	Say Amen	Inquirer	(to) Your Thanksgiving?	Not Grasp the Meaning

14:16b	They (inquirers)	Do Not Know (what are you saying?)	(Inquirer)	You	Not Grasp the Meaning
14:23	Inquirers or Unbelievers	Come in and Say (you are out of your mind).	Inquirers or Unbelievers	You	Not Grasp the Meaning
14:24-25	Unbelievers or Inquirers	Come in and Fall Down and Worship God	Unbelievers or Inquirers	Everyone	Meaning is Grasped

Table 2 represents several clear connections. Paul identified and distinguished between two groups of people in this passage: a) the in-group, and b) the outsider. First, one can note that the terms for "outsider" category revealed the following interchangeable words and phrase: a) "foreigner", b) "inquirer", c) "unbeliever", and d) "someone else". Table 2 demonstrates how the action (verb) that is practiced of the "outsider" is drastically different when the meaning of the communication is grasped and when the meaning of the communication is not grasped. Table 2 indicates that the outsiders viewed the in-group in a different way (you are out of your mind) than the in-group viewed themselves (giving thanks, building up others). The core issue for the Corinthian Christians was to understand the outsider perspective and let the understanding of the outsider inform the in-group behaviors. Paul acted as an outside voice to point out the in-group behavior that was dominating the scene and creating poor performance situations for the church at Corinth. Combining Table 1 and Table 2, one can see that Paul considered a lack of understanding of the outsider perspective to be a childish way of thinking and related to childish behaviors. In his attempt to enlighten the Corinthian Christians, he hoped for them to stop acting childishly, or narrow-mindedly related to in-group cohesiveness (1 Corinthians 14:20), and rather to gain an increased understanding on the outsider's perspective (1 Corinthians 14:16-25). It is clear from this analysis that Paul was acting as a consultant to the in-group members and informing them of the impact of their actions. It is also evident from the repetitive-progressive analysis that Paul considered the childish behaviors to include a propensity for in-group cohesion and acceptance.

Opening-Middle-Closing Texture in 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25

Robbins (1996) stated that the goal of opening-middle-closing textural analysis was to "discern the persuasive effect of the parts, how they work together, in relation to the persuasive nature of the entire text" (p. 51). Accordingly, opening-middle-closing analysis is concerned with the ordering of thoughts and words within a pericope or

even in larger parts, such as entire books of the Bible (Robbins, 1996). The result is another lens with which one can view the text and consider the author's intended meaning (Osborne, 2006). The opening in 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25 is somewhat artificial as the context of the larger context is best set in 1 Corinthians 12-14, but that pericope is too large for this study. It could be argued that the entire first book of Corinthians is a better context than this pericope of 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25; however, without narrowing the focus, any salient items related to groupthink could be lost in the vastness of data and time to accomplish a study of that scope. Starting the opening in 1 Corinthians 13:11 provides the opportunity for the reader to hear the argument within the larger argument of 1 Corinthians 12-14 and avoid some of the common arguments related to 1 Corinthians 13, such as cessationism (McDougall, 2003) and love (Cox, 1996). The opening in 1 Corinthians 13:11 was elucidated by Table 1, as is common for the repetitive-progressive analysis to inform the opening-middle-closing analysis (Robbins, 1996). The idea of acting like a child is carried from the opening, through the arguments in the middle of the pericope and culminates towards the end (1 Corinthians 14:20). The middle of the pericope introduces a more specific behavior related to Paul's thoughts on childish ways. Table 2 represents this advancement in Paul's argument and carries the idea of childish ways through the middle of the pericope in the conceptualization of misunderstanding between the in-group and "outsiders" – as listed in Table 2. Finally, the ending of this pericope brings home the point in bold fashion; essentially, if you listen to the outsiders, you will see that your in-group performance is not up to par (1 Corinthians 14:23), but with a few changes could be improved (1 Corinthians 14:24-25). Through the opening-middle-closing textural analysis, one can see Paul continuing to communicate as the voice of the consultant to the Corinthians.

