

ASSEMBLIES OF GOD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CODEPENDENCY IN CHURCH SYSTEMS: THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN  
INSTRUMENT TO ASSESS HEALTHY CHURCH LEADERSHIP

A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE  
DOCTOR OF MINISTRY COMMITTEE  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

DOCTOR OF MINISTRY DEPARTMENT

BY

F. WESLEY SHORTRIDGE

RICHARDSVILLE, VA

MAY 2016





## CONTENTS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| CONTENTS.....  | iv   |
| ABSTRACT.....  | viii |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....                                  | ix   |
| LIST OF TABLES .....                                   | xi   |
| Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION.....                           | 1    |
| The Context.....                                       | 1    |
| The Problem.....                                       | 2    |
| The Purpose .....                                      | 5    |
| Definition of Terms.....                               | 6    |
| Description of the Proposed Project .....              | 6    |
| Scope of the Project .....                             | 6    |
| Phases of the Project .....                            | 7    |
| Research.....  | 7    |
| Planning .....   | 8    |
| Implementation .....                                   | 9    |
| Evaluation .....                                       | 9    |
| Writing .....  | 9    |
| Conclusion .....                                       | 9    |
| Chapter 2: BIBLICAL-THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 11   |
| Introduction.....                                      | 11   |
| Toward a Biblical View of Addiction.....               | 12   |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Wine as a Type of Addiction .....                     | 13 |
| Wine in the Covenant of Life.....                     | 13 |
| Wine in the Abrahamic Covenant.....                   | 17 |
| Wine in the Mosaic Covenant.....                      | 18 |
| Wine in the Exile and Return.....                     | 24 |
| Wine in the Incarnation.....                          | 26 |
| Wine and the Spirit .....                             | 30 |
| Wine in the Last Days.....                            | 35 |
| Wine in the New Creation.....                         | 36 |
| A Summary of the Images of Wine .....                 | 37 |
| Ephesus as an Example of an Addictive System .....    | 39 |
| Biblical Solutions for Addiction .....                | 43 |
| Ephesus as a Model for Healthy Systems .....          | 50 |
| Conclusion .....                                      | 59 |
| Chapter 3: GENERAL LITERATURE REVIEW .....            | 60 |
| Introduction.....                                     | 60 |
| Codependency Defined.....                             | 60 |
| Early Definitions of Codependency.....                | 61 |
| Emerging Definitions of Codependency.....             | 65 |
| The Characteristics of Codependency .....             | 67 |
| Early Views of Codependency's Characteristics.....    | 68 |
| Emerging Views of Codependency's Characteristics..... | 70 |
| Characteristics within Relational Systems.....        | 73 |
| The Causes of Codependency .....                      | 75 |
| Codependency as a Progressive Condition .....         | 75 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Codependency's Emergence within Family Systems .....                 | 76  |
| Codependency and Spiritual Dysfunction .....                         | 78  |
| Codependency in Systems .....  | 80  |
| Codependency in Church Systems.....                                  | 85  |
| Leadership within the Church Relational System.....                  | 89  |
| Codependency in Larger Church Structures .....                       | 91  |
| Codependency in Pentecostal Churches .....                           | 92  |
| Codependency as Misplaced Priority.....                              | 95  |
| Assessment Instruments for Codependency .....                        | 97  |
| Toward Solutions .....   | 99  |
| Conclusion .....   | 106 |
| Chapter 4: DESCRIPTION OF FIELD PROJECT .....                        | 109 |
| Introduction.....  | 109 |
| Preparation of the Project.....                                      | 109 |
| Survey Sample .....  | 111 |
| Survey Questionnaire.....  | 112 |
| Comparison of Survey Instruments to Categories of Codependence ..... | 114 |
| Execution of the Project.....  | 119 |
| Results of the Project .....   | 120 |
| Demographics .....   | 120 |
| Response Analysis .....  | 120 |
| Findings.....  | 121 |
| The Project's Contribution to Ministry.....                          | 127 |
| Conclusion .....   | 128 |
| Chapter 5: PROJECT SUMMARY .....                                     | 130 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Introduction.....   | 130 |
| Evaluation of the Project.....                              | 130 |
| Keys to Project Effectiveness .....                         | 130 |
| Keys to Project Improvement .....                           | 131 |
| Implications of the Project.....                            | 133 |
| Recommendations for Denominational Leaders.....             | 134 |
| Recommendations for Pastoral Leaders.....                   | 135 |
| Recommendations for Future Study .....                      | 137 |
| Conclusion .....  | 140 |
| APPENDIX A: PROJECT SURVEY .....                            | 141 |
| APPENDIX B: CHURCH COVER SHEET .....                        | 145 |
| APPENDIX C: SPANN-FISCHER INSTRUMENT .....                  | 146 |
| APPENDIX D: HOLYOAKE CODEPENDENCY INSTRUMENT .....          | 147 |
| APPENDIX E: CO-DEPENDENTS ANONYMOUS CHECKLIST .....         | 148 |
| APPENDIX F: ESCALA ARGENTINA DE CODEPENDENCIA.....          | 152 |
| APPENDIX G: ORIGINAL SPANN 38-ITEM CODEPENDENCY SCALE ..... | 155 |
| APPENDIX H: DATA FROM RESPONDING CHURCHES.....              | 158 |
| APPENDIX I: CORRELATIONS FROM DATA .....                    | 185 |
| SOURCES CONSULTED.....                                      | 186 |
| Biblical Theological Review.....                            | 186 |
| General Literature Review .....                             | 190 |
| Description of Field Project .....                          | 197 |

## ABSTRACT

In spite of the prevalence of methods and literature devoted to church health, many churches remain plateaued or are declining. Some churches ignore reality and base their worth and identity on things less than biblical identity and Christian mission. Many declining churches demonstrate an environment similar to the codependency seen in addictive family systems. The published literature has expanded the understanding of the concept of codependency that was traditionally applied to family systems affected by alcohol and substance abuse by applying it to dysfunctional organizational structures. This project builds on this research. It investigated the hypothesis that dysfunctional churches exhibit dynamics similar to codependent family systems. The project adapted the Spann-Fischer Scale for Codependency, and in a pilot study of nine churches, two scales were developed: Church Health ( $\alpha = .891$ ) and Church Codependency ( $\alpha = .745$ ). A moderate negative correlation ( $r = -.431$ ) between these scales supported this hypothesis. It appears that the concept of codependency possesses elements that could assist church leaders to better understand dysfunctional churches. The project suggests a new approach to church health in certain environments and provides a new lens through which those desiring to help the local church grow might view their work.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledging every individual who contributed to the development of this project proves impossible. I first must thank God for saving me from a life of addiction and for giving me a love for His Church and the people who form His Church. The faith of my grandparents, Ivory T. Stallard, Elgie B. Stallard, and Maudy C. Shortridge, and my mother, Carol S. Shortridge, formed the foundation of my development toward serving God through the church. My wife, Linda, and my children, Amanda and Josiah, provided the encouragement and time needed to complete this project, and they provided countless hours of help in this project.

