

## Collaboration, Consensus and Communion: “Matters of Character and Heart”

Francis W. Devoy

---

**Abstract:** *Today's business world and catholic church call for effective collaboration. This paper explains that collaboration is a prized way of acting, but is also the outcome of a process. Reaching consensus is a prior step and is achieved when collaborators arrive at a common vision and a common purpose about the nature of their organisation, and about the ministry or work they wish to collaborate in. Drawing on Likert's organisational models and the church's ecclesiology, this paper explains that the church is an authoritative body, exercising the ideals and internal consistency of a consultative/participative organization. Further, the collaborative process only occurs effectively and without dysfunction with this understanding. At the heart of the participative process within the church is the spirituality of communion (communio): a Trinitarian openness and trust, which seek a unique harmony in collaborative relationships and teamwork.*

---

**Key Words:** ecclesiology; church – business model; church – sociology; collaboration; consensus; Likert's organisational model; communion

---

Allan Cohen's introduction to the book *The Portable MBA in Management* is at pains to explain that the business practices of the 1950s are no longer the envy of the world, for they no longer work. The 1950s were a long time ago. And too much has changed.<sup>1</sup>

Generally speaking, people are aware of this. Most businesses were forced by competitive-ness, or stockholders, or by their members, or by other compelling factors to move from those 1950 practices or become extinct. Mostly they moved. And mostly from an authoritarian or exclusively authoritative leadership style to the participative, acting collaboratively. After all, as Cohen explains, “[by] definition organisations consist of more than one smart person sitting alone and doing all the work.”<sup>2</sup>

The external pressures for change experienced by parishes were not quite the same as those felt in business. Nor was the movement in parishes always to a posture of collaboration. Parishes had pressures of a different kind: not the least being a newly designed Vatican II parish with unprecedented levels of expectation, entitlement, and involvement by the laity. And so in these times John Paul II reminds everyone that

---

<sup>1</sup> Allan R. Cohen, *The Portable MBA in Management* (New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, 1995), 1-7. Cohen edits this text of contemporary thinkers in the field of management.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, 7.

“pastors ... also know that they themselves were not established by Christ to undertake alone the entire saving mission of the Church.”<sup>3</sup>

The 1950s notion of being the boss, being ‘sole arbiter’ of what’s best for the parish, stayed with some parish priests. Many priests, however, made essential changes to the way parishes were organised, mostly based on intuition - a little participation here and a little there. But because some felt, conveniently or otherwise, that they would be held ‘finally responsible’ (by their bishops and perhaps by canon law), they insisted on remaining the ‘sole arbiters’ of a parish’s hopes, with all that it entailed. Often that way of thinking or acting resulted in minimal collaboration, or worked actively against it.

In those former days of business practice, Cohen insisted, there was no place “for relationships, teams, openness and trust - matters of character and heart.”<sup>4</sup> In a real sense, that was true also of decision-making in parishes. And yet, while sophisticated organisational theory had been developing for years as the basis of ‘best practice’ for organisations, there was little sophistication in what priests drew on to guide them in their new Vatican II parishes which were now, by definition, equally as complex and sophisticated - perhaps even more complex than other single focused organisations. For them, there was no clear framework on which to base collaboration.

Today in large bookstores there are hundreds of textbooks on the art of leadership, organisational theory, and management practice. And second nature to ‘best practice’ and the theory underpinning it are notions of relationships, teams, openness and trust - matters of character and heart. Given a powerful ecclesiology-the dynamics of grace and the work of the Spirit-which Church people must acknowledge, it is still hard to fathom why complex organisations such as parishes could be considered exempt from such theory and practice!

### *The Anatomy of Collaboration*

Collaboration demands character and heart. It simply won’t work in a parish organisation without real relationships, teamwork, trust and openness.

Collaboration also demands an understanding (at least minimal) of the nature of an organisation, for the nature of an organisation determines, in the main, the levels of collaboration possible within it. In simple terms, every organisation has two essential dimensions: the institution with its roles and expectations; and individuals with their personalities, hopes, expectations and needs who comprise it.<sup>5</sup> Collaboration is possible only when these two aspects, and the contents of both, are understood well and brought into harmony.

This is true of a parish. An understanding of the parish’s canonical nature (as an institution made up of individuals) is essential if collaborative harmony is to be achieved. One needs to know: what limitations and opportunities Canon law determines for a parish as institution; what matters, as a consequence, are open to discussion by the individuals

---

<sup>3</sup> John Paul II, *Christifideles Laici, on the Vocation and the Mission of the Lay Faithful in the Church and the World*, Apostolic Exhortation, (Homebush: St Pauls, 1989), no. 32; cf. Vatican II, *The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Lumen Gentium*, ed. Walter M. Abbott (Melbourne: Geoffrey Chapman, 1967), no. 30.

