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Welcome to Volume 7, Issue 1 of Emerging Leadership Journeys (ELJ). The journal took a one-year hiatus while the School of Business & Leadership reorganized its journal offerings, and as part of the restart, we offer a short issue of four articles. This issue contains conceptual and qualitative articles produced by students in the School of Business & Leadership’s Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership program. These articles provide excellent examples of the type of work our students produce during their program of study.
Organization Theory and Societal Culture
Marie Shaw

The issue of culture brings us to one of the hot topics in organization studies: do the cultural dynamics adequately explain organization theories (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013)? This study discusses three organization theories in three societal cultures based on the assumption that some organization theories work better in certain cultural contexts than others. The chosen theories are environmental contingency theory, institutional theory and stakeholder theory; along with those are the three culture clusters of Confucian Asia, Anglo and Nordic Europe. Issues of each theory are identified and studied in the respective culture contexts through the lens of the culture dimensions reported by the GLOBE culture study (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorman, & Gupta, 2004). It is understood that though each individual issue of the theories can find its best place among the three culture clusters, in general, environmental contingency theory and institutional theory are able to find their inroads in Confucian Asia, while the stakeholder theory works best in Anglo and Nordic Europe cultures.

A Conceptual Framework for Understanding Transcendental Phenomenology Through the Lived Experiences of Biblical Leaders
Stephanie Sheehan

Transcendental phenomenology brings added dimensions to the study of human experiences through qualitative research. Grasping and using its philosophical tenets such as noema, noesis, noeses, noetic, and epoche in a meaningful way can be challenging, given their abstraction and complexity (Moustakas, 1994). This paper provides a conceptual framework for deeper understanding and, therefore, more meaningful practice using parallels that emerge from the lived experiences of two biblical leaders, Pharaoh (of the Exodus) and Saul/Paul. An additional layer of the framework provides integration with theories of decision-making and organizational outcomes.
Extemporaneous Idea Formulation: Innovating Beyond Vision
Dustin A. Kelley

Globalization has taken traditional organizational leadership theory and altered it in an attempt to accommodate the changing business environment. Competitive advantages typically found in traditional sources are depleting on the basis of enhanced organizational knowledge. Creativity and innovation are the primary suppliers of this trend, developing cause for consistent organizational transformation. For this purpose, organizations are now relying on creativity and innovation as their competitive advantage, requiring greater leadership for applying these new ideas. This essay addresses creativity and innovation, applying a sacred texture analysis of the Book of Jude. To follow, a social, cultural, and psychological textural lens is applied in order to further interpret how creativity and innovation impacted the prosperity of Christianity. Finally, this essay juxtaposes Scripture with contemporary leadership challenges pertaining to creativity and innovation focusing specifically on vision, communication, and empowerment. Findings indicate an importance placed on maintaining ‘true intent’ despite the overwhelming urge for extemporaneous strategy formulation beyond shared organizational vision.

Love as a Replacement for Fear in the Workplace
Debby Thomas

Fear is routinely used in organizations and interpersonal relationships as a source of motivation. Some research supports the use of fear to motivate employees to work and to change. However, fear has long lasting negative effects that outweigh the motivation that it produces. This paper proposes and supports the notion of love as a central motivator in place of fear. Inner texture exegesis of 1 John 4:18, along with recent research on love in organizations, supports the move from fear to love. Love produces long lasting effects of inspiration and heart level motivation, increased creativity and effectiveness, and a release of energy. It offers holistic health and growth to individuals. Although replacing fear with love requires a paradigm shift, the effort produces an organizational environment that is more productive and more attractive to employees.
The issue of culture brings us to one of the hot topics in organization studies: do the cultural dynamics adequately explain organization theories (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013)? This study discusses three organization theories in three societal cultures based on the assumption that some organization theories work better in certain cultural contexts than others. The chosen theories are environmental contingency theory, institutional theory and stakeholder theory; along with those are the three culture clusters of Confucian Asia, Anglo and Nordic Europe. Issues of each theory are identified and studied in the respective culture contexts through the lens of the culture dimensions reported by the GLOBE culture study (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorman, & Gupta, 2004). It is understood that though each individual issue of the theories can find its best place among the three culture clusters, in general, environmental contingency theory and institutional theory are able to find their inroads in Confucian Asia, while the stakeholder theory works best in Anglo and Nordic Europe cultures.

According to Hatch and Cunliffe (2013), organization theory draws on interdisciplinary thinking to provide knowledge and understanding of the phenomena of organizations, which helps to explain the concepts and general principles of the various organizational elements and their interrelationships with each other. People embrace organization theories to improve their chances of becoming successful in business practices such as strategy, finance, sales and marketing, information technology, human resources and operations (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). To apply organization theories to these business practices, societal culture is an important factor to be considered, as it is the supersystem of which organizational systems are a part (Bertalanffy, 1950; Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). House et al. (2004) confirmed the argument. First, “the success of the organization in external adaptation required closeness to the contextual culture” (House et al., 2004, p. 265). Second, employees who are members of the societal culture bring the same values into their activities within the organization (Borg, Groenen, Jehn, Bilsky, & Schwartz, 2011; House et al., 2004). The studies of organizations and societal cultures are an “inseparable reciprocal process by which organizations and societal spheres influence each other” (Senge, 2013, p. 77).

This study discusses the application of three organizational theories in three different societal cultures. The three organizational theories are environmental contingency theory, institutional theory and stakeholder theory from the work of Hatch and Cunliffe (2004), and the three societal culture clusters are Confucian Asia, Anglo and Nordic Europe, reported by House et al. (2004). Key issues of each theory are specified, compared and contrasted within each of the three societal cultures, providing further insights on why and how different issues of each of the theories work in different cultural contexts.
Environmental Contingency Theory

Environmental contingency theory addresses the reflexive relationship between organization and environment (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). Burns and Stalker’s (1961) explanation of when to use mechanistic versus organic forms of organization is one early example to deal with the objective variable of environmental uncertainty. The information theory of uncertainty developed later by Duncan (1972) adds in the moderating factor of individual subjective perception about the information complexity and rate of change. Either way, organizations need to respond to the environmental uncertainty by changing the internal structures and management systems (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). Culturally speaking, the most relevant dimensions to environmental contingency theory are uncertainty avoidance and power distance (House et al., 2004). As reported by House et al. (2004), the values of Confucian Asia culture score the highest in both uncertainty avoidance and power distance, while Nordic Europe scores the lowest and Anglo falls in between, leaning towards low. The following sections discuss how these two culture dimensions influence the application of environmental contingency theory in different societies.

Organization Forms

Two major organization forms presented by organization theorists that best help to illustrate the environmental contingency theory are mechanistic and organic (Burns & Stalker, 1961). The mechanistic form of organization works best in stable environments by performing routine activities through standard procedures (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). Under such environmental conditions, the organization operates like a machine, of which the process is structured and efficient (Morgan, 2006). However, when the environment becomes unstable, the organic form of organizations has more advantages because of its structural flexibility and ability to adapt to change (Morgan, 2006). Societal culture with high uncertainty avoidance and power distance may well prefer the mechanistic form, while the organic form thrives in the culture of low uncertainty avoidance and power distance (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013; Hofstede, 1997).

In Confucian Asia culture, people are comfortable with the mechanistic form, of which the organization life is structured and governed by policies and regulations (House et al., 2004). People respect the hierarchical authority and need to be told what to do. Business practices are routinized (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013), and stability with low risk in management is preferred. For example, unlike in organizations in the United States, sales staff in the organizations of Japan receive higher base pay and lower commissions (Society of Human Resources Management, 2012). When promoting innovative projects, members of Confucian Asia culture tend to enact organizational rules and norms to resist change (House et al., 2004). In contrast, members in the culture of low uncertainty avoidance and power distance, such as Anglo and Nordic Europe, dislike rules and resist formalization and standardization (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2004). They prefer autonomy and use their own discretion. They embrace change as a norm and have more tolerance of ambiguity (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013), for which the organic form of organization fits better. Different from members of Confucian Asia culture, they view unexpected situations as an opportunity to learn, and that is why action research and action learning prevail in Nordic countries (Eikeland, 2012). Information and knowledge are obtained through a process of mutual learning (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011), in
which bosses are viewed as equal and employees expect to be consulted by them (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013).

**Information of Uncertainty**

Besides organization form, information is another issue to be dealt with in environmental contingency theory. Based on the information theory of uncertainty (Duncan, 1972), Confucian Asia culture members may more easily perceive uncertainty than those in Anglo and Nordic Europe cultures (House et al., 2004). In a changing environment, Confucian Asia culture members may feel the need to keep the situation under control and are comfortable when needed information is known or available in a manageable amount and rate of change (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). They predict risks and prepare detailed plans. A Chinese employee may ask as many questions as possible before beginning a new project to ensure perfect understanding of the work and expectations from the manager (Society of Human Resources Management, 2012).