I owe a debt to Dr. H. Robert Rhoden, Dr. Wayne Lee, and Dr. Sherry Lee for helping me to begin my educational journey and for encouraging me in the process. The people of Liberty Community Church remained behind me for the entire journey and sacrificed the availability of their pastor so I might answer God's call in this process. Their financial and spiritual support never faltered. The Assemblies of God Theological Seminary (AGTS) provided a rich source of development throughout my education, and I owe a debt to my many professors, especially former president Dr. Byron D. Klaus, Dr. Carolyn Tennant, Dr. J. Melvyn Ming, Dr. Charlie Self, and Dr. Rick Serbin. Their challenging classes and mentoring provided much of the thinking behind this project. I likewise owe a debt of gratitude to the Doctor of Ministry Department at AGTS and the

many encouragers who helped me in this process, especially Program Director, Dr. Cheryl A. Taylor and Program Coordinator, Dr. Ava K. Oleson.

This project would not have been possible without those who assisted me in developing and writing the project. I am grateful for the churches that participated in the survey. Dr. Stephanie Nance provided countless hours of editing and advice. Dr. Doug Oss provided theological guidance and challenged me through his classes and work as biblical adviser to think deeply about God. Dr. Johan Mostert provided the overall shape of this project as my project adviser and helped me to think deeply about the subject while encouraging me to continue the work. D.Min. Project Coordinator, Dr. Lois Olena, tirelessly worked throughout the process to encourage and keep the entire process moving forward. A doctoral project is a team effort in many ways, and I am grateful to the many persons who contributed to this project.

## LIST OF TABLES

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Table 1. Items 1-8: Church Health Assessment.....   | 113 |
| Table 2. Items 9-40: Codependency Indicators .....  | 114 |
| Table 3. Age of Responding Churches, Pastoral Tenure, and Setting.....                    | 120 |
| Table 4. Number of Responses from Participating Churches.....                             | 121 |
| Table 5. Mean Church Health Score (Items 1-8).....  | 122 |
| Table 6. Mean Codependency (Items 9-40).....  | 122 |
| Table 7. Minimum and Maximum Reported Church Health<br>Scores by Church (Items 1-8) ..... | 123 |
| Table 8. Minimum and Maximum Reported Codependency<br>Scores by Church (Items 9-40) ..... | 123 |
| Table 9. Mean Scores for Items 9-40 Grouped by Category .....                             | 124 |
| Table 10. Church Health Means for Groups in Homogenous Subsets (Items 1-8) .....          | 125 |
| Table 11. Codependency Means for Groups in Homogenous Subsets (Items 9-40) .....          | 125 |
| Table 12. Correlations Between Church Health and Codependency.....                        | 126 |

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Many churches decline each year in spite of efforts to revitalize. Others exist in a state of frustration, and the leaders of these churches likewise feel frustrated. The church fails to grow and resists outside assessment, and the church as a system functions in a way that perpetuates the church's poor health. Pastors and leaders feel a sense of shame and loss of identity, and the dysfunction escalates. Some churches exist in a state that resembles addiction in that the church resists health and maintains dysfunctional and unhealthy behavior.

The problem perpetuates as a systemic dynamic within the overall relational structure of many dysfunctional churches. A solution might lie in addressing the dysfunction in a manner similar to addiction intervention and recovery. This project will develop a key intervention tool to help the church identify the dysfunction and make steps necessary to recovery. The project will explore a biblical theology of addiction, review current literature related to the relational addiction of codependency, and develop an assessment tool to identify codependency within the systemic environment of the local church.

### **The Context**

I have served as the founding pastor of Liberty Community Church (LCC) in Bealeton, Virginia for fourteen years. Over the first decade, the congregation grew from a few people meeting in my living room to an attendance of several hundred. The church

has succeeded in its rural context in reaching many persons who were not reached by existing churches. Many persons attracted to the church came from addictive backgrounds. Over 400 persons were baptized at LCC in the first decade. Although LCC is my current ministry context, I will use other churches in the proximity of LCC to develop the project's assessment model. Twelve churches from various denominations and sizes were asked to participate in this project.

### **The Problem**

Churches define success in many ways. Many stall and fail to progress in their mission due to values that inform the systemic structure of the church. The church stagnates in a system that worked in the past but now fails to bring health as the church ages. Churches tend to plateau or decline at some point. The problem mimics addiction—increasing amounts of the previously relied upon values bring fewer results. The problem of addiction forms a systemic issue; it intertwines with the church's culture and prevents missional effectiveness. Addiction-related issues frequently manifest in the church as hunger for power and security; in other words, a form of codependency.

Within relational systems, codependency develops through dysfunction and perpetuates as a misapplied identity through feelings of shame. Similar to addiction to a substance, codependency manifests as a relational addiction where individuals seek identity and self-worth from relationships that prove unable to establish a person's worth. In the classic alcoholic family system, the codependent members seek worth from the substance addiction of the alcoholic and base their identity on the addicted person. Current research suggests systemic codependency in various corporate environments, and the possibility that the ecclesiastical environment likewise manifests some measure of

codependence seems likely. The church in a manner similar to substance addiction or the relational addiction dynamics of codependency may seek its worth and identity from sources unable to provide worth and healthy identity. Foundations of many forms of dysfunction within the ecclesiastical environment may exist within the addicted family system and in some commercial environments.