Narrational Texture in 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25

Narrational texture analysis focuses on the voice(s) represented in the pericope (Robbins, 1996). According to Robbins (1996) the narrational voice represents the discussion in the "speech, action, decisions, emotions and convictions of a person" (p. 72). A distinctive narrator's voice in the chosen pericope of 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25, is demonstrated as Paul utilized personal statements with either, "I", "me" or, "my". Paul's first-person speech pattern was utilized to convey progressive truth that enabled the Christians at Corinth to better understand the impact of his statements. Paul utilized this first-person approach to draw attention to his own example and call the Corinthian Christians to emulate his actions and attitudes. Perhaps the most poignant demonstration of Paul's speech is in 1 Corinthians 14:17-19:

> You are giving thanks well enough, but no one else is edified. I thank God that I speak in tongues more than all of you. But in the church, I would rather speak five intelligible words to instruct others than ten thousand words in a tongue (New International Version).

The juxtaposed impact of Paul's "I"-statements in the above passage relate the behavior of the "you" group as ineffective. Thus, the ineffective communication would relate to the poor group performance that Paul address later (1 Corinthians 14:23). Paul points out the ineffective communication (verse 17), then exemplifies his own behavior through the personal pronoun "I". Paul can also be a part of the in-group (verse 18), but he declares that he also knows how to connect outside of the in-group (verse 19) and therefore can instruct the Corinthian Christians towards increased group performance. This passage strongly conveys the narrational voice as a spiritual and practical guide for the betterment and effectiveness of the Christians at Corinth. Again, Paul takes on the role of the consultant and specifies his own example as one to model rather than perpetuating the in-group behaviors that were alienating the outsiders and thus causing the church at Corinth to be ineffective in achieving one of their key missions.

Argumentative Texture in 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25

Robbins (1996) stated that argumentative texture has related to words that are utilized with the purpose of persuading the reader to act, feel, or think in a specific way. This argumentative speech is usually conclusive of compelling reasons why the reader or listener should respond in thought, feeling, or action (Robbins, 1996). Clearly, Paul's words in I Corinthians 13:11-14:25 are focused on persuasion and connecting with the feelings of the Christians at Corinth. Perhaps the strongest language to persuade the reader is evidenced when Paul referred to the response of the "inquirer" as interpreting the actions of the Corinthian Christians as follows: "Will they not say that you are out of your mind?" (1 Corinthians 14:23b New International Version). This powerful and somewhat negative statement was likely meant to engage the emotion of the reader by connecting with the perspectives of the "outsider". Paul continues to utilize strong language in the following verses, but paints a more positive picture. For example, if the Christians at Corinth respond well, then there is potential that the "inquirer" will experience a supernatural encounter that uncovers "the secrets of their hearts" (1 Corinthians 14:25 New International Version). Paul's words here are evocative and positively calling to the desire of the church at Corinth to be effective in making new disciples of Jesus. Finally, Paul captures a future imagery that would be sure to move the hearts of the Corinthian church when he stated that the "inquirer" would encounter the believers at Corinth and have such a powerful experience that the outsider would "fall down and worship God, exclaiming, 'God is really among you!'" (1 Corinthians 14:25 New International Version). This statement is indicative of the argumentative texture of Paul's writing that engaged the thought, feeling and action of the reader. The argumentative texture analysis agrees with the position of Paul as consultant and provides further data for the motivational tactics employed by Paul to reduce the group cohesiveness that was centered around the shared group activity of spiritual gifts at Corinth.

Sensory-Aesthetic Texture in 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25

Robbins (1996) stated that sensory-aesthetic texture is in the ability to engage the senses through the text and release the text to communicate through the realm of aesthetics (Robbins, 1996). The imagery and evocative meaning is utilized to communicate and cause one to examine or re-examine and question previously held understandings of the text and applications to one's life (Robbins, 1996). The closest connection to sensory-aesthetic text in this pericope is 1 Corinthians 14:7-9:

> Even in the case of lifeless things that make sounds, such as the pipe or harp, how will anyone know what tune is being played unless there is a distinction in the notes? Again, if the trumpet does not sound a clear call, who will get ready for battle? So it is with you. Unless you speak intelligible words with your tongue, how will anyone know what you are saying? (New International Version).