Whatever forms of organization or ways to manage information are employed, organizations need to change as the environment changes (Morgan, 2006). To handle the different conditions and elements demanded by the environment, Anglo and Nordic Europe may face less challenge than Confucian Asia, particularly in restructuring internal systems through integration and differentiation (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). Low power distance makes egalitarian leadership possible, in which power or authority can be redistributed, so realignment with the environment can be achieved (House et al., 2004; Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). While environmental contingency theory mostly addresses the alignment with the technical and physical environment from a modern perspective, institutional theory adds the social elements to the study from the symbolic perspective. The following section presents how organizations work in the three culture clusters in terms of the social, culture, political and legal elements.

**Institutional Theory**

Organization theorists argue that along with raw materials and other resources, social elements also play an important role in the study of organization-environment relations (Dimaggio & Powell, 1983). Institutional theory expands the perspective by including social legitimacy as a contributor to both the organizational development and transformation process (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). Two major issues that institutional theory deals with are isomorphism and institutional change (Dimaggio & Powell, 1983; Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). Organizations are pressured to conform to a set of institutionalized beliefs and processes from the environment, as well as to innovate when change is needed. Culture wise, the most relevant dimensions are power distance, uncertainty avoidance, performance orientation and collectivism (House et al., 2004). Based on the report of House et al. (2004), the culture values of Confucian Asia score the highest in all dimensions except performance orientation. On the contrary, the culture values of Anglo and Nordic Europe score the highest in performance orientation. Yet, both Anglo and Nordic Europe score higher than Confucian Asia in terms of institutional collectivism. The following sections show how isomorphism and institutional change work within the culture dimensions.
Isomorphic Pressures

Based on DiMaggio and Powell (1983), organizations are pressured to become isomorphic with the environment in three ways: coercive, mimetic and normative. Coercive isomorphism is a response to the expectations of the society in which the organization exists, including political, legal, cultural and traditional conditions, which work best in the culture of high power distance. Instead of pressure, coercive isomorphism is viewed as a valued practice by Confucian Asia, because people are used to accepting wills imposed on them and conformity is a culture norm (Hofstede & Bond, 1988). Institutional theory is preferred for it helps to minimize uncertainty and encourage loyalty and cohesiveness through collective actions (House et al., 2004). As a matter of fact, culture members of Confucian Asia give power to the institutional environment over them to meet their needs of dependency (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). However, coercive isomorphism finds little room in Anglo and Nordic Europe cultures where societies perceive control and domination as inappropriate behaviors (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). In low power distance cultures, members are independent and individualistic for which mimetic and normative isomorphism fits better. This type of isomorphism as explained by DiMaggio and Powell (1993) is basically to model oneself after best practices, which involves a transformation that occurs in the face of uncertainty. It encourages the spirit of being on the cutting edge, which prevails in the culture of low uncertainty avoidance. Also, low bureaucratic structure allows equality of status, and high performance orientation fosters the pursuit of professional excellence (Ouchi, 1979), though this application may turn out to be more industrial than national.

Institutional Change

Another issue of institutional theory is about institutional change. If institutional theory promotes the idea of environment determination, how then can institutions change? While enactment theory (Weick, 2003) proposes the creating of environment, Hatch and Cunliffe (2013) suggested a term of institutional entrepreneurship. Though institutions do change in reality, the process is complex and difficult. No matter what societal culture, change deals with the breaking down of mature and established forces of routine (Wright & Zammuto, 2013). Due to low power distance, uncertainty avoidance and individualism, institutional change may happen more easily in Anglo or Nordic Europe than Confucian Asia culture. Or to put it in a more accurate way, institutional change or entrepreneurship may look different in Confucian Asia from Anglo or Nordic Europe perspectives (Hofstede & Bond, 1988). Wright and Zammuto (2013) claim that in Anglo culture, institutional changes occur “when organizations located at the field center, periphery, and in between trigger different multilevel processes” (p. 308). The misalignment urges the group of actors to realign structure or redistribute power (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013), which can be supported by the culture trait of low power distance. In Nordic Europe, such realignment may even be welcomed, as seeking deconstruction and bringing about innovation are prevailing thoughts that well match with low uncertainty avoidance and low power distance.

In Confucian Asia societies, high uncertainty avoidance does not initiate change, high power distance frustrates the change process, and collectivism enlarges the scope and complexity of change. As institutional change often means a shift of assumption, system, power and control, it clashes with the long
and deeply embedded beliefs, high context of culture, bureaucratic structure, self-protective leadership and centralized control (House et al., 2004). Institutional change can also be viewed as disloyalty, rebellion and anarchy for the society of collectivism, which frustrates even the thought of institutional entrepreneurship. That is probably one reason why, in spite of rapid economic growth, there are still few institutional changes seen taking place on a large scale in China, a phenomenon which puzzles western scholars (Hofstede & Bond, 1988; Smallbone & Welter, 2012).

**Stakeholder Theory**

Stakeholder theory approaches organization from a post-industrial perspective (Bell, 1973). The distinguishing feature of post-industrial organizations is boundarylessness, which means boundaries with the environment or between internal groups are either transparent, permeable or have disappeared (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). People collaborate in a way of cross-function and cross-team, and change is ever-existing. Another issue of stakeholder theory is the implication of ethical obligation, in which environmental sustainability and corporate social responsibility are two major movements (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). In the application of stakeholder theory, the most relevant culture dimensions are uncertainty avoidance, power distance and human orientation. Confucian Asia scores higher than Anglo and Nordic Europe in uncertainty avoidance and power distance, whereas Nordic Europe scores higher than Confucian Asia and Anglo in human orientation (House et al., 2004). The following sections show how boundarylessness and corporate responsibility are embraced by the three culture clusters.

**Boundarylessness**

Boundaryless organizations prevail in Anglo and Nordic Europe cultures (Evers, Anderson, & Hannibal, 2012). With low uncertainty avoidance, boundarylessness is viewed as an organizational dynamic, of which entrepreneurs are the central force in developing and leveraging stakeholder relationships (Barney, 1991). Constant change is a chance for single-loop, double-loop and even triple-loop learning to renew organization capabilities (Ambrosini, Bowman, & Collier, 2009). In the learning process, mistakes are celebrated. With low power distance, CEOs recognize the vitality of the connection with stakeholders and proactively build networks internationally and leverage their expertise, knowledge, and resources (Evers et al., 2012). International New Ventures in Ireland, Sweden and Denmark are good cases of business organizations that experience fast international market growth through employing the resources of all stakeholders (Oviatt & McDougall, 1994).

However, Anglo and Nordic Europe may find it harder to promote their successful practices of stakeholder theory to Confucian Asia due to high uncertainty avoidance and power distance. For Confucian Asia, the work of handling multiple stakeholders and constant change can be overwhelming. The existing hierarchy clearly defines divisions, reporting lines and fixed roles, giving no room to cross-function (Morgan, 2006). Cross-team or multi-stakeholder collaboration means chaos that breaks the value of harmony (Zhang & Prosser, 2012; Zhao, 2012). Paradoxes and mistakes created by double-loop learning challenges stability and causes people to lose face. The whole idea of boundarylessness is too ambiguous and uncertain for Confucian Asia to tolerate (Hofstede & Bond, 1988).
Corporate Responsibility

It is the argument of stakeholder theory that corporate responsibilities should not be restricted to the protection of shareholder interest but should include the fulfillment of social obligations to all stakeholders (Freeman & Reed, 1983). Corporate responsibility is a concept stemming basically from Western culture, such as Anglo or Nordic Europe, based on Judeo-Christian faith (Kim & Choi, 2013), which fosters a high culture dimension score of human orientation. It becomes the motivation for corporate responsibility activities, which denotes “a generalized sense of altruism, the notion that one should help others in need, even those one does not know, without expectation of benefit of reward” (Wokutch & Shepard, 1999, p. 533). In Confucian Asia, by contrast, corporate responsibility is characterized as relationship and collaboration, fulfilling ethical obligations to achieve harmony and cohesion of family, organization and the society, even at the expense of individual interest (Boardman & Kata, 2003).

In practice, Anglo and Nordic Europe cultures demonstrate their understanding of corporate responsibility in the movements of environment sustainability and corporate social responsibility, by working against exploitation of multinational corporations and calling them to take care of the larger environment and to promote the welfare of disadvantaged groups (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). Confucian Asia is more likely to narrow the scope to national corporations rather than multinational corporations because they identify themselves with national corporations where individuals cooperate with the organization to work together for the common good (Kim & Choi, 2013).