<sup>4</sup> Cohen, *The Portable MBA in Management*, 1.

<sup>5</sup> See the work of Egon Guber and Jacob Getzels in Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, *Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974), 68-70; for ecclesiological perspective and the notions of *Gemeinschaft* (informal group) and *Gesellschaft* (formally structured society), see Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974), 43-45.

who comprise it; and, to what extent might a parish be a participative, or consultative, or authoritative, or a democratic organisation?

In general, collaboration (that is, *working with others* to achieve an harmonious outcome) requires consensus (that is, *thinking with others* to reach a thoughtful and sure agreement). Consensus comes first. Every step towards a successful collaborative outcome is always preceded by a process of thinking with others about the nature of the organisation (or a particular work within it), coming to agreement about it, and consenting to the nature of the task to be undertaken. When people have reached such consensus, then those participating in the decision-making process can collaborate freely towards an effective, appropriate, and harmonious outcome.

The glue that binds these processes together is a dynamic interplay of virtue, which inspires relationships, teamwork, trust and openness. In *Novo Millennio Ineunte*, John Paul II refers to the personal qualities that characterise such interplay as the “spirituality of communion.” It is a spirituality that brings soul to what he calls the “structures of participation”:

the spirituality of communion, by prompting a trust and openness wholly in accord with the dignity of and the responsibility of every member of the people of God, supplies institutional reality with a soul.<sup>6</sup>

Again:

Let us have no illusions: unless we follow this spiritual path, external structures of communion will serve little purpose. They would become mechanisms without a soul, “masks” of communion rather than its means of expression and growth.<sup>7</sup>

The Pope goes further:

Communion must be cultivated and extended day by day and at every level in the structures of the church’s life. ... To this end, the structures of participation ... must be ever more highly valued. ... The theology and spirituality of communion encourage a fruitful dialogue between Pastors and the faithful: on the one hand uniting them a priori in all that is essential, and on the other leading them *to pondered agreement in matters open to discussion*.<sup>8</sup>

The Pope’s insights identify the three organisational dynamics alluded to above:

- 1) “the structures of participation,” referring to a collaborative spirit within the parish as a canonical institution;
- 2) “pondered agreement,” indicating a deeply reflective posture and attitude, leading to a well thought through consensus by the individuals who comprise the canonical institution; and
- 3) “matters open to discussion,” alluding to the limitations and opportunities that are products of the canonical nature of the Church as institution.

In short, one needs to be clear about the nature of the organisation (the parish) and how it behaves as an institution and system; to reach a consensus about the nature of the task to be accomplished, including what is possible and what is not within its institutional framework; and then collaborate freely and effectively in the exercise of the church’s mission in the parish.

---

<sup>6</sup> John Paul II, *Novo Millennio Ineunte: At the beginning of the New Millennium*, Apostolic Letter, (Strathfield: NSW; St Pauls, 2001), no. 45. Italics mine.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, no. 43.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, no. 45. Italics mine.

## 1. COLLABORATION AND THE NATURE OF A PARISH ORGANISATION

The over-riding requirement of the Church is that its leaders should act in ways that are *participative*, and do so by ensuring that *participative structures* are in place. But this hope can only come about if it fits exactly the organisational structure of the Church and what it permits canonically in terms of participation. This is so because participation/collaboration depend on a more-or-less perfect match. Organisational theory and Canon law guide us:

From the vantage point of organisational theory, these pertinent general principles must be kept in mind:<sup>9</sup>

- 1) organisations (including parishes) are complex social systems: since they have mutually interdependent parts, any change to one part of the organisation affects all other parts.
- 2) an organisation, by design, is dynamic and has compatible component parts: it will change (for better or otherwise) when forces that are external to it, and events that are internal to it, change.
- 3) to force an organisation to work in ways that are not consistent with its nature and complex structure will cause it to act dysfunctionally, e.g., using the decision-making processes of a highly authoritative system in a system that is fully participative will cause dysfunction. Hence, it is not possible to graft one system onto another without some form of dysfunction.
- 4) If one person has the authority within an organisation to make all or any final decision for that organisation, a fortiori it is not a fully “participative” organisation. This is self-evident.

Given that these principles apply to parishes as organisations, by virtue of principle 4) above, the Church is not a fully “participative” organisation. And while the Church’s hope is for authentic genuine participation, in the real world of the Church bishops can say ‘no’. So too can parish priests. And they do; each drawing perhaps on pastoral directives and/or Canon Law:

The structures of participation envisaged by Canon Law, such as the Council of Priests and the Pastoral Council... of course are not governed by the rules of parliamentary democracy, because they are *consultative rather than deliberative*; yet this does not mean that they are less meaningful and relevant.<sup>10</sup>

The law, by providing precise rules for participation, attests to the hierarchical structure of the Church.<sup>11</sup>

Again:

Diocesan and parochial Pastoral Councils and Parochial Finance Councils, of which non-ordained faithful are members, enjoy a consultative vote only and cannot in any way become deliberative structures.