The church as a family system forms an environment in which the possibility of relational dysfunction similar to traditional codependency in a substance-abusing environment might exist. Through dysfunction introduced from various persons within the environment it seems likely that the system of relationships making up the church might experience corporate shame and misapplied identity that manifests similarly to the traditional addicted family system. Traditional addicted family systems ignore reality and shun outside help or intervention in a spiral of dysfunction that increases the unhealthy dynamics of the family system and damages the individuals within the system. The toxic environment resists change and descends further into toxicity. Many churches likewise demonstrate traits similar to the addicted family system. Dysfunctional churches seem to resist outside help as they cling to dysfunctional or damaging behaviors and outdated methodology. The dysfunctional church in many ways resembles the addicted family system. Codependency describes the underlying dysfunction in the addicted family system, and it might likewise underlie much of the brokenness of the dysfunctional church.

Addictive tendencies can enter the system of the church through a variety of avenues. Pastors and key leaders often introduce codependent behavior into the church system. Eventually, the system itself behaves as a codependent, addictive system.

Tragically, systemic codependency in the church environment results in a lack of effectiveness and a toxic environment that hinders discipleship. Power struggles and political issues based on misplaced identity and priorities manifest in systemic codependency. Security issues arise as persons seek a sense of homeostasis within the church and refuse to change or risk moving forward. Security issues relate to addiction as people seek consolation in a particular style of worship, room design, or other comforts that ultimately fail to provide the assurance found only in God. These issues appear in churches that fail to demonstrate faith in God and do not move forward in mission as they seek to preserve the past and its false sense of security.

Codependency poses a serious issue within the church. Likely, church leaders form the greatest source of codependency within the systemic environment of the local church. Pastors frequently tie self-worth to attendance numbers or to their popularity in the church or community. Often the codependency of leadership impacts all relational structures within the church, and a clique structure emerges to help the individual manage the codependent expectations. Dysfunctional structures, however, descend into power struggles and often use gossip, manipulation, and other destructive behaviors to seek control and manage relationships in an effort to meet the deepening codependent needs of the individuals.

Many issues hide behind attendance statistics, salvation reports, or other pragmatic measures of success. Codependency in the church emerges from within the systemic relationships of the church, and the systemic dysfunction often ends in the moral failure of church leaders or destruction of the environment itself. Attendees might promote the codependent behavior as it often drives pragmatic success in earlier stages of

church development. Later, the attendees respond with disbelief when they discover their pastor, who could draw a large crowd, in his or her addictions. Leaders prefer to produce safe, controlled, and likeable services rather than deal with underlying conflict and sin. Often, the church itself serves as the substance of a pastor's addiction.

Within a church's systems, the possibility of codependence exists in various levels. A church may need to rediscover biblical identity and reimagine its values and mission. The church as a system might demonstrate several codependent tendencies related to biblical identity and misplaced missional direction. Church plants transitioning to maturity often face systemic issues of identity and values related to codependent tendencies and determine identity and values in less than biblical ways. For example, a church might value attendance numbers over discipleship. A church might also fail to develop mature leaders due to a tendency to accept people without challenging them to biblical maturity. Each issue relates to a misplaced emphasis that sought church growth through means that brought short-term gains at the expense of long-term health. Misplaced values prove similar to addiction in that they seek wholeness through pragmatic standards that form from principles less than the biblical standard of discipleship and relational health.

### **The Purpose**

This project's purpose is to develop an assessment tool to identify codependent tendencies in churches and to test the tool's reliability. The project will also assess general church health in order to establish a correlation between health indicators and codependency.



## **Definition of Terms**

*Codependence*—a shared condition in which persons depend on sources of self-worth unable to establish worth. A dysfunctional helping relationship in which a person supports another person's dysfunction

*Systemic Codependence*—the tendency of an organization to act as an individual in seeking worth from sources unable to establish worth and supporting dysfunction

*Addiction*—an escalating use of a substance, behavior, or thinking pattern to establish worth and deny the truth that worth is not established

## **Description of the Proposed Project**

### **Scope of the Project**

This project will explore whether or not codependency exists in ecclesiastical settings as it does in addicted family systems and commercial settings. It will determine if measurement of codependency in ecclesiastical settings is possible through the development of an assessment tool to identify systemic codependency in the church environment. It will use standard measurement instruments and current research to develop an instrument for assessment in several test churches. This project will analyze the assessment tool for validity and for possible correlations with church health, and the instrument will measure general church health to establish possible corollary relationships between codependence and church health.

This project will involve adaptation of a standard codependence measurement instrument used to assess codependence in individuals to the systemic environment of the church. The revised instrument will then be administered in sample churches in April-May of 2015 to determine its validity. For comparison sake, the sample churches will

include plateaued or declining churches and growing churches. It will include churches of various denominational affiliation, environments, and ethnicities. In the assessment, the project will look at responses to the survey from pastors, directors, leaders, and church members. Following collection of all data, I will analyze the collected data for validity and possible correlations. Data will be prepared for presentation to district officials for evaluation.

### Phases of the Project

The project will include five phases: research, planning, implementation, evaluation, and writing.

#### *Research*

In the first stage, this project will examine the Scriptures to provide a biblical-theological review of biblical theology of addiction as the underlying cause of codependency in the systemic environment. In the second stage, I will explore historical literature related to codependency in order to trace the development of the concept as it relates to addiction. I will also explore current literature related to codependency in order to establish current thinking related to the concept. The literature review will also explore sources relating codependency to systemic environments especially the systemic environment of the church.

#### Biblical-Theological Literature Review

In the biblical-theological review I will provide an understanding of addiction through reviewing biblical concepts, examples, and typological implications of wine use. Codependency as a concept is a modern construct that emerged in the latter part of the

twentieth century. Although many examples of codependent relationships exist in the Bible, the review will avoid reading back into biblical literature the modern concept of codependency. In the review I will focus instead on addiction through a biblical theology of wine. Codependency is generally viewed as a form of addiction to relationships, and the principles outlined related to wine relate to the underlying addictive tendencies found in the relational dynamics of codependency. In the biblical-theological review, I will also explore the systemic nature of addiction in a relational system through Paul's letter to the Ephesian church.

### General Literature Review

In the general literature review I will explore resources that define codependency and describe theories of codependency and systems. It will review the evolution of thinking related to the concept over the past decades and relate emerging theories of codependency to current theories of addiction. The review will specifically focus on emerging theories of codependency as a systemic dynamic found in relational systems rather than individuals isolated from relational dynamics. Specifically, the literature review will relate systemic codependency theories to the relational environment of the church. I will also look at current instruments used to assess codependency in individuals and apply the principles to the project's development of a tool for assessment in the systemic environment of the church.