The issue of human rights identified by corporate social responsibility may be a challenge in Confucian Asia culture as social stability is built on unequal relationships in the social system (Hofstede, Neuijen, & Ohayv, 1990; Kim & Choi, 2013). High power distance and institutional collectivism, which lack the understanding of stakeholder theory, view human rights as detrimental to the society, making communication and transplanting of the human rights concept a difficult task to tackle (Tang & Li, 2009; Zhao, 2012).

Conclusion

Environmental contingency theory, institutional theory and stakeholder theory were born, used and modified largely in Western societies such as Anglo and Nordic Europe in the past (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013). As organizations go global today, these theories are applied and tested on a larger international scale (House et al., 2004; Hofstede, 1997). Will the theories generalize to Confucian Asia? Culture is one determinant in answering the question (Senge, 2013; Kim & Choi, 2013). As this study explains, the culture dimensions of high power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism and low human orientation in Confucian Asia hinder the application of these three theories rather than enhancing them. But the good news is that as Western organization theorists struggle to find inroads to the Confucian Asia society, Confucian Asia may be stimulated and awakened to revisit their beliefs and assumptions within the culture, seeking new ways to understand organizations. Hopefully, such seeking may lead to new revelations toward truth.
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A Conceptual Framework for Understanding Transcendental Phenomenology Through the Lived Experiences of Biblical Leaders

Stephanie Sheehan
Regent University

Transcendental phenomenology brings added dimensions to the study of human experiences through qualitative research. Grasping and using its philosophical tenets such as noema, noesis, noeses, noetic, and epoche in a meaningful way can be challenging, given their abstraction and complexity (Moustakas, 1994). This paper provides a conceptual framework for deeper understanding and, therefore, more meaningful practice using parallels that emerge from the lived experiences of two biblical leaders, Pharaoh (of the Exodus) and Saul/Paul. An additional layer of the framework provides integration with theories of decision-making and organizational outcomes.

Transcendental phenomenology (TPh), largely developed by Husserl, is a philosophical approach to qualitative research methodology seeking to understand human experience (Moustakas, 1994). Pure TPh is grounded in the concept and conditioned upon setting aside all preconceived ideas (epoche) to see phenomena through unclouded glasses, thereby allowing the true meaning of phenomena to naturally emerge with and within their own identity (Moustakas, 1994). Moustakas discusses at length Husserl's philosophical underpinnings of TPh. Though philosophically sensible, the terminology somehow lacks clarity even when defined. For example, noema is defined as “not the real object but the phenomenon, not the tree but the appearance of the tree” (p. 29), that which is “perceived as such” (p. 30), and “that which is experienced, the what of experience, the object-correlate” (p. 69). The term noesis is defined as the “perfect self-evidence” (p. 30), the “the act of perceiving, feeling, thinking, remembering, or judging ... ” (p. 69), the “way in which the what is experienced, the experiencing, or act of experiencing, the subject-correlate” (p. 69). Noeses is defined as “bring[ing] into being the consciousness of something” (p. 69). In true philosophical style, even with multiple definitions of each term, there remains a question of “what?”. These terms when understood create more value and richness in the study of human experience, yet perhaps are shunned due to a lack of opportunity to apply them in a familiar context.

This exegetical research first discusses Husserl's transcendental phenomenology constructs of noema, noesis, and epoche as presented by Moustakas (1994), followed by discussion of elements that affect individual decision-making. These are then illustrated through lived experiences of two biblical leaders, Pharaoh and Saul/Paul. The lives of Pharaoh and Saul/Paul share some striking similarities that serve well at providing relevant examples of Husserl’s philosophical constructs and the import these have on leader decision-making. This is accomplished through a comparative
study of Pharaoh’s lived experiences during and after the plagues (Exodus 7 – 12; 14) and the lived experiences of Saul/Paul before and after his Damascus road encounter (Acts 7 – 28).

**Literature Review**

Phenomenology is a form of inquiry that seeks to understand human experience (Moustakas, 1994), to explore phenomena and how it is perceived and experienced by individuals in the phenomenological event (Lester, 1999). Moustakas (1994) posits phenomenology as an appropriate tool for exploring and describing shared experiences related to phenomena. Phenomenology within the realm of religion is a highly debated topic. Blum (2012), however, advocates for its use and positioned it as that which can “offer an interpretation of religion or of religious experience and consciousness” (p. 1029) and that which “seeks to disclose the meaning encapsulated and expressed in the religious discourse, text, or experience under analysis” (p. 1030). Blum added that phenomenology “seeks to describe and interpret the perspective of the religious subject or the experience that the subject regards as real” (p. 1030). Blum clarified the role of phenomenologist, stating the primary interest is “in the experience of that which the subject takes to be transcendent, rather than in the transcendent itself” (p. 1030). Perhaps most succinct and relevant is Padgett’s (2008) definition of phenomenology: “explor[ing] the lived experience of a phenomenon” (p. 35). The word phenomenon originates from *phaenesthai*, a Greek word meaning to “flare up” or “appear,” and its construct comes from *phaino*, a Greek word meaning to “bring to light, to place in brightness ...” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 26). Although the light is to provide clarity in order to see things authentically, the process of seeing requires epoche.

**Epoche**

Husserl introduced the concept of consciously setting aside current thoughts, beliefs, and judgments which lend themselves to bias with use of the Greek word epoche, “meaning to stay away from or abstain” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 85). Moustakas noted that epoche is a conscious process of identification and subsequent quarantine of naturally occurring thought patterns. Blum (2012) described epoche as “the suspension of this natural attitude” (p. 1032), “allowing things, events, and people to enter anew into consciousness, and to look and see them again, as if for the first time” (p. 85). Moustakas (1994) notes the difficulty, and yet necessity, of the process in order that “we may see with new eyes in a naïve and completely open manner” and “suspend everything that interferes with fresh vision” (p. 86). The process is continual throughout as the mind sometimes wanders, and each thought previously set aside must be done so again through acknowledgement, followed by the intentional act (Moustakas, 1994). It is through epoche that one becomes able to perceive and receive that which is communicated without tainting its purity with preconceived beliefs, thoughts, or judgments (Moustakas, 1994). The source of these is based on experiences which result in the construction of individual noesis and noema, noetic reference, and noematic meaning.
Noesis, Noema, Noetic-Noematic

Noetic-noematic schema represents the connection between an individual and the world (Sousa, 2014). Noesis, noema, and the noetic-noematic correlates are critical to understanding transcendental phenomenology (Moustakas, 1994). The noetic is derived from noesis and the noematic from the noema (Moustakas, 1994). The noema and noesis are inseparable (Ashworth & Greasley, 2009; Moustakas, 1994). Yet the definitions and examples are often clouded with ambiguity, leaving novice researchers with more questions than answers. In response, this section attempts to synthesize Moustakas’ definitions and descriptions, as well as provide additional examples before discussion in the context of biblical leaders.

Noema is defined as “not the real object but the phenomenon, “not the tree but the appearance of the tree” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 29), that which is “perceived as such” (p. 30), and “that which is experienced, the what of experience, the object-correlate” (p. 69). Moustakas describes the appearance of the tree as unique to an individual and based on multiple factors such as lighting, angle, and life experiences. Noema ascribes meaning to what one sees, touches, thinks, or feels, noting that each experience has meaning for an individual (noematic meaning) (Moustakas, 1994). Blanchard (2013) distills a succinct meaning of noema, defining it as a social phenomenon.

Moustakas (1994) explains noesis as the “perfect self-evidence” (p. 30), “the act of perceiving, feeling, thinking, remembering, or judging ... ” (p. 69). Noesis is the way in which a noema is experienced (Moustakas, 1994); it is one’s internal perspective that defines the noema (Blanchard, 2013).