Paul's words engage the audible sensory texture in the perception of notes being played through various instruments. Beyond merely audible tunes, Paul relates the clarity of a tuned instrument to the clarity of communication between the in-group and the outsiders. In this way, an aesthetic texture emerges in form of understanding. Communication involves understanding what is spoken. Paul reaches to the essence of "understanding" and informs the in-group that their group behaviors are not connecting to others in a way that can be understood. Perhaps this sensory-aesthetic portion of the text solicited an emotional response in the Corinthian Christians and caused them to pause and give thought to the meaning and the outsider interpretation of their in-group behavior(s). The sensory-aesthetic analysis provides some confirmation to the other inner textural analysis, but if it were to stand-alone, this data would not be enough to relate to groupthink. However, taken together with the other four inner textural methods, the sensory-aesthetic textural analysis does seem to confer with the role of Paul as the instructor/consultant that has adopted the outsider point of view.

Analysis of 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25 and Reducing Groupthink

In the literature section of this article, a brief overview of the extant literature on reducing groupthink was provided. As stated earlier, no current or past research was discovered that had utilized the Bible as a key ancient text to address the construct of groupthink. Through the utilization of Robbins' (1996) inner texture analysis of 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25, one major pattern emerged from the exegetical data that correlates with groupthink. Considering all five inner texture analysis methods, it was evidenced that Paul was in the position of a consultant to the church at Corinth. This was demonstrated by Paul's words and counsel that demonstrated knowledge of the in-group and the group's self-perception as well as the outsider perception. In this chosen pericope Paul is the outside consultant, writing to an in-group, the Christians at

Corinth. Paul acknowledges the in-group excitement to utilize spiritual gifts (1 Corinthians 14:1,39), but warns the Christians at Corinth not to be so focused on those behaviors that it resulted in ignorance related to the utilization of spiritual gifts (1 Corinthians 12:1) and ostracizing those whom the church was on mission to reach (1 Corinthians 14:23).

The in-group cohesion may have energized the extravagant utilization of spiritual gifts as a means to prove allegiance to the Christian group at Corinth. This very excitement produced an in-group cohesiveness that was preventing the church at Corinth from accomplishing its mission of making new disciples. Paul centers his intervention via the text in 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25 on the elements that will allow the church at Corinth to increase its group performance and addresses the near-sightedness of in-group behaviors that were reducing group performance by driving away the people that the church was called to reach (1 Corinthians 14:23). Paul even went as far as to suggest behaviors for improvement and stated behaviors that should immediately stop being practiced in order to increase group outcomes and effectiveness. Thus, Paul is fulfilling an important role for the Corinthian Christians. Researchers have found that there are at least two ways to reduce groupthink related to an outsider perspective: a) adding a group role that intentionally adopts an outsider's view, and b) bringing in an outside consultant to help expand the in-group thought processing and group behavior outcomes (Andrew Sai, 2005; Burdon & Harvey, 2016; Schütz, & Bloch 2006). This positive correlation between reducing group think through involving a consultant is the clearest connection to the pericope of 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25.

Understanding the pericope in the light of Paul as a consultant yields important insights to the literature on reducing groupthink. For example, in this ancient text one can see a case study of a situation that involved a high level of in-group cohesiveness - group members' excitement to practice spiritual gifts – and how that situation was addressed through the utilization of an outsider – the apostle Paul. Whether Paul was a consultant or merely playing the devil's advocate is irrelevant as both behaviors can have a positive effect on reducing groupthink (Andrew Sai, 2005; Burdon & Harvey, 2016; Schütz, & Bloch 2006). Group cohesion refers to a group member's desire to remain in the group (Dailey, 1977). The desire to remain in the group can negatively impact the group member's ability to share or involve outside opinions that contradict the in-group culture (Sims & Sauser, 2013). Utilizing an inner textural analysis of 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25, a case study has emerged that involved the apostle Paul addressing the in-group behavior of Christians to operate in spiritual gifts through a pattern of behaviors that precluded "outsiders or unbelievers" (1 Corinthians 14:23 English Standard Version) from participating. Thus, the church at Corinth was operating in at least two antecedents of groupthink: a) "group cohesion, and b) ideological homogeneity" (Ben-Hur et al., 2012, p. 713).