It is for the Parish Priest to preside at parochial councils. They are to be considered invalid, and hence null and void, any deliberations entered into, (or decisions taken), by

---

<sup>9</sup> Phyllis F. Schlesinger and Leonard A. Schlesinger, “Designing Effective Organizations,” in Cohen, *The Portable MBA in Management*, 210-213. See also Rensis Likert, *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), 123-127.

<sup>10</sup> John Paul II, *Novo Millennio Ineunte*, no. 45. Italics mine.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*, no. 45.

a parochial council which has not been presided over by the Parish Priest or which has assembled contrary to his wishes.<sup>12</sup>

And again:

... It would therefore be senseless to consider the pastoral council as a body replacing the parish priest in his government of the parish, or as one which, on the basis of majority vote, materially constrains the parish priest in his direction of the parish. In accordance with the norms of law on just and honest administration, bodies which have been established to consider economic questions in a parish, may not constrain the pastoral role of the parish priest, who is the legal representative and administrator of the goods of the parish.<sup>13</sup>

By virtue of organizational principles 1) to 3) above, participative processes need to be carefully thought through in parishes. True, the church calls for its structures to be participative and its decisions to be the product of “pondered agreement.” But it also advises that these processes should occur in “matters open to discussion” - implying that there are some matters *not* open to discussion, and for which such processes would be inappropriate.

To what extent, then, can an organisation be fully “participative” when someone has the authority to limit: the boundaries of discussion; the content of discussion; or who can be involved in the discussion? Participative decision-making and collaboration certainly can take place in a parish or diocese, and most certainly do and ought to. The issue is: how much participation and collaboration can occur in what is effectively an authoritative consultative structure, keeping in mind that organizations - including parishes - must act in ways that are consistent with their nature and complexity?

From the above, a tentative principle follows:

The degree of collaboration that occurs in a *parish* will be in direct proportion to the degree of consensus achieved about the organisational (and canonical) nature of a parish by parishioners and priest together. The greater the consensus about the nature of a parish, the greater the possibility of collaboration; the less the consensus, the less the possibility of collaboration.

This principle will be clear when the second issue of church law and spirit are treated in the pages that follow.

### *Organisational Design and Canonical Imperatives*

In the late 1960s, social scientist Rensis Likert researched extensively the dimensions of organisational types within the workplace. He settled on four major organisational systems. Spanning from a deeply authoritarian organisational model and style of leadership across to the fully participative, they are: Exploitive Authoritative, Benevolent Authoritative, Consultative Authoritative, and the Participative group:<sup>14</sup> See appendix A. (I have taken the liberty of adapting Likert’s models, by changing some key words: “superior” to “pastor”; “subordinate” to “parishioners”; “organization” to “parish”; and “job” to “task”).

<sup>12</sup> Dicastries of the Holy See, *Instruction on Certain Questions regarding the Collaboration of the Non-ordained Faithful in the Sacred Ministry of Priests* (Strathfield, NSW: St Pauls Publications, December, 1997), Article 5, nos. 2 and 3. See also, *Codex Juris Canonici*, cann. 514, 536; and can. 537.

<sup>13</sup> Congregation for the Clergy, *Instruction: The Priest, Pastor and Leader of the Parish Community* (Strathfield: St Pauls, 2003), no. 26.

<sup>14</sup> Rensis Likert, *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value* (New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), 4-10. For the sake of clarity in this paper, I have taken the liberty of changing the words “superior” to “pastor”, “subordinate” to “parishioners”, “organization” to “parish”, and “job” to “task”. I have also introduced his later designation of system headings and design format into this chart – see pp. 14 ff.

Limited though these organisational types may be, they provide, nonetheless, a framework for understanding the organisational spectrum. As mentioned on the previous page, each of Likert's four systems has mutually interdependent parts which cause each system to behave in ways consistent with its type. Each is a complex system, where by one type cannot be grafted onto another without a somewhat dysfunctional outcome.

After examination of the chart, what becomes clear is that the Church is at least a "consultative authoritative" organization – illustrated in the third organizational model from the left. It is also clear that a real amount of participative and collaborative endeavour can and does occur in the consultative authoritative system. To illustrate this fact, Likert *breaks the horizontal line* in the organisational headings to the right of the word "consultative". He has done this because it is the nature of the consultative-authoritative 'to bleed' a little into the participative and v.v. – consultation embraces some level of participation. But to depict more adequately the Church's contemporary sense of a parish canonically and organizationally (and show something of the bleeding!), I have constructed an extra column (shaded in appendix A) headed "Consultative/participative", still within the authoritative structure zone.

A parish of its nature, both organisationally and canonically, may be best described as a consultative-authoritative-participative structure.