Usage is often the best teacher, and, therefore, some examples of noema/noematic meaning and noesis/noetic framework are included. Ashworth and Greasley (2009) identify noesis as the “mental orientation to learning” and noema as that which is to be learned (i.e., studied) through one’s perceptions or interpretations. Ashworth and Greasley describe a scenario of a dyslexic student who struggles with learning (noesis) and who dislikes and avoids interacting with the textbooks, declaring that learning is too difficult and laborious (noema). Moustakas’ (1994) example was describing his own reaction to a situation in which he received medical advice (noema) for a health condition as critical disbelief and distrust (noematic meaning). Moustakas recognized that the source of the noematic meaning was his noesis, or noetic framework, which was formed through a prior experience with medical professionals in which healthcare decisions had a tragic impact on a sibling. Flood (2006) identifies noesis and noema in the Bible. Flood points to the text itself as the noesis or noetic framework, and its noema are its reader(s) as “the object of the text’s noesis or noetic process,” or the noema can be an “extra-textual source to which it bears witness, [such as] the voice in the burning bush ... ” (p. 506). Blanchard (2013) provides two strong and clear examples: First, he describes an elevator full of people (the noema) facing the doors and buttons because that is what convention has taught (noesis). If an individual were to get on the elevator and face the opposite way, the noema (social phenomenon) would be disrupted, because it goes against the noetic framework established by convention. Blanchard’s second example described an individual as observing two people from a distance, not knowing their
relationship. The individual must set aside immediate musings (epoche) and continue observing to determine if perhaps the two individuals are family, romantically involved, or another social phenomenon (noema) (Blanchard, 2013). In summary, noema is the observable phenomenon—and is texturally rich. Noesis is the internal structure/structuring that drives interpretation of the noema—the noetic framework produces noematic meaning. It is these which must be set aside in order to have valid inquiry as a researcher and objective decision-making as a leader.

Individual Decision-making and Inherent Vulnerabilities

Organizational decisions determine the company’s trajectory, and poor decisions have the power to change the trajectory and negatively impact organizational outcomes (Ivancevich, Konopaske, & Matteson, 2011; Mellahi & Wilkinson, 2004). For organizations with a powerful leader and without external or board governance, poor decisions can be catastrophic, because, as Sharpanskykh (2009) states, individuals make decisions within the context of self—self-needs, abilities, perception of organizational environment, and social structure. Given the self-focus, these individual decisions are vulnerable to overconfidence (Fast, Sivanathan, Mayer, & Galinsky, 2011), commitment escalation, and risk (Ivancevich et al., 2011).

Overconfidence

Overconfidence describes an individual’s self-magnified knowledge, superiority, and accuracy (Fast et al., 2011). Fast et al. state that power results in overconfidence, an inflated sense of being able to personally affect and/or manage outcomes through personal action or ability. This “illusory control” perpetuates repetition of belief in self, belief in accuracy of self-knowledge, and continuation of the decision-making logic. (Fast et al., 2011). In a meta-analysis of extant literature on decision-making, Sleesman, Conlon, McNamara, and Miles (2012) found and validated that overconfidence in decision-making is an antecedent to escalation of commitment.

Commitment Escalation

Geiger, Robertson, and Irwin (1998) describe escalating commitment behavior as when an individual continues pursuit of an objective or decision despite indicators that failing results will not change. Leaders feel compelled to have consistency of decision and therefore, despite evidence, remain committed to a decision in spite of observable failure, as though the initial decision had been correct (Sinha, Inkson, & Barker, 2012). This arises from a sense of self-justification about the current or previous decision and leads to internal pressure to continue commitment to the decision to prove its correctness (Geiger et al., 1998), even in the face of new information and/or undeniably negative outcomes, when, clearly, new decisions should have been made (Maner, Gailliot, & Butz, 2007). In some sense, it seems the risk of being wrong outweighs all other influences.
Risk Aversion and Power

When decision makers are afraid of risk, the decisions made tend to be risk averse. Though appearing safe, these risk averse decisions may not be best in the long-term interest of the organization (Ivancevich et al., 2011). Risk aversion and/or avoidance can stem from fear of losing power and/or position due to negative outcomes from risky decisions. This occurs primarily when concerned with loss of legitimate power and/or position by someone with coercive power (Ivancevich et al., 2011; Maner, Gailliot, & Butz, 2007). Given the findings of Fast et al. (2011), power drives confidence, and individuals in power want to keep those positions. It appears there may be a loop of power exertion and power maintenance driven by the need to be powerful and the fear of losing such power.

Illustration of Conceptual Framework through Lived Experiences of Biblical Leaders

This illustrative framework of the philosophical constructs and applicability of phenomenological paradigms is based on a comparative study of Pharaoh’s lived experiences during and after the plagues (Exodus 7 – 12; 14 NKJV) and the lived experiences of Saul/Paul before and after his Damascus road encounter (Acts 7 – 28). During these times, each oppressed God’s people (Ex 5; Acts 7, 8), received direct revelations from God (Ex 5 – 14; Acts 9), and experienced three days of darkness (Ex 10:21-23; Acts 9:8, 9). Within these contexts, noema, noesis, epoche, and how these influence decision-making will be illustrated.

Pharaoh

As Exodus opens in Egypt, Joseph has just died (Ex 1:6), the children of Israel were highly favored and blessed, and a new king appeared—a king who did not know Joseph (Ex 2:6-7) nor all that he had done for Egypt (Gen 41: 37- 47:26), nor would he have cared. This pharaoh was from a different dynasty than the previous pharaoh (Nichol, 1953). He expelled the previous dynasty and its people, which had been friendly toward the Israelites, and this pharaoh was not (Nichol, 1953). This new ruler was fearful that the multitudes of the Israelites would turn against the Egyptians and side with their enemies and decreed that heavy oppression must be used to subdue the Israelites (Ex 1:9-14). He also attempted genocide of the Israelites through the killing of the male children being birthed (1:15-22). Against this backdrop the story of the birth of Moses through his call to rescue Israel is told (Ex 2-6). In the next seven chapters (Ex 7-14), the story of Moses and Aaron as God’s mouthpieces to Pharaoh takes place. It is in this covenantal act of freeing His people (Ex 6:1-8) that the word given to Abram regarding the time of sojourn and affliction of His people in a foreign land has fulfilled its time (Gen 15:13), the same spoken of by Paul in Galatians 3:17.

Pharaohs were all-powerful in the land (Gen 41:40), and though they kept advisors, the pharaoh was still the decision-maker for the territory under rule. As Moses and Aaron approached Pharaoh with God’s command to free His people, Pharaoh’s embrace of power, control, and defiance
surfaces in his first response: “Who is the Lord, that I should obey His voice to let Israel go? I do not know the Lord, nor will I let Israel go” (Ex 5:2). Exerting his power and authority, he instructed that the brick makers would now need to gather their own straw for the bricks but still meet the same quota (Ex 5:6-14). As the drama unfolds in chapters 6 - 14, Pharaoh demonstrates the same prideful stubbornness. At each request by Moses for Pharaoh to heed the word of God to free His people, Pharaoh resisted and made the decision not to free the Israelites (Ex 6 - 11).