### *Planning*

The planning stage of this project will involve integrating concepts from the general literature review and the biblical-theological review with current assessment tools. I will adapt the existing instruments to the systemic environment of the church and

develop them into the instrument tested by this project. I will design the instrument to test two primary theses: 1) Codependency exists and is measurable in the systemic environment of the church. 2) Codependency within the church system correlates with church health.

### *Implementation*

The assessment tool developed in this project will be administered to at least twelve churches. Results will be compiled and prepared for analysis to determine the validity of the instrument and possible correlations within the assessment.

### *Evaluation*

I will compile the results from the survey developed during the implementation stage and assess the results for validity and possible correlations between church health data and codependency as measured by the instrument.

### *Writing*

The writing phase of this project will occur between November 2014 and July 2015. I will adjust my schedule to ensure several days each week dedicated to research and writing.

## **Conclusion**

The downward spiral of many churches and denominations leaves leaders frustrated and enmeshed in a cycle of shame and identity loss that further drives the churches into deeper downward spirals. Current assessments of church health tend to focus on numbers of attendees, baptisms, or financial indicators. This project will

develop an alternative to assessment of church health that focuses on longer-term health and underlying relational strength within the church as a system of relationships.

Many current church health assessments ignore underlying relational health and create shame based results that might actually create further relational dysfunction in the system that manifests later as church splits or dysfunction. The identity of the church as a relational system becomes tied to numerical indicators rather than healthy relational identity in Christ. Shame and loss of identity in leadership and in the church as a system leads the church further from missional effectiveness and health in the long term. Addictive tendencies within the system that seek health from sources less than God forms the core of the issue. This project will develop a tool for intervention in dysfunctional systems earlier than most current assessment tools identify underlying dysfunction. It will hopefully suggest tools for recovery of the system before most current instruments suggest the need for intervention.

## CHAPTER 2: BIBLICAL-THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

### **Introduction**

This chapter will look at the local church through the lens of codependency and addiction as a systemic issue. Neither term existed in the time of the biblical authors, but the underlying issues in the human condition have existed throughout time. The writers of the Bible wrote from and to a worldview in which persons were part of systemic relationships rather than separated individuals as in many Western views.<sup>1</sup> The Bible addresses systemic addiction and codependency through its focus on human relationships as damaged by sin and redeemed in Christ.

The lens of addiction and codependency applied to the biblical texts proves useful for observing the church as a system of relationships. However, the lens has limitations and functions as one of many lenses through which the Bible may be applied. Richard L. Rohrbaugh cautions concerning the relationship of Western models and the ancient text of the Bible:

The use of models is thus not without some dangers. They are not mere templates one can place over any and all data. They must be chosen to fit the level of abstraction appropriate to the data and adapted to regional and historic variations ... If we simply follow scholarly intuition and fail to examine the implicit,

---

<sup>1</sup> Bruce J. Malina observes the “primitive” culture of the Bible. “The distinctive feature of this epistemological model was that primates never perceived themselves as single beings, but believed themselves to be irreducibly part of the larger group. To use modern jargon, such primates were not simply codependent but totally dependent in their self-awareness.” Bruce J. Malina, “Understanding New Testament Persons,” in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996), 54.

Western models we inevitably use to organize whatever data we encounter, we risk blindly imposing our modern perceptions and categories on every biblical text we read.<sup>2</sup>

This review examines the biblical texts through the models of addiction and codependency by examining the concept of addiction through the unfolding motif of wine and Paul's instruction to the church at Ephesus.

### **Toward a Biblical View of Addiction**

Many theologians take a dogmatic approach to wine and addiction and end with a legalistic imperative against wine use or a liberal view justifying the use of wine without restriction.<sup>3</sup> The issue proves far more complex and rich than a systematic approach can reveal. The church approaching the issue through dogma remains powerless to relieve the distress of the addict.<sup>4</sup> The deeper problem, however, resides in the fact that many churches behave similar to the stereotypical addict. Church systems often rely on dysfunctional methods in ways resembling the addict's addiction to wine. Ultimately the problem is one of missional effectiveness, as addiction leads the addict further from the desired spiritual wholeness and the church further from God's mission.

---

<sup>2</sup> Rohrbaugh, Richard L, "Introduction," in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*, ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996), 9-10.

<sup>3</sup> For examples of various applied positions on alcohol use see "On Alcohol use in America," The Southern Baptist Convention, accessed June 18, 2013, [www.sbc.net/resolutions/amresolution.asp?ID=1156](http://www.sbc.net/resolutions/amresolution.asp?ID=1156); John L. Rabb, "Guidelines for the Use of Alcoholic Beverages at Church Functions or on Church Property within the Diocese of Maryland," accessed June 19, 2013, [www.ang-md.org/alcohol-service-guidelines.pdf](http://www.ang-md.org/alcohol-service-guidelines.pdf); and "Abstinence," The General Council of the Assemblies of God, accessed June 18, 2013, [http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position\\_Papers/pp\\_downloads/pp\\_4187\\_abstinence.pdf](http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position_Papers/pp_downloads/pp_4187_abstinence.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> Stanley J. Grenz notes that the theological commitment must be "applied to life" rather than just systemized. The goal of theology is that "faith can issue forth in discipleship." Stanley J. Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 25.

A biblical theological approach to the issue provides a lens through which a church can find wholeness and missional effectiveness in a culture bound in addictive patterns. Wine provides a lens through which other addictive behaviors such as codependency can be addressed. As the motif unfolds in the covenants of the Bible, wine typifies relational wholeness through the Holy Spirit. The motif unfolds in two threads: (1) a type of joy, fruitfulness, and relief in a fallen world and (2) a type pointing to judgment. The church able to discover the wholeness to which the type of wine points can renew its effectiveness to a culture bound by addictive behavior and human attempts to seek spirituality apart from God.<sup>5</sup>

### Wine as a Type of Addiction

#### *Wine in the Covenant of Life*

The Bible begins with God's command to be fruitful and subdue the Earth in relational unity with God (Gen. 1:28). Humans receive a position of authority over the creation of God over "every plant yielding seed that is on the face of all the earth, and every tree with seed in its fruit" (v. 29).<sup>6</sup> Blessing of relationship, fruitfulness, and authority over creation form the relational covenant of the Garden.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Karl Barth calls God the "genuine Counterpart" and points to God as the fulfillment of all human longing. He states, "God is indeed the genuine Counterpart which alone can finally and primarily satisfy human beings and all creation as such." Karl Barth, "Selections from Church Dogmatics (1932-1967)," in *Karl Barth: Theologian of Freedom*, ed. Clifford Green, 171-264 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 171.