It would be a mistake to imagine that a parish belonged to the fully "participative" system. Dysfunction would result because "the structures of participation envisaged by Canon Law ... are not governed by the rules of a parliamentary democracy, because they are consultative rather than deliberative."<sup>15</sup> And yet, as Cardinal Kasper explains, a genuine sense of the democratic must be an authentic element of the church's structural self-understanding:

Naturally, the church is not a democracy - but nor is it characterised exclusively by its hierarchical structure! In the past, the church adopted a number of feudal and monarchical elements in order to provide a concrete articulation for its own constitution. In the same way, it can and must take up some democratic structural elements and procedures today, in a manner both critical and creative, in order to express in the forms appropriate to human law its own constitution, which is prescribed antecedently to the church's action, since it belongs to the sphere of divine law and hence is inviolable. I do not have the impression that the implications of Vatican II have been fully realized as yet; these questions are still to be discussed in depth.<sup>16</sup>

The Church prefers to use the language 'consultative-participative' rather than the baldly 'democratic'; also, that these be balanced in an authoritative context. Keeping this in mind, there are many apostolates in a parish that are not totally governed or 'protected' authority-wise by Canon Law. High levels of consultation and participation *are* appropriate. In essence, their content or processes are simply not a major concern to the authoritative/ consultative nature of the Church. That would be true mostly of a Pastoral Carers' Team in a parish, for example - the priest would find collaboration there relatively easy.

On the other hand, a Catholic school might provide a different scenario, where considerable (if not major) authority resides with a principal and/or the Catholic Education Office; or where the pastor perhaps has not come to grips with the vision and common purpose of the catholic school in the parish/diocese.

---

<sup>15</sup> John Paul II, *Novo Millennio Ineunte*, no. 45.

<sup>16</sup> Walter Kasper, *Leadership in the Church: How Traditional Roles Can Serve the Christian Community Today* (New York: Crossroad, 2003), 63.

Given that almost all apostolates in a parish allow a collaborative style, there may still be some value in identifying, as an exercise, the relatively “authority-laden” and “authority-free” pastoral apostolates there. As a general rule if one keeps listening to, talking with, communicating and sharing with parishioners in a spirit of trust and openness in every pastoral endeavour in the parish, then consensus, participation and collaboration will surely result. The greater the degree of consensus among the parties to a particular parish endeavour, the greater the possibility of collaboration taking place.

## 2. CONSENSUS AND COMMUNION: PREREQUISITES FOR COLLABORATION

As mentioned above, collaboration (*working with others* to achieve an harmonious outcome) requires consensus (*thinking with others* to reach a thoughtful and sure agreement). Consensus comes first; it is a prerequisite for collaboration. A prior step, however, in reaching consensus is taken when a common vision is created among the individuals who comprise the institution, the parish itself, or one of its pastoral works.

Common vision is the living expression of shared meaning held by a group (i.e., by the participants in a pastoral work). It aims to bring clarity to the group’s understanding of what it is established for and why. It is arrived at by pastor and parishioners, under the inspiration of the Spirit; it is committed to writing, and stated with clarity. It cannot be arrived at independently of parishioners. Thus the process ensures a match between the common vision being sought and the personal needs, expectations, and hopes of those who participate in its decision-making and life. A parish’s common vision will be brought to fruition by a sense of common purpose.

Common purpose is an individual’s and group’s expression of the desirability of pursuing and being deeply involved in a particular pastoral work for which a common vision has been established. Hence, it is inseparable from the common vision and is the second step in achieving consensus.

Common purpose is the source of real meaning for those who participate in the organisational life of the parish or a part of it. As a result parishioners and pastor have a strong desire to be part of its life. It is, in fact, the source of commitment for parishioners and pastor.

The pastor’s role, as “head and shepherd,”<sup>17</sup> is to inspire and transform his people and, thereby, to synthesize and integrate the vision and purpose in order to achieve clarity, commitment, and consensus. His inspiration creates a “continuous stream of actions ... [which have] the effect of inducing clarity, consensus, and commitment regarding the organisation's basic purpose.”<sup>18</sup> This is done to celebrate one’s faith; to celebrate the faith of the Church, so that all are proud to profess it in Christ Jesus our Lord.<sup>19</sup>

In short, common vision brings *clarity*; common purpose ensures *commitment*. Consensus results from the percolation of a common vision (clarity) and a common purpose (commitment). One cannot collaborate without them. Nor can they be achieved without a mature Christian spirituality.

From this, a second tentative principle follows:

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. John Paul II, *Pastores dabo vobis* (Boston MA: St Paul Books and Media, 1992), in which this notion of sharing in the life of Christ, as Head and Shepherd, is very often repeated.

<sup>18</sup> Peter B. Vaill, “Visionary Leadership” in Cohen, *The Portable MBA in Management*, 22.