Pharaoh’s life experiences resulted in a noesis built by position, power, authority, and ethnic elitism. This noetic construct resulted in the social phenomenon, the noema, of class and status differentiation, and noematic feelings of superiority and entitlement. In each scene of the pre-Exodus events, including the pre-plague request by Moses and Aaron, Pharaoh is provided demonstration of a power greater than his own. Yet, his decision to disregard God remains. The stakes continually heighten, yet Pharaoh does not relent. After each manifestation of God’s power, Pharaoh had the chance to make a different decision. He had the opportunity to set aside his noetic and noematic schema—to experience an epoche in order to see things as they really were; however, he did not. In the scenes of the first and second plagues (water becomes blood; frogs), Pharaoh justified his disbelief, disobedience, and decision, since his magicians and sorcerers replicated the plague (Ex 7:22,23; 8:7, 15). During the second plague (frogs), Pharaoh told Moses he would free the people if Moses would petition and provide relief from the frogs, but when relief was wrought, Pharaoh remained committed to his decision and reneged. The magicians could not replicate the third plague (lice), and told Pharaoh it was “the finger of God,” but Pharaoh would not relent (Ex 8:18, 19). Beginning with the fourth plague (flies), God provided even more clarity for Pharaoh by afflicting only the Egyptians and not the Israelites (Ex 8:21-23). Pharaoh once again declared a changed decision and pled for mercy; yet once relief was provided, Pharaoh remained committed to his original decision (v. 28-32). The fifth plague brought disease that killed all of the Egyptian’s livestock, but Pharaoh did not repent (Ex 9:1-7). The sixth plague brought boils to all of the Egyptian people, but Pharaoh did not repent (Ex 9:8-12). The seventh plague brought torrential hail that destroyed crops and structures. At this, Pharaoh declared that God was righteous, he and his people were sinners, and that he would therefore let God’s people go upon relief from the hail. When the relief came, Pharaoh reneged once again, remaining committed to his rebellious decision (Ex 9:13-35). The eighth plague brought locusts which ate everything left after the death of the livestock and the destructive hail, including every tree—so many locusts they would fill every house and cover the face of the earth (Ex 10:1-6). At this point (before the locusts arrived), Pharaoh’s advisors finally spoke up to Pharaoh, noting the utter destruction of Egypt and urging Pharaoh to obey God and let the Israelites go and serve the Lord in order to avoid further catastrophe (v. 7). Pharaoh, however, only offered a compromised decision that the Israelite men could go. So the plague of locusts came as God had warned, and did so much damage that “there remained nothing green on the trees or on the plants of the field throughout all of Egypt” (v. 16). In response, Pharaoh repeated his declaration of having sinned against God, and he begged for relief from the locusts, which God provided. Yet Pharaoh then refused to change his mind (vs. 16-20). The ninth plague brought darkness—darkness so heavy it could be “felt”—and it lasted for three days (v. 21, 22). Practically all of Egypt was annihilated, all because of Pharaoh’s unwillingness to admit that God’s sovereignty was greater than his authority. The three days of darkness provided
ample opportunity, again, for Pharaoh to intentionally shift his frames of reference—to set aside his noesis of supremacy and privilege and his noema of power. It was a period of time Pharaoh could have used to reevaluate the state of the land and people that had resulted from his decision and continued commitment to that decision. At any point had he done this and experienced an epoche, it would have enabled him to see the error of his pride, overconfidence, and desire for power, and the kingdom and the people would not have suffered such catastrophic loss. Pharaoh once again offered Moses a compromise that all could go, but no flocks and herds could be taken, which was still not a changed decision (Ex 10:24-28). Sadly, Pharaoh’s decision brought about the tenth and last plague, death of the firstborn, which physically and emotionally devastated his people (Ex 11:1-10; 12:29, 30). In spite of multiple tangible evidences of an unwise decision, counsel from advisors, the obliteration of crops and structures, and the physical and emotional sufferings of his people, Pharaoh remained in a state of continued escalation of commitment. Only after the death of the firstborn did Pharaoh finally acquiesce to God’s instruction to let Israel go (Ex 12:31). However, even after all that the people had personally endured (thirst, frogs, lice, flies, boils, hunger from loss of crops, eerie darkness, and death of children), and that the land and livestock had suffered (frogs, lice, flies, disease, hail, locusts), he returned to his original decision, determined not to lose power and not to submit to God’s sovereignty (Ex 14:5). This escalation of commitment to the previous decision eventually led to additional tragic losses.

Based on Sleesman, Conlon, McNamara, and Miles’ (2012) categorical and sub-categorical classifications of escalation determinants, Pharaoh’s action encompassed the following aspects of escalation as identified by category, theory, and definition:

- **Project:** subjective expected utility theory: personal preference for decision.
- **Psychological:** self-justification theory: a) self-confidence results in disregard of negative results from decision due to over-confidence of self-ability to reverse probable negative outcomes, and b) ego threat in which decision-maker is highly sensitized to others’ opinions and thus does not want to be wrong, in order to guard reputation.
- **Social:** self-presentation theory: decision-maker is concerned about others’ opinions and critique of the decision and wants to “save face” (p. 543).
- **Structural:** agency theory: decision-maker acts in best self-interest, even though not in the best interest of the organization.

In Pharaoh’s quest to capture and oppress the Israelites once again, he led his most able military men, over 600 of them, and all of the requisite military resources (chariots, horses, support troops, etc.) to their demise (Ex 14:27, 28). The end result of Pharaoh’s immovable and irrational decision was the severe suffering of the people, animals, agriculture, economy, and a devastatingly high death toll.

**Saul/Paul**

Saul of Tarsus (Acts 9:11) first appears at the end of a long narrative portraying Stephen’s recount of the history of Israel and its leaders (Acts 7). This discourse served as an indictment against the current leaders (Wiersbe, 1989) and resulted in the climactic and violent death of Stephen. Saul is
identified first as the one in front of whom Stephen’s murderers laid their robes to be guarded (Acts 7:58; 22:20). Saul was highly educated as a Hebrew and was a Pharisee (Acts 22:3; 26:5; 2 Cor 11:22; Phil 3:5), and he also held Roman citizenship (Acts 22:28). Saul was a persecutor of the church in Jerusalem and any believers of the “Way,” wreaking havoc with the church by kidnapping people from their homes, beating them, and putting them in prison (Acts 8:1-3, 22:4, 22:19; Gal 1:13, 14, 23). The fact that women were included in his persecution speaks to the fervor of his acting on his beliefs (Wiersbe, 1989). At the time of his pivotal experience, he was on his way to perpetrate more of this behavior specifically against the believers in Damascus—to arrest and imprison them (Acts 9:1,2). Saul is referred to as Paul for the first time in Acts 13:9 and the name Paul is used thereafter. Nichol (1953) notes that there are differing theories regarding his names, the most plausible for these purposes being the number of multilingual peoples at the time and the name variations in different languages. Thus Saul was his Hebrew name and Paul, the Roman version of the same name (Nichol, 1953). Given that Saul’s ministry from this point forward (Acts 13:9) is primarily to non-Jews, it is understandable that he is referred to by his non-Jewish name, except during his recounting of his testimony (Acts 22:7, 13; 26:14) (Nichol, 1953). Saul/Paul’s noetic framework, based on his quality Jewish upbringing, excellent education, and dual citizenship, led to his noema of entitlement, religious fervor, pride of heritage, and leadership as a Pharisee. These noetic-noematic dynamics manifested in wanton persecution of those who believed in the Messiah, which Saul considered to be the work of God. So he obtained open warrants for “any who were of the Way” and set out for Damascus (Acts 9:2). Intent on arresting believers, God essentially arrested him first (Acts 9:2). Saul’s testimony of this event is found in Acts 9:1-10; 22:1-21; and 26:12-18, as he recounts suddenly being amidst an intensely bright light, falling to the ground, and being questioned by the Lord about his persecution of Him (Jesus), to which he responds by asking what he should do. Saul was without sight for three days—three days of darkness (Acts 9:9), and it was a time of epoche for Saul that is evidenced by his inquiry to the Lord for instruction. Saul’s three days of darkness were spent setting aside all suppositions and reframing his noetic perspective and its noematic meaning. This is evidenced by his embrace of the knowledge that although he thought he was working for God, he was actually persecuting Him (9:5; 22:7; 26:15), and acceptance of the calling on his life to witness before “Gentiles, kings, and the children of Israel” (9:15). He later explained that his witness was to tell of what was and what would be revealed (26:16) and, ironically, to “open their eyes [Jews and Gentiles], to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among those who are sanctified by faith in Me” (26:18). Saul heard and received the counsel about his purposeful decision to persecute believers and, through an epoche, accepted God’s counsel, rescinded his decision, and changed the trajectory of his life. In comparison to Pharaoh’s determinants of escalation, Saul’s experience was the direct opposite. Based on Saul’s submission to God, and the acceptance and fulfillment of his mission, it becomes clear that Saul acknowledged God’s power and sovereignty, set aside his personal preferences, tempered self-confidence and ego, and disregarded others’ negative opinions of his newly constructed noetic-noematic paradigm. Paul’s humility, in response to direct revelation from God, prevented escalation of commitment (Owens
& Hekman, 2012) and contributed to his successful work among the Gentiles and the building of the first century church.

Conclusion

The concepts of noema, noesis, noetic-noematic, and epoche in transcendental phenomenology exist in relative abstraction and complexity (Moustakas, 1994), and often lack relevant examples. Offering insight through establishment of parallels between these theoretical concepts and lived experiences of the biblical leaders Pharaoh (of the Exodus) and Saul/Paul contributes to the body of knowledge in this area. Pharaoh and Saul each oppressed God’s people (Ex 5; Acts 7, 8), a manifestation of their noema and noesis; received direct revelation of God (Ex 5 – 14; Acts 9) as contradiction to current direction and as a prompt for epoche; and were each allotted three days of darkness (Ex 10:21-23; Acts 9:8, 9), during which to each had opportunity to embrace an epoche of their respective noematic and noetic paradigms. The decisions each of these leaders made with regard to setting aside presuppositions to see things as they really were, rather than their own perceptions and constructions had vastly different results. Pharaoh was not willing to fully experience an epoche and, consumed by his own noetic and noematic paradigms, led his empire (i.e., organization) to suffer interminable losses and be gutted of leadership and resources (Ex 7:1 - 14: 28, 29). Saul, however, experienced an epoche as he set aside his paradigms in order to see things differently (Acts 9:5-9) and consequently led the effort to build the first century church (i.e., organization). These narratives also illustrate the intricacies and potential vulnerabilities of leader decision-making and the highly variable outcomes dependent upon leaders that demonstrate obstinance and commitment escalation, or humility to accept reality and rescind poor decisions.
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Globalization has taken traditional organizational leadership theory and altered it in an attempt to accommodate the changing business environment. Competitive advantages typically found in traditional sources are depleting on the basis of enhanced organizational knowledge. Creativity and innovation are the primary suppliers of this trend, developing cause for consistent organizational transformation. For this purpose, organizations are now relying on creativity and innovation as their competitive advantage, requiring greater leadership for applying these new ideas. This essay addresses creativity and innovation, applying a sacred texture analysis of the Book of Jude. To follow, a social, cultural, and psychological textural lens is applied in order to further interpret how creativity and innovation impacted the prosperity of Christianity. Finally, this essay juxtaposes Scripture with contemporary leadership challenges pertaining to creativity and innovation focusing specifically on vision, communication, and empowerment. Findings indicate an importance placed on maintaining ‘true intent’ despite the overwhelming urge for extemporaneous strategy formulation beyond shared organizational vision.