<sup>6</sup> All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the English Standard Version.

<sup>7</sup> William J. Dumbrell points to the image of God in the humans as the confirming element of the covenant. Man in relationship with God was to function as God's representative on Earth. William J. Dumbrell, *Covenant and Creation: A Theology of Old Testament Covenants* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2009), 33-34. Grenz describes the image of God in humans as a "social rather than an individual concept." Grenz, 175. The confirming element in the Covenant of Life is human relationship to God and to other humans. Ultimately, "each person can be related to the image of God only within the context of life in community with others." Ibid., 179.



## The Adamic Covenant

God conditions His blessings with a command to refrain from eating one particular fruit of the Garden while remaining in a dependent relationship with God as the superior party in the covenant (Gen. 2:17).<sup>8</sup> The serpent, however, approaches the first couple with the idea that the blessings of creation reside in a created substance rather than a relationship.<sup>9</sup> God extends His blessing conditioned by human choice to remain in a relationship with God as the source of life, but the humans choose to seek life on their own terms.<sup>10</sup> The source of blessing forms the core of the issue. Humanity must choose between God as the source of wisdom, fruitfulness, and blessing or the substance of the fruit as the source. Pride rests at the center of the choice. Humanity can remain in humble submission to God's command or seek self-exaltation apart from God's command.

The blessing of the Garden and the freedom of the forbidden fruit, through human ambition and pride, turn into a curse through separation from the Source of Life. Seeking a source outside the relational covenant for fulfillment results in separation from the

---

<sup>8</sup> Dumbrell describes the nature of the pre-fall covenant as entailing "the obligation to understand the nature of the relationship and the duty to maintain it by exercising a God-centered life." Dumbrell, 36. The Fall therefore is a denial of God-centered living and a descent into forming identity on other basis than God.

<sup>9</sup> The fruit had no substantial consequence inherent in itself, and sin is in no way a substance. Adam and Eve, however, believe there was some substantial benefit within the substance of the fruit. They look to a substance rather than God. They, like the chemically addicted, look for spirituality in a substance. Grenz describes something as "substantial" if it "'stands under' or goes into the making of a person." Grenz, 155. Adam and Eve looked to the substance of the forbidden fruit to establish their identity apart from God.

<sup>10</sup> Paul Tillich makes the case that any object can be sacramental as long as "the transcendent is perceived to be present." The distinction between holy and demonic, to Tillich, is found in God's "unconditional demand." Adam and Eve, to Tillich, would be attempting to make an object sacramental in that it imparts life apart from God's command. Paul Tillich, *Paul Tillich: Theologian of the Boundaries*, ed. Mark Kline Taylor (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 91.

blessing of the covenant.<sup>11</sup> Sin separates the man and woman from their relationship with God and humanity descends into selfish striving for blessing.<sup>12</sup> Similar to addiction in which humans seek results from a substance or behavior that actually separates from the desired results, humanity looks to ever-increasing doses of rebellion and descends into further separation.<sup>13</sup>

### The Noahic Covenant

God in His desire to bless humans renews His covenant of life through Noah.<sup>14</sup> In submission to God's command, Noah builds an ark as a means of renewal and deliverance (Gen. 6:18). After the flood Noah lives a renewed world. God reissues the covenant of life in a command to be fruitful and multiply similar to His command in Eden. In the renewed covenant God promises fruitfulness and dominion again based on a submitted relationship with God (9:1-5). Noah again faces the possibility of fruitful relationship with God or the possibility of seeking spiritual wholeness through creation

---

<sup>11</sup> Grenz defines sin as "our failure to reflect the image of God." Grenz, 187. Since the image of God is in the context of "life in community" sin is a failure of community both in fellowship with God and with fellow humans. Ibid., 179. Grenz continues, "In its essence, sin is also whatever disrupts and seeks to destroy the community God seeks to establish. Summarily stated, sin is the destruction of community." Ibid., 187.

<sup>12</sup> Tillich describes the state of humanity after the Fall as a descent into loss of humanity's "determining center." He states, "Self-loss as the first and basic mark of evil is the loss of one's determining center; it is the disintegration of the centered self by disruptive drives which cannot be brought into unity." Tillich, 205.

<sup>13</sup> Original sin may best be seen as a community phenomenon. The image of God denied in Adam and Eve's sin manifests in the community through division and murder. Grenz writes, "What ought to drive us to a quest for God and the fulfillment of our destiny to participate in the community of God degenerates into a search for a humanly devised substitute. We thereby miss the mark and suffer the consequences." Grenz, 206.

<sup>14</sup> Dumbrell states that the first use of the word "covenant" or *b'rit* is found in Genesis 6:17-18 and is used by God to address His relationship with Noah. Dumbrell, 11.

rather than the Creator with the resultant consequence of losing the fruitfulness of the covenant.

The first mention of wine in the biblical record appears immediately after the renewed covenant with Noah (Gen. 9:20-23). Noah misuses the fruits of the covenant from his newly planted vineyard. Noah's family looks like a codependent family in which the children cover their father's failure. As in the Garden, nakedness results from abuse of a substance, and vain attempts to cover the resultant nakedness occur.

God gives wine as part of His covenant of blessing and fruitfulness, but abuse of the substance results in separation from the covenant blessing. The text places much of the guilt of the covenant breach on Noah's son, Ham, as the person who uncovers his father's nakedness, but blame must also rest on a father who places his children in a codependent relationship requiring them to cover his drunken nakedness.<sup>15</sup> The relational dysfunction caused by Noah's drunkenness manifests in the relational division between Ham and his two brothers. The command of the covenant to be fruitful and expand the next generation turns through Noah's actions into a curse on his son (Gen. 9:25). As in Eden, humanity has looked to the substance of creation instead of the Creator and found the substance meant to point to God's relational blessing has separated them from blessing and relationship.