<sup>19</sup> From *The Rite of Baptism for Children* (1969), trans. ICEL (Sydney: E. J. Dwyer, 1989).

The degree of collaboration that occurs in a *parish pastoral ministry* will be in direct proportion to the degree of clarity, commitment, and consensus achieved between priest and parishioners concerning that particular ministry. The greater the clarity, commitment, and consensus about that ministry the greater the possibility of collaboration; the less the clarity, commitment, and consensus, the less the possibility of collaboration.

### *The Spirituality of Communion*

Consensus and collaboration occur properly when people act decently together: when they act with character and heart, driven by deeply Christian virtues. These virtues shape a respectful Christian attitude, defining a spiritual way of life - an attitude of communion, of *communio*. They provide soul to the structures of participation. According to John Paul II that spiritual way of life, that "spirituality of communion," is to be:

the guiding principle of education wherever individuals and Christians are formed, wherever ministers of the altar, consecrated persons, and pastoral workers are trained, wherever families and communities are being built up.<sup>20</sup>

The Trinity is central to this spirituality. Priests are reminded of this in *Pastores dabo vobis*, with its focus on relationships. The following lines summarize its message: A determining feature of the priest's configuration in Christ is its Trinitarian nature. At the core of priestly identity is a design that summons the priest to relationships based on the unity and integrity of the relationship between Father, Son, and Spirit.<sup>21</sup>

Ordination means relationships – the multiple and rich inter-connections which persist when the priest lives communion within the Church. And the blessings derived from being drawn into that mystery and communion compel him to mission. Thus the "come and see..." is a decisive invitation into relationships, which mirror the manner of Christ's very own mission.<sup>22</sup>

The unique harmony that defines the Trinity is the source and model of relationships which seek vision with its clarity, common purpose with its commitment, consensus as a state of mind and heart, and collaboration in practice. We are invited to adjust our sense of relationship by seeing that oneness and harmony "shining on the face of the brothers and sisters around us."<sup>23</sup>

In addition to the Trinitarian dimension, the Church asks its people to see others as "those who are part of me", drawing on the image of the Mystical Body:

This makes us able to share their joys and sufferings, to sense their desires and attend to their needs, to offer them deep and genuine friendship. A spirituality of communion implies also the ability to see what is positive in others, to welcome it and prize it as a gift from God: not only as a gift for the brother or sister who has received it directly, but also as a "gift for me."<sup>24</sup>

This insistence on communion calls everyone to make room for others and to be willing to bear each other's burdens. Further, each of us is reminded of the sources of discontent which defeat consensus, communion, and collaboration: namely, "selfish temptations which constantly beset us and provoke competition, careerism, distrust and jealousy."<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> John Paul II, *Novo Millennio Ineunte*, no. 43.

<sup>21</sup> John Paul II, *Pastores dabo vobis*, 12.

<sup>22</sup> See Francis Devoy, "Priestly Identity and Role: Engaging the Human and Mystical Phenomenon" (paper, National Catholic Commission for Clergy Life and Ministry, 31st May, 1999).

<sup>23</sup> John Paul II, *Novo Millennio Ineunte*, no. 43.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

To live the spirituality of communion - matters of character and heart, and more - is simply to live the challenge of one's baptism; no more, no less.

### 3. COLLABORATION: PERSONALITY AND TEAMWORK

John Paul II's Apostolic Letter has identified certain personality characteristics needed for collaboration: among the core characteristics are trust and openness. These qualities apply to both priest and laity. There is, however, a weightier responsibility on the priest. According to the Apostolic Exhortation, *Pastores dabo vobis*, the Pope says that the priest:

should be able to know the depths of the human heart, to perceive difficulties and problems, to make meeting and dialogue easy, to create trust and cooperation, to express serene and objective judgments. .... Future priests should therefore cultivate a series of human qualities, not only out of proper and due growth and realization of self, but also with a view to the ministry.<sup>26</sup>

*Pastores dabo vobis* calls for the priest to be: "credible", "acceptable", "a bridge for others", in order to allow "dialogue", "cooperation", and "trust."<sup>27</sup> The call is not just to 'ordinary' trust. The Apostolic Exhortation compels: mutual trust, complete trust, total trust, unflagging and unshakable trust and hope, to use the document's very own words!<sup>28</sup> Of special importance, it continues, is the capacity to relate to others.<sup>29</sup>

Such is fundamental to "the man of communion". Hence, spiritual development and affective maturity are "significant and decisive", otherwise the priest remains incomprehensible to himself and without meaning.<sup>30</sup> Such trust is comprehensive and, along with a depth of grace, is the critical foundational human quality that shapes one's capacity to share, to relate, to communicate effectively, to love and be intimate, to be a "man of communion". The healthy qualities of trust and openness - at the service of consensus, communion and collaboration - stimulate positive pastoral experiences which can be usefully exercised in self-managed teams.<sup>31</sup>