Effective leadership, from a situational perspective, is conducted in response to environmental conditions. Considering this perspective, the current organizational outlook factors on globalization, technology, and liberalization as virtual unknowns when it comes to forecasting the ever changing organizational environment. According to Venkaiah and Drucker (2013), traditional means for competitive advantages are shifting toward adopting a new economic approach for organizations. In particular, dynamic industries, or those characterized by rapid growth (Milberg & Gray, 2013), have altered the perception of change and inculcated transformation as a continuous response to shifting environmental conditions.

Scripture offers a comparable outlook that considers a transformational response to adaptation and growth. A confluence of perception exists when considering leadership exemplified within Scripture and necessary leadership during the 21st century. Biblically-based leaders, like that of contemporary leaders, were forced into the unknown when adopting various methods for identification within an environment of unpredictability. It was transformation and adaptation depicted throughout Scripture which provided sustainability for Christianity, thus overcoming the negative implications brought about by creative and innovative change. From a contemporary leadership position, negative implications stemming from an ever changing organizational environment include knowledge management processes, strategic, information technology, resources and relationships, and crises management (Venkaiah & Drucker, 2013, pp. 10-11) to name a few. Further, Venkaiah and Drucker (2013) suggested that organizations, as their only means for survival, become adaptive to emerging conditions through transformational processes.
Therefore, transformation was and is necessary in order to circumvent a shifting environment.

Enormous pressures on 21st century leadership originate from the aforementioned challenges primarily as subsets of both creativity and innovation. In this sense, creativity and innovation can be viewed as negative occurrences challenging the status quo. This essay serves as a reference for juxtaposing Scriptural leadership and 21st century leadership challenges through an analysis of the Book of Jude. Findings indicate that positive perceptions of creativity and innovation were a mark of self-fulfilling agency from false teachers who took away from God’s true intent by describing apostolic teachings as “outdated” or “uniformed” (DeSilva, 2004, p. 875). This essay first considers the Book of Jude as its primary Biblical reference for describing various points of contention. Socio-rhetorical criticism, specifically sacred texture analysis that considers social, cultural, and psychological textural lenses help further describe the historic setting. Finally, three transformational principles form around vision, communication, and empowerment pertaining to organizational creativity and innovation challenges in the 21st century.

Sacred Texture Analysis

Socio-rhetorical criticism offers a textual analysis for multi-layer assessments (Poon, 2006). According to Robbins (1996) socio-rhetorical criticism is a tool to assist with analyzing various sources by placing them in dialogue. In addition, socio-rhetorical criticism seats the reader in a position of interactivity through text exploration. Within the primary field of socio-rhetorical criticism are five subsets: (a) inner texture analysis; (b) intertexture analysis; (c) social and cultural analysis; (d) ideological texture analysis; and (e) sacred texture analysis. The latter, according to Winston, Bekker, and Phil (n.d.), provides an examination of how God is viewed in various instances within the text. In order to further aid the exploration of creativity and innovation in leading early Christian communities, this essay will take a deeper look into the Book of Jude, specifically ferreting out social, cultural, and psychological aspects applying textural lenses.

The Book of Jude

Jude, brother to James, half-brother to Jesus, is commonly viewed as a leader in Jewish Christianity. The Book of Jude was chosen for this essay because the author was engaged with a great diversity of traditions similar to that of contemporary culturally diverse organizational leaders. Jude’s primary interest was addressing teachings inconsistent with revelations from the apostolic gospel (DeSilva, 2004). From his perspective, Jude believed select teachers were applying creativity and innovation in order to give false authority and legitimation for their own enrichment and enjoyment. Jude interpreted this falsification as cause for judgment when accusing these teachers of manipulating the Godly gift of grace through immorality (v. 4).

The Book of Jude depicts fictional teachers as destroyers of self for selfish purpose (v. 16) and leaders of fruitless lives (v. 12). Knowing that God had historically punished for worse (sinners, unbelievers, Israelites, angels, Sodom and Gomorrah, etc.), Jude expresses fear of judgment for these sinners as a warning (Carson, Moo, Morris, 1992, p. 459). Jude’s strategy was to
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communicate with followers of these false teachers, gaining their trust and favor. Then, while referencing historic Biblical accounts, Jude challenges the character of these false teachers (vs. 17-18).

Social Texture Lens

From a social perspective, Jude’s challenge of the false teachers’ character was an attack on their honor. According to DeSilva (2004), honor during that period was a classifier for constituting placement in the hierarchical society. Therefore, Jude applied character judgment on those seeking false refuge within the upper echelon of society built upon the importance of significance to others. Within this society, reputation could be lost through accurate judgment providing a great consequence to those accused and deemed guilty.

Cultural Texture Lens

DeSilva (2004) speaks of the cultural lens as a dichotomy of purity and pollution. In other words, members of a culture view certain actions and values as pure and others as caustic. Within the New Testament texts, inherent values were founded on rejection of societal majority, toward faithful and obedient followers of Christ. Individuals following Christ and this minority depiction were forewarned by God’s commandment of Aaron (Lev 10:10) not to be a conformist of separatist society; rather discern between ‘holy and common’. Within this minority following was a hierarchy starting at the top with the high priest, followed by priests, Levites, and those with access to Christ. According to DeSilva, individuals found within this society, beyond what was deemed common, held a responsibility of cleanliness and holiness. However, as Jude aptly exposed, those attempting to advance within this hierarchy by claiming false access to Christ were actually perceived as devilish in their actions (v. 11).

Psychological Texture Lens

Finally, considering these social and cultural norms, Jude was able to gain favor of the false teacher audiences and raised questions as to their credibility of character. Knowing honor and shame were critical components to status, Jude’s psychological approach was to expose those innovators of fictitious accounts under selfish intent for the purpose of dishonoring them within their communities. Despite the social hierarchy formed by conditions of character, those visibly deemed dishonorable, from a social and cultural context, were historically excluded from future patronage (Heb 6:4-8; 10:26-31). Therefore, Jude’s attempt at gaining favor by his audiences served to reverse selfish benefits received by false teachers, thus holding them accountable for these unfaithful actions.

Juxtaposing Scripture with Contemporary Leadership

This analysis of the Book of Jude provides an historic account of creativity and innovation as it relates to survival during an ever-changing environment. Specifically, the Book of Jude challenges the notion that everything calling itself Christian is good, and followers of Christ should abandon
discernment for tolerance. Despite the attempt by false teachers to alter God’s word, Jude teaches that Scripture is continually significant. From this context of continued Scriptural significance, within the depiction of creativity and innovation from Jude, comes three transformational principles for 21st century organizational leadership vision, communication, and empowerment.

Vision

As previously noted, prophets exposed in the writings of Jude were emerging through the claims of divine revelations beyond the apostolic teachings. The intent of these false teachers was to make Scripture more relevant to the times while enhancing their image in the process. However, Jude’s response was to expose these individuals for their wrongdoing, illustrating the importance of staying true to God’s vision (Maxwell, 2003). Therefore, from a spiritual context, the Book of Jude teaches that Christians need to keep with God’s vision despite innovation and creativity. From a contemporary standpoint, one could translate this teaching as maintaining vision or reasoning behind an organizational venture at all times while finding new uses within that vision through creativity and innovation, thus enhancing that vision. This assertion brings us to the first posed principle addressing the challenge of leadership today:

Principle #1: Leaders of burgeoning organizations in dynamic industries require illustrations of vision complemented by creativity and innovation in order to successfully transform their continuously changing environment.