---

<sup>15</sup> Some commentators point out that the drunkenness was incidental, and the real issue was Ham's behavior and subsequent curse. For an example, see Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary* (Leicester, England: Tyndale, 1967), 103. It seems reasonable that drunkenness within the family system was part of the issue. Many commentators miss the social aspect of drunkenness and sin.

*Wine in the Abrahamic Covenant*

In the midst of humanity's deepening struggle, God offers a new covenant of promise for humanity.<sup>16</sup> He calls Abram from his home and renews the promise of relational fruitfulness through the promise of a son (Gen. 12:2-3). Wine enters the story at this point as a type of renewed covenant and blessing in Abram's encounter with the priest Melchizedek. Abram demonstrates submission to the priest through tithes as the priest brings forth bread and wine pointing to the blessing of covenantal relationship (14:18).

Lot, Abram's nephew, chooses a different path. He lives in the sinful city of Sodom surrounded by human striving for fruitfulness and blessing through sexual immorality. In contrast to Abram and his reliance on God for covenant fulfillment, the citizens of Sodom look to their own efforts and desires for fulfillment. Abram rescues Lot from the sinful and doomed city. Wine again enters the story as an agent of destruction and judgment in the perverse story of Lot's daughters' attempt to find the promise of fruitfulness in the substance of wine and sexual immorality rather than in the God who delivered them (Gen. 19:31-36). The rebellious and sinful nations of Moab and Ammon result from the incestuous relationship, and the two nations become the source of many conflicts with Israel in later history. The underlying sin and rebellion resembles the fruit in the Garden and Noah's experience in the tent. The two threads remain clear. Wine points to judgment when looked to as a means of fulfillment, and wine points to blessing when God is the source of fulfillment.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Dumbrell describes the Abrahamic Covenant as bringing "into prominence the biblical doctrine of redemption." Dumbrell, 47.

<sup>17</sup> Dumbrell stresses the need to "pass on from the sign to the substance of the sign." Dumbrell, 30.

Wine appears again in Isaac's blessing of Jacob (Gen. 27:27-29). The blessing resembles the covenants with Adam, Noah, and Abraham as it relies on God as the source of blessing. Fruitfulness is imagined in the image of grain and wine along with dominion over enemies. Wine in the blessing again appears as a type of fulfillment of covenant blessing through submitted relationship with God.

Human tendency to strive continually for the blessings of covenant relationship apart from the relationship forms the core of addiction. Wine to this point in the biblical record points to life in covenant relationship through renewed fruitfulness in relationship with God.<sup>18</sup> Drunkenness, however, reveals humanity's tendency to seek the substance of the typological object rather than the fulfillment of the type. The same action points in two opposite directions depending on the motive of the user. Humans tend to seek a temporal source of joy and spiritual satisfaction rather than the eternal source that provides deeper eternal fulfillment. The substance provided by God often takes the place of God as the object of worship and draws the human further into the illusion of control and away from the God who demands control.

#### *Wine in the Mosaic Covenant*

The Mosaic Covenant involves two contexts: (1) the forty years in the wilderness, and (2) the entry and settlement in the Promised Land. The wanderers in the desert have little access to wine in enough quantity to make drunkenness a significant issue. Drunkenness reenters the narrative in the Promised Land where vineyards are planted.

---

<sup>18</sup> Leland Ryken, "Wine," in *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*, ed. James C. Wilhoit and Tremper Longman (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1998), 953-954.

## In the Wilderness

God separates Israel to bring about the promised Messiah through the Mosaic Covenant.<sup>19</sup> Various types point to the coming Messiah, and God gives a system of laws to protect the people and point to the need for a coming Messiah. God clarifies His role as giver of life, fruitfulness, and relational health. Unfortunately, most of the people rely on the type itself for fulfillment. For example, the temple becomes the means of fulfillment rather than a type pointing to God. Wine is not available to the wanderers in the wilderness and God emphasizes relationship with Him (Deut. 29:4-6).

Wine forms a significant part of the covenant in the relational emphasis of the drink offering (Num. 15:5). The presence or absence of grain and wine illustrates covenant blessing and relates to the presence of blessing and the absence of judgment.<sup>20</sup> Drink offerings occur in the temple rather than among the people outside the temple. The people observe the elements of relationship represented in bread and wine, but they are restricted from access to the elements. As holy people they should look to the God of the elements instead of the elements themselves. God focuses the people on Him in the Mosaic Covenant and emphasizes the tendency of wine to distract through the sin of drunkenness.

Leviticus 10 offers clarity with a strange story comparing the sin of drunkenness with the typological significance of wine.<sup>21</sup> God consumes the priests Nadab and Abihu

---

<sup>19</sup> The terms of the covenant described in 19:5-6 involve Israel's identity as "my own possession," "a kingdom of priests," and a "holy nation." The stress is on Israel's identity as God's people in contrast to the false identities of the surrounding peoples. Dumbrell, 85.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Israel functions in a state of *hesed* in which its actions were to be undertaken on behalf of God "where a close personal relationship has provided the basis for action." Dumbrell, 106. "The aim of the

for offering an “unauthorized” or strange “fire before the Lord” (Lev. 10:1). He forbids the priests from drinking the wine of the sacrifice suggesting the offering was made in the spirit of drunkenness (v. 9). The two priests likely consume the wine of the drink offering and neglect the lamb and grain. Chapter 10 further supports the idea of drunkenness as the lamb and grain are present in the corrective offering without the wine. Nadab and Abihu err, assuming this interpretation, in seeking spiritual fulfillment and relationship through the substance of wine rather than the God of the sacrifice.

The voluntary Nazirite vow provides another example of separation from the substance of wine while still allowing wine to point to the fulfillment of God’s promise (Num. 6:3). Wine appears in the temple sacrifice that completes the Nazirite vow (v. 17). The people and the priests are restricted from wine, but the Nazirite after completion of the vow may drink wine (v. 20). The passage proves confusing apart from a typological view of wine as a substance pointing to deeper relationship with God. The Nazirite focuses on God through abstinence while under the vow and then uses wine in the ritual completing the vow. The wine apart from the sacrifice and vow results in judgment and drunkenness, but the wine after the vow points to the possibility of renewed covenant blessing in the Spirit. Only through seeking the God behind the type can a person be free to see the God to which the type points without being drawn into reliance on the type itself.

---

covenant sacrifices was to preserve what had been established, not to initiate new relationships.” Dumbrell, 111. Nadab and Abihu miss the point of their priestly action entirely and look to the wine as fulfillment rather than to God as the basis of the covenant.