Given adequate, appropriate education and formation, parishioners working in self-managed teams - collaborative by nature - alleviate enormous pressures from the lives of priests. A self-managed team that prepares either young parents for Baptism, or engaged couples for Marriage, or looks after bereavement and does the 'leg work' for funerals, or conducts the RCIA, or worries about the management of parish plant etc. can be real blessings to priests in parish life. They are real lifesaving devices and should be fostered. Some consideration of the following guidelines or ground rules, however, is advisable:

- Team members are naturally required to work in the context of the opportunities and limitations that are defined for a parish by church law.
- The primary source of satisfaction for such teams is their strong performance based on clarity, commitment, and consensus, and obvious love for the Church.
- The activities and actions of teams should be task-oriented and not based on the individual feelings of team members.

---

<sup>26</sup> John Paul II, *Pastores dabo vobis*, no. 43.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> See *ibid*, nos. 1, 2, 33, 36, 43, 59, for references to trust.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid*, no. 43.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid*, nos. 43, 44.

<sup>31</sup> See Harvey Kolodny and Torbjorn Stjernberg, "Self-Managing Teams: The New Organization of Work," in Cohen, *The Portable MBA in Management*, 297-314. Considerable adaptations of an ecclesial nature have been made.

- Each team should have an identifiable organisational boundary, constructed to ensure an overall integration with the vision and purpose of the parish.
- The activities and actions of each team should have a clear beginning and end and any subsidiary tasks should be contained within the boundary of the team's primary task.
- Teams should have full access to the information they require to accomplish their task.
- Team members should be geographically close enough to be able to communicate easily.
- While the size of each team is dictated by its task, ideally it should not be too large.
- Teams should have control over many of their own administrative functions and should be self-starting, self-governing, self-regulating, and self-directing where possible, given the limitations and opportunities afforded by church law.
- Team members should participate in the selection of new members.
- Teams should not be overburdened by the details and specifications of its task.
- Members should ensure a balance of the workload of each member.

Inter-team coordination may be valuable at times to ensure an overall common vision and common purpose.

- Facilitation, education, and formation skills should be available to teams as required.
- Interdependent tasks require effective interpersonal relationships and teams should receive training and coaching support to foster such relationships.
- The skills necessary for each team should be comprehensible to all and achievable by most of its members.
- The pastoral coordinator of the parish (pastor or lay person) should provide inspiration, strong motivation and support for each team, particularly by synthesizing and integrating the vision and purpose of the apostolate in order to achieve clarity, commitment, and consensus.
- Team members should be appointed for a set period of time, otherwise avenues should be provided for team members to leave the team with the passing of time.

## CONCLUSION

The call for laity to participate and collaborate in the life of the church stems from their Baptism. For that reason (rather than an overextended clergy) participation and collaboration are fostered. The gifts, abilities, and talents of so many of the laity in so many facets of their lives are precious to every parish and diocese. Priests have both the responsibility and privilege of honouring God's call to the laity, which arises from Baptism; and they have the duty of availing themselves of a proper mode of participating and collaborating with them.

Central to a priest's disposition to participate and collaborate is his level of trust and openness. Virtually nothing can replace these qualities - their absence may well mean a level of vulnerability that is more inclined to drive competition, ambition, exaggerated control and distrust.

Today, perhaps more than ever before, priests face pressures the likes of which they hardly ever envisioned. Deep spiritual growth and affective development will provide the framework for collaboration and participation to occur as the sensible way forward. Thus, one immediate outcome of collaboration is an easing of pressure. "By definition," as

recalled earlier, “organisations consist of more than one smart person sitting alone and doing all the work”; further, “pastors ... know that they themselves were not established by Christ to undertake alone the entire saving mission of the Church ...”<sup>32</sup>

While the Church has made plain the problems associated with the clericalisation of the laity and laicisation of the clergy, vast opportunities remain for collaboration and participation. The hallmark of the mature priest is his ability to respect appropriate role differences while not breaching their respective boundaries, but participating and collaborating effectively nevertheless. The Church positively endorses and encourages those processes that bring soul to the structures of participation.

## APPENDIX A

ORGANISATIONAL AND PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS OF DIFFERENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS BASED ON A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS					
SYSTEM OF ORGANISATION					
OPERATING CHARACTERISTICS 1. Leadership processes used	AUTHORITATIVE System 1: Exploitive	AUTHORITATIVE System 2: Benevolent	AUTHORITATIVE System 3: Consultative -->	PARISH <-- Consultative/ Participative - >	PARTICIPATIVE System 4: Participative group <--
Extent to which pastors have confidence and trust in parishioners	Have no confidence and trust in parishioners	Have condescending confidence and trust, such as master has to servant	Substantial but not complete confidence and trust; still wishes to keep control of decisions	Acts with full confidence and trust; is held finally responsible in some major issues that are “not open to discussion” canonically	Complete confidence and trust in all matters
Extent to which pastors behave so that parishioners feel free to discuss important pastoral issues with their pastor	Parishioners do not feel at all free to discuss pastoral issues with their pastor	Parishioners do not feel very free to discuss pastoral issues with their pastor	Parishioners feel rather free to discuss pastoral issues with their pastor	Parishioners are encouraged to discuss pastoral issues quite freely	Parishioners feel completely free to discuss pastoral issues with their pastor
Extent to which	Seldom gets ideas and	Sometimes gets ideas	Usually gets ideas and	Canvasses widely for	Always gets ideas