Communication

Jude’s message was one of communication, addressing prayer (v. 20), compassion for doubters (v. 22), and avoidance of sin (v. 23) (Maxwell, 2003). The reader finds that Jude presents the importance of community, judging creators and innovators attempting to move away from God’s vision in His teachings. The message is not to excommunicate these individuals; rather, to have mercy and bring these individuals back in alignment (vs. 22-23). Similarly, 21st century leaders need to communicate organizational direction to keep followers aligned with progress (Venkaiah & Drucker, 2013). Specifically, Venkaiah and Drucker (2013) suggested that efficiency and commitment come from people who relate to, align with the values of, and assimilate into the organizational culture. This brings us to our second principle:

Principle #2: Leaders of burgeoning organizations in dynamic industries require communication in order to align innovative and creative individuals and ideas with organizational interests in order to successfully transform their continuously changing environment.

Empowerment

Jude’s message consistently pleads with his audience to return to a lifestyle pleasing to God (vs. 20-21). For example, Jude applies the word “ungodly” in multiple circumstances, laying the foundation for expressing judgment and establishing the requirement for both positive and
negative reinforcements (Maxwell, 2003). Essentially, through socio-rhetorical criticism, we find that Jude is empowering the reader to determine for themselves, right from wrong. From a 21st century perspective, leadership must be viewed as a collective effort due to the complexities of a global economy and the constant creative and innovative avenues. Gibert and Fairholm (1994) mentioned that “leadership is an interactive function of a leader and several followers jointly engaged” (p. 8). Venkaiah and Drucker (2013) suggested that this collective effort is a factor of followers and leaders being united under shared-terms and organizational goals. Therefore, the third and final principle here proposes:

Principle #3: Leaders of burgeoning organizations in dynamic industries require a collective effort on the part of the organization in order to successfully transform with their continuously changing environment.

Conclusion

Jude’s negative perception of creativity and innovation within the text was not a dismissal of the importance of creativity and innovation; rather a message promoting aligned creativity and innovation. Teachers promoting fictional accounts for selfish purposes were not aligned with God’s true intent. Therefore, Jude offered necessary leadership by guiding followers back to His truth. His message was one of consequence for those straying from this true path, requesting that creativity and innovation not be separated from intent. Consequence for falling out of alignment was continued Divine judgment despite the notion of grace (vs. 14-15), which Jude expressed as a gift to be respected, not a license for impunity.

Leaders of contemporary organizations in this global economic environment are charged with anticipating, envisioning, maintaining flexibility, thinking strategically, and acting as change agents (Christensen, 1997). Strategic leadership methods, such as the principles relating to vision, communication, and empowerment, become of critical importance in order to achieve desired outcomes. Further, the competitive environment continues to advance, requiring constant creativity and innovation for dynamic organizations to maintain their competitive advantage. Despite the need for leaders to evolve and remain flexible (Mullins & Komisar, 2009), focus should be placed on true intent, thus avoiding the threat of extemporaneous idea formulation and the execution of strategic decisions beyond that of organizational vision and purpose.
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Fear is routinely used in organizations and interpersonal relationships as a source of motivation. Some research supports the use of fear to motivate employees to work and to change. However, fear has long lasting negative effects that outweigh the motivation that it produces. This paper proposes and supports the notion of love as a central motivator in place of fear. Inner texture exegesis of 1 John 4:18, along with recent research on love in organizations, supports the move from fear to love. Love produces long lasting effects of inspiration and heart level motivation, increased creativity and effectiveness, and a release of energy. It offers holistic health and growth to individuals. Although replacing fear with love requires a paradigm shift, the effort produces an organizational environment that is more productive and more attractive to employees.

Fear is used regularly in organizations to produce motivation and change. Fear is also regularly used to motivate people in families, churches, and in one-on-one settings. Some research shows that fear is a good motivator and if used wisely can produce positive results. This present research delves into the concept of fear as a motivator, and its opposing force love. Love and fear are considered as motivators and the results of their usage are examined. Inner texture exegesis of the biblical concepts of love and fear in 1 John 4:18 bring further clarity to Christians desiring to motivate others through love or fear.

**Fear as Motivation in Organizations**

Fear is commonly used as a motivating force in organizations and in relationships. Tanner, Day, and Crask (1989) present projection motivation theory which concerns how individuals who process threats choose responses to cope with danger brought on by the threats (p. 267). Tanner et al. use projection motivation theory to study fear appeals used in marketing. They propose that fear appeals are most effective when subjects are presented with a coping strategy. Welbourne (1994) applies this research to organizational change and proposes that fear tactics may be used effectively in organizational change, but only when coupled with coping strategies that aid individuals in identifying behavior that will help them adapt to the change and avoid the fear-inducing consequences of the change. Welbourne advocates the use of fear in organizational change and suggests that fear is the primary motivator of change, which should be used by organizations facing change to motivate cooperation by the members. There is a stream of research that encourages the use of fear in organizations as a way to motivate their organizational members to change.

Secretan (2009) agreed that society has “embraced fear as a weapon to coerce others to do their bidding” (loc. 71). Secretan believes that in a vast majority of organizations and institutions (marketing, leadership, coaching, politics, education, health care, parenting, and religion), fear has
become the “base operating system” (loc. 71). However, there is evidence from Secretan and many others that fear may not be an ideal form of motivation.

Ryan and Oestreich (1998) declare that, “fear doesn’t motivate toward constructive action. On the contrary, it nourishes competition within an organization, fosters short-term thinking, destroys trust, erodes joy and pride in work, stifles innovation and distorts communication” (p. xiii). They acknowledge that fear is the primary motivator employed by many organizations. However, they find that fear consistently undermines “the commitment, motivation, and confidence of people at work” (Ryan & Oestreich, 1998). They believe that the key to breaking the power of fear is to create environments where trust, productivity and innovation can flourish, and that banishing fear is the only way to accomplish this goal.

Although some previous research such as Welbourne’s (1994) advocates the use of fear to motivate people towards change, other authors disagree. According to Ryan (1998), fear breeds the absence of motivation and ideas; in fact, fear crushes enthusiasm and creativity. Fear causes people to live in silence, afraid to talk about issues that need to be discussed. Fear discourages communication, creating an environment where individuals are reluctant to speak up, causing negativity, anger and frustration (Ryan & Oestreich, 1998, p. 5). Helliwell (2009) finds that individual fear undermines trust and often manifests itself in “territorialism, aggression, depression, and escapism” (loc. 1476). Furthermore, fearful people are unable to do their best work since much of their time and energy are spent watching their backs, covering themselves, and playing it safe (Helliwell, 2009, loc. 1524). People are unable to fulfill their potential; they are miserable, and only able to give a fraction of what they could if they were not controlled by fear (Helliwell, 2009, loc. 1524). Helliwell also found that when under the influence of fear even irrational fears appear rational. People under the influence of fear are in an unbalanced emotional state and lose their sense of perspective. Fearful people tend to see the negative side of things, tend to see visions of doom and generally feel that their lives are covered in a murky gray cloud (Helliwell, 2009, loc. 1493).

It is evident from this research that fear, while widely used in the work place, does more harm than good. Fear creates an environment where people are less productive causing individuals and the organization as a whole to suffer. Fear makes people not speak up, not give their whole selves at work, but rather act in ways that are self-protective. While used to motivate people, fear often falls short and ends up demotivating them. Ryan and Oestreich (1998) propose that the way to dispel fear in the workplace is through fostering trust. Trust encourages people to talk about problems and is in opposition to fear. Secretan (2009) proposes that love is the psychological, emotional and spiritual opposite of fear (loc. 74). Scretan believes that although fear can produce some kind of motivation, but only love can inspire. He proposes that, “love is the place that gives rise to inspiration” (2009, loc. 74).
Fear and Love in 1 John 4:18

A biblical passage that talks directly about fear and love, 1 John 4:18, speaks of perfect love that casts out fear. A closer exegesis of this passage illuminates the biblical concepts of love and fear and gives further support to love as the central motivator replacing fear.

The author of 1 John wrote the book in the context of Christians who had left the church and were denying that Jesus was the son of God (Elwell & Beitzel, 1988). In response to this, the author of 1 John introduced a theme of love, which permeates the book with over 40% of the verses in 1 John dealing directly with the subject of love (Bartling, 1958). The author made the case that anyone who does not act in love does not know God (4:8). The logic is this: God is love and so those who love know God and those who do not love do not know God. 1 John 4:7-21 urges Christians to accept God’s unconditional love for them and in turn to show love to one another. It is in the midst of this appeal to embrace God’s perfect love and love one another that 1 John 4:18 states: “There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear; for fear has to do with punishment, and whoever fears has not reached perfection in love” (New Revised Standard Version).