Although a clear correlation exists between the pericope of 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25 and the practice of employing an outside consultant to reduce groupthink, little can be ascertained about the impact of Paul's consultation efforts on the effectiveness of the church at Corinth. This presents a significant limitation to the usefulness of this pericope as a case study in reducing groupthink. There is not a clear results section from the pericope itself – meaning that one cannot accurately determine the impact of Paul's words and counsel on the practice of the in-group behaviors. Paul clearly operated as an outside consultant, but his own effectiveness and the group's overall performance after his interaction with them is not immediately apparent. The further analysis of ancient text and near eastern history that would be required to substantiate the impact of Paul's words to the church at Corinth are beyond the scope of this study. Therefore, considering this limitation in the findings of the outcome of Paul's speech, it is appropriate to state that this exegetical study has provided a positive correlation to the extant literature on reducing groupthink by breaking up the in-group cohesion that dominates poor communication and poor group performance. However, this exegetical study is inconclusive as to the impact of the outsider intervention and the resulting group performance. This gap in documented results can be addressed in two ways: a) first, it can be stated as is – inconclusive, or b) based on the extant literature that has established a positive correlation with outsider involvement and reducing groupthink (Andrew Sai, 2005; Burdon & Harvey, 2016; Schütz, & Bloch 2006), the exegetical study can infer that a similar positive correlation would have been experienced by the church at Corinth.

Conclusion

This exegetical research was conducted to explore how leaders can reduce groupthink. This article presented 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25 as a salient pericope to study how Paul addressed in-group cohesiveness and groupthink among the church members at Corinth. Although no new behaviors were uncovered to reduce groupthink in this study, it was argued that 1 Corinthians 13:11-14:25 produced a positive correlation to the extant literature on reducing groupthink. Table 2 represented the element of the outsider as an added viewpoint. This finding from the inner texture analysis established a positive correlation with the extant literature on reducing groupthink by employing an outsider viewpoint or consultant (Andrew Sai, 2005; Burdon & Harvey, 2016; Dailey, 1977; Schütz, & Bloch 2006; Sims & Sauser, 2013). However, the pericope itself was inclusive in the effectiveness of the impact of the consultant's intervention and the reduction of groupthink or an increase in group performance. Although the Bible is rich with ancient history, a contextualized social-cultural analysis does not always guarantee outcomes within the chosen pericope. A positive correlation with the extant literature on reducing groupthink exists, but more research is needed to explore the impact of groupthink among the church at Corinth and the impact of Paul's consultation towards reducing that groupthink. Future research could explore other passages of Scripture

utilizing Robbins' (1996) socio-rhetorical methods to examine the text towards reducing groupthink. Also, a researcher could advance the current study by employing another type of Robbins' socio-rhetorical criticism to the same pericope as was chosen in this study.

About the Author

Benjamin Stoffel is a third-year Ph.D. student at Regent University, where he is studying organizational leadership. He has served in youth ministry, pastoral ministry, church leadership, and leader development for the past 15 years.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Benjamin Stoffel at benjst1@mail.regent.edu.

References

Ahlstrom, D., & Wang, L. C. (2009). Groupthink and France's defeat in the 1940 campaign. Journal of Management History, 15(2), 159-177.

Andrew Sai, O. K. (2005). Organizational communications in Hong Kong: A cultural approach to groupthink. Corporate Communications, 10(4), 351-357.

Ben-Hur, S., Kinley, N., & Jonsen, K. (2012). Coaching executive teams to reach better decisions. The Journal of Management Development, 31(7), 711-723.

Bowman, J. W. (1959). Three imperishables: a meditation on 1 Corinthians 13. Interpretation, 13(4), 433-443.

Burdon, W. M., & Harvey, J. (2016). A plea for adoption of ethical compliance. Journal of Financial Crime, 23(1), 187-200.

Callan, T. (1985). Prophecy and Ecstasy in Greco-Roman Religion and in1 Corinthians. Novum Testamentum, 27(2), 125-140.

Campbell-Reed, E. R. (2010). The Healing Power of Love in the 'Tragic Gap' (1 Corinthians 13:1-13). Word & World, 30(1), 91-97.