<sup>32</sup> See Cohen, *The Portable MBA in Management*, 7; John Paul II, *Christifideles Laici*, no. 32; cf. Vatican II, The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, no. 30.

<p>pastor tries to get parishioners' ideas and opinions and makes constructive use of them in solving pastoral problems</p>	<p>opinions of parishioners when solving pastoral problems</p>	<p>and opinions of parishioners when solving pastoral problems</p>	<p>opinions and usually tries to make constructive use of them</p>	<p>ideas and opinions which are valued and used constructively where possible. Parish Pastoral Council is key body in this process</p>	<p>and opinions and always tries to make constructive use of them</p>
<p>2. Character of motivational forces</p>	<p>System 1: Exploitive</p>	<p>System 2: Benevolent</p>	<p>System 3: Consultative --&gt;</p>	<p>&lt;-- Consultative / Participative -&gt;</p>	<p>System 4: Participative group &lt;--&gt;</p>
<p>Manner in which motives are used</p>	<p>Fear, threats, punishment, and occasional rewards</p>	<p>Rewards and some actual or potential punishment</p>	<p>Rewards, occasional punishment, and some involvement</p>	<p>Motivates for the good of whole parish community and its ecclesial growth. Participation is key. 'Rewards' and 'punishments' are not part of language</p>	<p>Group participation and involvement in setting goals, improving methods, appraising progress toward goals, etc. .... system developed through participation</p>
<p>Amount of responsibility felt by each member of the parish for achieving parish's goals</p>	<p>High levels of management feel responsibility; ordinary parishioners feel less; often welcome opportunity to behave in</p>	<p>Management personnel usually feel responsibility; parishioners usually feel relatively little responsibility for achieving</p>	<p>Substantial proportion of personnel, especially at high levels, feel responsibility and generally behave in ways to</p>	<p>All are encouraged to accept responsibility for the parish's goals, hopes, and dreams. This is especially true for Pastoral/Finance Councils,</p>	<p>Personnel at all levels feel real responsibility for parish's goals and behave in ways to implement them</p>

	ways to defeat parish's goals	parish's goals	achieve the parish's goals	self-managed teams etc.	
3. Character of communication process	System 1: Exploitive	System 2: Benevolent	System 3: Consultative -->	<-- Consultative / Participative ->	System 4: Participative group <--
Amount of interaction and communication aimed at achieving parish's objectives	Very little	Little	Quite a bit	Wide ranging inter-action and communication at all levels, and within groups	Much with both individuals and groups
Direction of information flow	Downward	Mostly downward	Down and up	Essentially across, but also up and down in a fully transparent way	Down, up and with peers
Extent to which downward communications are accepted by parishioners	Viewed with great suspicion	May or may not be viewed with suspicion	Often accepted but at times viewed with suspicion; may or may not be openly questioned	Warmly received, subject to transparency; but with reasonable questioning invited/expected	Generally accepted, but if not, openly and candidly questioned
Accuracy of upward communication via line	Tends to be inaccurate	Information that boss wants to hear flows; other information is restricted and filtered	Information that boss wants to hear flows; other information may be limited or cautiously given	Is accurate. Information to enhance growth is heard from all; PP has ear to ground, meets parishioners often	Accurate
Psychological closeness of pastors to parishioners (i.e. How well	Has no knowledge or understanding of problems of	Has some knowledge and understanding of problems of	Knows and understands problems of parishioners quite well	Knows and understands parishioners very well, along with the	Knows and understands problems of parish-

does pastor know and understand parish-ioners' problems?	parishioners	parishioners		hopes, dreams, disappointments, problems etc.	ioners very well
4. Character of interaction-influence process	System 1: Exploitive	System 2: Benevolent	System 3: Consultative -->	<-- Consultative / Participative ->	System 4: Participative group <-->
Amount and character of interaction	Little interaction and always with fear and distrust	Little interaction and usually with some condescension by pastor; fear and caution by parishioners	Moderate interaction, often with fair amount of confidence and trust	"Structures of participation" in place, leading to high levels of friendly interaction, accomplished with trust and confidence	Extensive, friendly interaction with high degree of confidence and trust
Amount of cooperative teamwork present	None	Relatively little	A moderate amount	High	Very substantial amount throughout the organization
5. Character of decision-making process	System 1: Exploitive	System 2: Benevolent	System 3: Consultative -->	<-- Consultative / Participative ->	System 4: Participative group <-->
At what level in the parish are decisions formally made?	Bulk of decisions at top of the parish structure	Policy at top, many decisions within prescribed framework made at lower levels	Broad policy and general decisions at top, more specific decisions at lower levels	Decision making done widely "in matters open to discussion", especially engaging Councils and self-managed teams for this purpose	Decision making widely done throughout the parish, although well integrated through linking process provided by overlapping groups