## In the Promised Land

Israel in the Promised Land plants vineyards and makes wine. Isaiah observes in judgment of Jerusalem: “These also reel with wine and stagger with strong drink; the priest and the prophet reel with strong drink, they are swallowed by wine, they stagger with strong drink, they reel in vision, they stumble in giving judgment” (Isa. 28:7). Isaiah also uses a vineyard as a metaphor for the Israeli nation and points to the tendency of the Israelites to seek comfort in wine rather than God’s presence as a sign of their fallen status (5:11-12). The wine given by God to point to a joyful relationship has become a substance taking the people further from God and placing them in judgment.

A wayward and foolish son forms a primary image of drunkenness in the Promised Land.<sup>22</sup> Wine appears as a destructive substance. For instance, “Wine is a mocker, strong drink a brawler, and whoever is led astray by it is not wise” (Prov. 20:1). Wine can point to the antitype and reveal something to humanity about God, or it can lead humanity into separation from God if persons rely on the type more than God. Abusers of wine become societal outcasts and carry the image of waywardness and judgment. Proverbs, for example, paints a clear picture of the stereotypical drunkard (23:29-35): The drunkard “will not be rich” (21:17); “The drunkard and the glutton will come to poverty, and slumber will clothe them with rags” (23:21); the drunkard abuses wine and moves further from reality and relational wholeness.

Drunkenness forms one of the Bible’s clearest images of sin and judgment. David, for example, laments the judgment brought by surrounding nations and states that God

---

<sup>22</sup> Leland Ryken, “Drunkard, Drunkenness,” in *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*, ed. James C. Wilhoit and Tremper Longman (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1998), 220-221.



has given Israel “wine to drink that made us stagger” (Ps. 60:3). Jeremiah similarly uses wine in a pronouncement of judgment against Moab (Jer. 48:26) and equates drunkenness with judgment (51:39). Wine confuses the ungodly and represents God’s judgment on those who ignore Him. Leland Ryken observes that drunkenness in almost all cases appears as an image of God’s judgment and “an awesome picture of human confusion and helplessness brought upon themselves by their God-defying arrogance.”<sup>23</sup>

Drunkenness also appears as judgment in the image of the cup as a “special horror” that implies a “humiliating progression” as something a “person does deliberately.”<sup>24</sup>

Judgment appears in the image of the cup of wine in Psalm 75:8.

The typology of wine confuses if one does not consider the antitype. Wine points to judgment but also often relates to blessing from God.<sup>25</sup> Isaiah’s picture of restoration includes the image of wine as a blessing from God (Isa. 25:6). Solomon portrays wine as a type of relational wholeness (Song of Sol. 1:4, 4:10). The Psalms portray wine as a symbol of relief from distress (Ps. 104:14-15). Ecclesiastes describes wine as something that “gladdens life” (10:19). Wine leads to destruction and serves as a strong metaphor for judgment from God, but it also carries the expectation of gladness and relief from distress. Wine numbs the senses and relieves those surrounded by the sorrow of life in a fallen world, but wine also points to a relationship with God through the Holy Spirit as the ultimate Comforter.

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 221.

<sup>24</sup> Leland Ryken, “Cup,” in *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*, ed. James C. Wilhoit and Tremper Longman (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1998), 186.

<sup>25</sup> Grenz describes the interrelation of love and God’s wrath and judgment, “The possibility of experiencing love as wrath arises out of the nature of love itself. Bound up with love is protective jealousy.” When wrath is missing from love “love degenerates into mere sentimentality.” Grenz, 73.

The story of Hannah seeking God for a child illustrates confusion in the issue. She encounters God, but the priest accuses her of drunkenness (1 Sam. 1:14). The image of wine forms such strong spiritual suggestion that the seeker of the presence of God is accused of looking for spiritual fulfillment in wine. Drunkenness in wine points to spirituality apart from God, while spiritual ecstasy seems to look very similar to drunkenness. The difference is in the source. A seeker may look to wine, or the seeker may look to the Spirit to which the type points. Drunkenness can seem spiritual. Those alienated from God and seeking spiritual salve for the pain and judgment experienced in a fallen world often look to wine for relief. God promises complete spiritual salve and healing in an outpouring of His Spirit. Isaiah points to the promise: “Be drunk, but not with wine; stagger, but not with strong drink!” (Isa. 29:9). Jeremiah describes an experience of intoxication without wine, “I am like a drunken man, like a man overcome by wine, because of the Lord and because of his holy words” (Jer. 23:9). God sees the pain of life in a fallen world and brings relief and victory. Wine points to relief in the presence of the Spirit and drunkenness points to judgment. The Spirit brings an experience similar to intoxication, but the experience leads to God’s blessing.

Wine serves as a gift from God to soothe the fallen soul in a former age in which the Spirit is not yet poured out on all flesh. Wine may temporarily soothe the heart, but the temporary nature of wine easily leads to drunkenness and further separation from God. The prophets point to fulfillment in terms of an outpouring of God’s Spirit. Isaiah calls for the spiritual seeker to return to God: “Come, everyone who thirsts, come to the waters; and he who has no money, come, buy and eat! Come, buy wine and milk without money and without price” (Isa. 55:1). The Spirit will soon be freely available as the Great

Comforter of God's people. Similar to the images of law and the temple in the Mosaic Covenant the image of wine leaves the seeker looking for completion in a later time in which the seeker's heart contains the law, the soul contains the temple, and the salve of wine occurs without the price of drunkenness in the presence of the Spirit.

### *Wine in the Exile and Return*

The exile and return of Israel provides hope and anticipation through Messianic expectation and restoration.<sup>26</sup> Ezra, for example, reads the law before the weeping returned exiles: "Go your way. Eat the fat and drink sweet wine and send portions to anyone who has nothing ready, for this day is holy to our Lord. And do not be grieved, for the joy of the Lord is your strength" (Neh. 8:10). The sacrifice of the temple (the fat of the sacrifice) and wine combine in a promise sent to those outside the settlement of restoration and covenant blessing. The passage presents great hope of forgiveness and renewed joy and fruitfulness through sacrifice and the typological promise of wine. The people look for restoration in a coming Messiah and in an outpouring of God's presence to all people that will flow into the nations. Three Messianic prophecies use wine as part of the image of renewal and hope of the expected covenant blessing.<sup>27</sup> Hope appears in the image of mountains dripping "sweet wine" (Joel 3:18, Amos 9:13). Israel flourishes in grain and new wine (Zech. 9:17). Their hearts "shall be glad as with wine" (10:7). Blessings flow from Israel into the surrounding areas through the expected Messiah and

---

<sup>26</sup> Dumbrell points out that all that was lost to Israel in the exile was its identity through location in the land. God had simply taken from Israel the false identity in the substance of its location in the land and attempted to replace Israel's identity with the promise of Messiah. Dumbrell, 165.