There are two kinds of fear spoken of in the Bible in regard to God. There is fear that refers to the reverence of a son in obedience to his father, which is eulabeia. This form of fear is often used in regard to Christians fearing (or respecting, obeying, humbling themselves before) God. However, in this verse fear refers to the fear and dread that a bondslave may have, phobos (Robertson, 1933). This verse states that fear has to do with punishment. This is true from the literature on fear; punishment or threat of punishment is used to cause fear, which then motivates people to do things they would otherwise not do. Fear and punishment in the Bible and in the literature are always bound together.

From this verse, we find that fear and love are mutually exclusive (Jackman, 1988; Marshall, 1978). When God’s perfect love is present, fear is cast out, forcefully removed, because the two cannot coexist together. If there is fear, perfect love is not present. If there is perfect love, fear cannot be present. This verse establishes that perfect love is the opposite of fear and that the two cannot coexist together. However, God alone can live out perfect love. Perfect love is not an option for every person because of human nature; humans are unable to enact perfect love as God does. As 1 John 4:18 shows, Christians must live in a state of love, mirrored after God’s perfect love, and it is God’s perfect love that casts out fear. Christians, therefore, should not use fear as a relational tactic, but rather love, love that is modeled after God’s perfect love.

The Greek word used to describe the love that Christians are to have for God and for others in this passage is agapao. Agape love and agapao love are often seen as interchangeable, but Winston (2002) makes a distinction between them. Agape love, which is used in this passage only to describe God’s love “is a self-sacrificing love that references total commitment even unto death” (Winston, 2002, p. 5). The statement “God is love” made in 1 John 4:16 is an example of the usage of the word agape. Agapao love, on the other hand, is defined as “a moral love, doing the right thing at
the right time for the right reason. To love in a social or moral sense, embracing the judgment and the deliberate assent of the will as a matter of principle, duty, and propriety” (Winston, 2002, p. 5). Agapao love is the kind of love that Christians are to have towards God and towards their neighbors. Every instance of a person loving God or loving others in this passage is agapao, a human love that mirrors God’s love, but is not the same as God’s love.

This passage advocates the act of agapao love as the central place for the Christian. Love (agapao) of God and love (agapao) of others is expected as an act of knowing and accepting God’s (agape) love. Christian leaders need to make their foundational approach to leadership enacting love as it is described in this passage. The work environment then becomes permeated with love, rather than the cultural norm of fear. Agapao love as described by Winston (2002) is a moral love that does the right thing at the right time for the right reason; it is the foundation of relationships between people and produces motivation at the heart level, even inspiration. In an environment permeated with love, fear has no place. And conversely in an environment permeated with fear, love has no place.

Love and Respect as Replacement for Fear in the Workplace

A number of authors advocate love as a replacement for fear in organizations and relationships in general. Secretan (2009) proposes that a leader who is humble, forgiving and loving is more authentic and is more inspiring and effective as a leader. He believes that love should take the place of fear and defined love as “the place where my heart touches your heart and adds to who you are as a person” (loc. 81).

Regine (2009) believes that vulnerability is power; feeling vulnerable is "letting yourself feel the love and be in the love" (loc. 173). Vulnerability is described as an "incredible connectedness" with other human beings, in the moment of communication, in which each person is heard and validated. In essence Regine advocates love and vulnerability to unleash authenticity and to promote deep level communication and understanding (loc. 172).

Ryan and Oestreich (1998) believe that the opposite of a fear-based organization is a trust-based organization. Covey (2006) also proposed that trust is the foundation of changing everything in an organization. Covey (2006) delineated a process for fostering and increasing trust in organizations that involves self-trust, relational trust and stakeholder trust. Covey (2006) believes that trust fosters good communication, respect, transparency, and justice; overall, trust helps organizations to be much more efficient in every way. Trust, as these authors present it, can best be fostered by a loving environment, but trust is destroyed by fear.

Caldwell and Dixon (2009) advocate that to promote employee ownership, commitment, and individual initiative, employees need to be inspired by their leaders. A review of the organizational leadership research finds that love, forgiveness, and trust are essential values for leaders who desire to maximize the value of organizations and at the same time enable individuals to become the best they can be.
Argandona (2011) argues that the mechanistic view of organizations that focuses primarily on the procuring of resources, making of goods and services, and selling of goods and services leaves no room for love. In this view of an organization people are another resource and the relationships between people are governed by contractual agreements. Instead, Argandona presents organizations as many individual people connected by relationships and motivated (or demotivated) to work. Each action is motivated by extrinsic reasons (reward or punishment), intrinsic reasons, and external reasons (how the action effects others in the organization). Argandona proposes that transcendent values also affect people because they want to act in moral ways that have positive effects on the organization and especially on other people. In order to create an organization that is effective, attractive, and that grows and changes over time, people must be treated as whole people in the organization. Argandona argues that contractual agreements do not inspire, but love enacted in different ways throughout the organization produces inspiration and releases human motivation in a way that contractual relationships cannot.

Ahiauzu and Asawo (2010) conducted a quantitative study in Nigeria, which measures altruistic love in the workplace with worker commitment. Their study provides evidence that altruistic love practiced in the workplace leads to high affective and normative commitment on the part of workers (p. 97). This study lends quantitative evidence that at least one aspect of work (worker commitment) is increased in an environment of altruistic love. Further quantitative research such as this could be conducted to measure multiple outcomes of altruistic love in the workplace.

Ferris (1988) proposes that organizational love is the foundation of all that organizations seek to accomplish. Employees today are interested in life values, fulfillment, and a sense of wholeness, all of which Ferris believes are founded in love (p. 41). Furthermore, leaders are expected to have creative insight, sensitivity, vision, and connection with employees, which Ferris argues are all based on love. Argandona (2011) defines love as “a feeling of caring or deep respect for yourself and others, of valuing and believing in yourself and others, and of helping to achieve the best of which everyone is capable” (p. 42). Ferris (1988) notices that love does not fit well with the modern notion of how organizations are run, and yet for the underlying needs of employees to be treated holistically and for organizations to be productive, love needs to become an acceptable norm. Love in an organization means caring for the health of individuals: physical, emotional, mental and spiritual health. It means sharing power, and truly caring and desiring the best for others. Ferris believes that focusing on love in organizations demands a paradigm shift away from our present cultural norms for organizations. However, Ferris also believes the rewards are great: releasing a vast amount of human energy through inspiration, creating a deeper and more holistic organizational alignment, releasing energy for productivity and creativity, and creating stronger and more empowering leadership.

Bakke (2005) shares lessons learned from many years of leading a multi-national energy company. Bakke’s passion is “to make work exciting, rewarding, stimulating and enjoyable” (p. 13). Bakke’s philosophy of leading is to care deeply for those he works with and to do everything in his power to make them feel in control of their work and capable of making decisions. Bakke believes that the biggest determinant of an employee’s effectiveness is not intelligence and education, but rather
an organizational culture that “treats people of every background as creative, capable, responsible, and trustworthy” (p. 182). Bakke promotes a work environment of love, concern and respect for every individual. In Bakke’s personal experience, when he purchased a power plant and implemented his principles of love and respect in the workplace, the power plant could be run with approximately half the employees and produce approximately double the electricity. Bakke found this to be consistently true no matter what country the power plant was in. Bakke’s experience shows that an environment of love and respect unleashes creativity, initiative, effectiveness, and efficiency that is stifled in an environment of contractual agreements, or worse yet, an environment of fear.

This literature builds a strong case for love to replace fear as the basis of the work environment. Love fosters inspiration, harnesses the full capacity of the person, and releases organizational members to realize their full potential. Although fear has a motivational effect, it also has devastating and limiting consequences. Love empowers, creates, and releases; most of all it inspires people to apply themselves fully and frees them to realize their potential.

Conclusion

The default motivator in organizations and relationships is fear. It comes naturally, is easy, and has immediate effects. It seems to fit nicely into the mechanistic view of organizations and the contractual relationship between employees and their supervisors. Many modern organizations use some sort of fear to control or motivate members. However, fear also has negative effects. Although it may produce motivation, it also undermines trust, crushes creativity and at best offers only moderate amounts of motivation.

The inner texture exegesis of 1 John 4:18, as well as current research on love and fear in organizations, supports the notion of substituting love for fear in the workplace and in personal relationships. Love creates the foundation for trust, creativity, openness, and living up to one’s full potential. Love has the capability of motivating from a heart level, motivating through inspiration. Where fear has crippling consequences for a mediocre boost in motivation, love produces positive results and motivates through heart level inspiration, unlocking potential that would be crushed by fear.
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