Chapman, J. (2006). Anxiety and defective decision making: An elaboration of the groupthink model. Management Decision, 44(10), 1391-1404.

Chester, S. J. (2005). Divine Madness? Speaking in Tongues in 1 Corinthians 14.23. Journal For The Study Of The New Testament, 27(4), 417-446.

Chowdhury, M. F. (2015). Coding, sorting and sifting of qualitative data analysis: Debates and discussion. Quality and Quantity, 49(3), 1135-1143.

Cox, S. L. (1996). 1 Corinthians 13--An Antidote to Violence: Love. Review & Expositor, 93(4), 529-536.

Dailey, R. C. (1977). The effects of cohesiveness and collaboration on work groups: A theoretical model. Group & Organization Studies (Pre-1986), 2(4), 461-470.

Esser, J. (1998). Alive and well after 25 years: A review of groupthink research, organizational behavior and human decision processes. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 73(2), 116-141.

Gandossy, R., & Sonnenfeld, J. (2005). 'I see nothing, I hear nothing': Culture, corruption and apathy. International Journal of Disclosure and Governance, 2(3), 228-243.

Henningsen, D. D., Henningsen, M. M., Eden, J., & Cruz, M. G. (2006). Examining the Symptoms of Groupthink and Retrospective Sensemaking. Small Group Research, 37(1), 36-64.

Hogg, M. A., & Hains, S. C. (1998). Friendship and group identification: a new look at the role of cohesiveness in groupthink. European Journal Of Social Psychology, 28(3), 323-341.

Hollander, H. W. (2010). Seeing God 'in a riddle' or 'face to face': An analysis of 1 Corinthians 13.12. Journal for The Study of the New Testament, 32(4), 395-403.

Houghton, M. J. (1996). A Reexamination of 1 Corinthians 13:8-13. Bibliotheca Sacra, 153(611), 344-356.

Janis, I. L. Victims of groupthink. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972

Klein, D. B., & Stern, C. (2009). Groupthink in academia: Majoritarian departmental politics and the professional pyramid. The Independent Review, 13(4), 585-600.

Maharaj, R. (2008). Corporate governance, groupthink and bullies in the boardroom. International Journal of Disclosure and Governance, 5(1), 68-92.

McDougall, D. G. (2003). Cessationism in 1 Cor 13:8-12. Master's Seminary Journal, 14(2), 177-213.

Neck, C. P., & Moorhead, G. (1995). Groupthink remodeled: The importance of leadership, time pressure, and methodical decision-making procedures. Human Relations, 48(5), 537-557.

Patterson, S. J. (2009). A Rhetorical Gem in a Rhetorical Treasure: The Origin and Significance of 1 Corinthians 13:4-7. Biblical Theology Bulletin, 39(2), 87-94.

Porter, C. L. (1997). Within the understanding distance: The vocation of a New Testament professor. Encounter, 58(1), 61-71.

Robbins, V.K. (1996). The tapestry of early Christian discourse: Rhetoric, society and ideology. New York, NY: Routledge.

Rowe, A. J. (2005). 1 Corinthians 12 -- 14: the use of a text for Christian worship. Evangelical Quarterly, 77(2), 119-128.

Russell, J., Hawthorne, J., & Buchak, L. (2015). Groupthink. Philosophical Studies, 172(5), 1287-1309.

Schnall, E., & Greenberg, M. J. (2012). Groupthink and the Sanhedrin. Journal of Management History, 18(3), 285-294.

Schütz, P., & Bloch, B. (2006). The "silo-virus": Diagnosing and curing departmental groupthink. Team Performance Management, 12(1), 31-43.

Schweizer, E. (1959). Service of worship: Exposition of 1 Corinthians 14. Interpretation, 13(4), 400-408.

Sims, R. R., & Sauser, W. I. (2013). Toward a better understanding of the relationships among received wisdom, groupthink, and organizational ethical culture. Journal of Management Policy and Practice, 14(4), 75-90.

Smit, J. (1991). The genre of 1 Corinthians 13 in the light of classical rhetoric. Novum Testamentum, 33(3), 193-216.

Tompkins, T. C., & Rhodes, K. (2012). Groupthink and the ladder of inference: Increasing effective decision making. The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning, 8(2), 84-90.