To what extent are decision makers aware of problems, particularly at lower levels in parish?	Often are unaware or only partially aware	Aware of some, unaware of others	Moderately aware of problems	Usually well aware. Open at all times to hear problems, hopes, desires from all levels	Generally quite well aware of problems
Extent to which technical and professional knowledge is used in decision making	Used only if possessed at higher levels	Much of what is available in higher and middle levels is used	Much of what is available in higher, middle, and lower levels is used	Whatever/whoever is available, using "structures of participation"	Most of what is available anywhere within the parish is used
To what extent are parishioners involved in decisions related to their well-being?	Not at all	Never involved in decisions; occasionally consulted	Usually are consulted but originally not involved decisions	Consulted and involved actively in decision making relating to their well-being	Are involved fully in all decisions related to their work
Are decisions made at the best level in the parish so far as the motivational consequences (i.e. Does the decision making process help to create the necessary motivations in those persons who have to carry out the decisions?	Decision making contributes little or nothing to the motivation to implement the decision; usually yields adverse motivation	Decision making contributes relatively little motivation	Some contribution is made by decision making process, giving the motivation to implement	Substantial contribution is made by decision making process, giving strong motivation to implement. The process of ensuring a 'common vision' and a 'common purpose' leading to consensus assists greatly	Substantial contribution is made by decision-making processes, giving strong motivation to implement
6. Character of goal setting or ordering	System 1: Exploitive	System 2: Benevolent	System 3: Consultative -->	<-- Consultative / Participative ->	System 4: Participative group <--

Manner in which usually done	Orders issued	Orders issued, opportunity to comment may or may not exist	Goals are set or orders issued after discussion with parishioner /s re: problems and planned action	Goals are set in participative process involving parishioners or their chosen representatives, or within self-managed teams	Except in emergencies, goals are usually established by means of group participation
Are there forces to accept, resist, or reject goals?	Goals are overtly accepted but are covertly resisted strongly	Goals are overtly accepted but often covertly resisted to at least a moderate degree	Goals are overtly accepted but at times with some covert resistance	Goals are fully accepted as part of reaching a 'common vision' and 'common purpose': consensus	Goals are fully accepted both overtly and covertly
7. Character of control processes	System 1: Exploitive	System 2: Benevolent	System 3: Consultative -->	<-- Consultative / Participative ->	System 4: Participative group <--
Extent to which the review and control functions are concentrated	Highly concentrated at top of parish structure	Relatively highly concentrated, with some delegated control to lower levels	Moderate downward delegation of review and control processes; lower as well as higher levels feel responsible	Widespread. Responsibility for review and evaluation remains with Councils and committees, with pastor ensuring transparent process	Quite widespread responsibility for review and control, with lower units at times imposing more rigorous reviews and tighter controls than top management
Extent to which there is an informal	Informal team present and	Informal team usually present and	Informal team may be present and	Self-managed teams reaching a	Informal team and formal

team present and supporting or opposing goals of the parish	opposing goals of the parish	partially resisting goals	may either support or partially resist goals of the parish	'common vision' and 'common purpose' ensure fidelity to goals; parishioners are free to challenge goals	parish are one and the same; hence all social forces support efforts to achieve the parish's goals
Extent to which control data (cost, etc.) are used for self-guidance or group problem solving by pastors; or used by pastors in a punitive, policing manner	Used for policing and in punitive manner	Used for policing coupled with reward and punishment, sometimes punitively; used somewhat for guidance but in accord with orders	Largely used for policing;... used for guidance in accord with orders; some use also for self-guidance	Largely used for self-guidance and positive evaluation; not used punitively	Used for self-guidance and for coordinated problem solving and guidance; not used punitively

---

**Author:** Francis W. Devoy, M.A., Ed.D., M.A.C.E. is parish priest of Holy Spirit Parish, Bangalow-Byron Bay, in the Diocese of Lismore, N.S.W. He prepared this paper for the National Commission for Clergy Life and Ministry being a member of the Commission at the time, and presented the document in workshop form to the priests of the Archdiocese of Hobart during their Plenary Conference in May 2002. The document has undergone revision, including an expanded and a more complete Appendix.

Email: [devv@bigpond.com](mailto:devv@bigpond.com)

---