<sup>27</sup> Gary T. Meaders, "Abstain, Abstinence," in *Baker Theological Dictionary of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996), 8-9.

the subsequent outpouring of relational blessing flowing from Israel like wine from the mountains. The emphasis is not on wine as a substance but on Messianic renewal to all people.

The motif of judgment and error in seeking wine itself for joy and spiritual completeness continues. Drunkenness describes the ignorance of those facing certain judgment. Habakkuk calls wine a “traitor” used by “an arrogant man who is never at rest” (Hab. 2:5). Ezekiel equates drunkenness and sorrow: “You shall drink your sister’s cup that is deep and large; you shall be laughed at and held in derision, for it contains much; you will be filled with drunkenness and sorrow” (Ezek. 23:32-33). Hosea describes the coming judgment of Israel: “Therefore I will take back my grain in its time, and my wine in its season” (Hosea 2:8-9). Israel has forgotten the God who gives wine and looked to the wine itself for spiritual health. They have sought spiritual completeness on their own terms similar to Adam and Eve in the Garden or Noah in the tent and God removes His blessing. The Spirit will be poured out on all nations, but Israel will face judgment. A cycle of addiction begins as Israel seeks further wholeness apart from God in substances and legalism rather than in relationship. Hope comes only from the God who gives the substance rather than the substance itself.

Wine serves as an image of promised joy and restoration. Ezekiel repeats the Mosaic restriction on drinking wine among priests entering the presence of God in the temple (Ezek. 44:21). Access to God’s blessing and joy in the coming age will come on God’s terms and in a relationship with Him in the Spirit in the new temple of the heart of the believer. The promises fulfilled in type of wine are freely available in the coming age

without the drunkenness and judgment of the substance of wine.<sup>28</sup> Wine as a type of the Spirit draws attention to the desperate hope of humanity in a fallen world for something to salve the pain of life through relationship with the Creator. The coming Messiah promises comfort and joy freely available to all humans in the presence of God.

### *Wine in the Incarnation*

Many approaches to wine see the issue as moral rather than as a type fulfilled in the person of Christ and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. Jesus' perceived use of wine often sanctions or restricts the believer's use of wine. An artificial distinction between non-alcoholic "new wine" and alcoholic wine based on the Greek terms for wine form many arguments. The three primary terms for wine in the New Testament are *oinos* (common wine), *gleukos* (sweet wine), and *sikera* (strong wine).<sup>29</sup> The text, however, does not support a distinction among the terms indicating some form of grape juice rather than alcoholic drink. The terms are used interchangeably and the choice of word provides little textual significance or indication of alcohol content. Much in the same way a person might reference liquor, spirits, or cocktails in modern English, the Greek terms simply mean some form of alcoholic wine. The issue is most profound if the exegete attempts to read a modern Fundamentalist restriction into the text. Without consideration of the Spirit to which wine as a type points the issue descends into moralistic dogma. Jesus' use of

---

<sup>28</sup> Guy P. Duffield and Nathaniel Van Cleave observe the relationship of wine and the promise of the Holy Spirit, "Wine seems to call attention to the spiritually stimulating and joy-giving characteristics of the Spirit's indwelling presence." Guy P. Duffield and Nathaniel Van Cleave, *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology* (Los Angeles: Foursquare, 1983), 117.

<sup>29</sup> Spiros Zodhiates, ed., *The Complete Word Study: New Testament* (Chattanooga: AMG, 1991), 940. Johannes B. Bauer, "Wine," in *Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology: The Complete Sacramentum Verbi* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 968.

wine, however, points to deeper fulfillment rather than moral imperative in the life of the believer.

In the persons of John the Baptist and Jesus, humanity faces the choice of renewal from God on His terms or further addictive attempts at renewal and spirituality on human terms. John the Baptist “must not drink wine or strong drink” instead “he will be filled with the Holy Spirit” (Luke 1:15). He points the way to the promised Messiah through repentance. The people, however, refuse to receive the promised Spirit through repentance and accuse John of being filled with a demon (7:33). John the Baptist foreshadows the renewed believer. Jesus, on the other hand, points to salvation at the Cross and the coming joy of the Spirit and is accused of being a drunkard (v. 34). The people, however, fail to see the joy to which Jesus points and only see the moral issue. Apart from the renewed relationship to which both point, the issue of alcohol use manifests as another attempt to please God on human terms.

Jesus’ first recorded miracle involves winemaking (John 2:9-11). The lack of wine at the wedding feast points to spiritual barrenness in first century Israel.<sup>30</sup> The wine of Jesus’ making proves better than the previous wine consumed by the wedding party. Jesus points to the Cross and the outpouring of the Spirit in His first recorded miracle. The coming life in the Spirit will be better than the previous covenant. The Comforter will be better than the comfort of wine. Jesus begins his ministry by revealing himself as the fulfillment of the type of wine and the One who will open human access to the promised Holy Spirit. He will provide something better, and He will provide it freely.

---

<sup>30</sup> *The English Standard Version Study Bible* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2008), 2022.

Judgment in terms of drunkenness also occurs in the Incarnation. Jesus teaches on the coming destruction of Jerusalem and provides a warning of future judgment: “But watch yourselves lest your hearts be weighed down with dissipation and drunkenness and cares of this life, and that day come upon you suddenly like a trap” (Luke 21:34). The drunkenness of addiction that seeks results in ever increasing quantities of the substance apart from God leads to judgment. Wine points to the possibility of joy, but reliance on wine itself again leads to destruction.

Jesus fills human hunger and thirst in terms of drink and bread. His followers will eat His flesh and drink his blood (John 6:54-56). At the Last Supper Jesus seals the New Covenant with bread and wine. He echoes the grain and drink offering of the Mosaic Covenant (Exod. 24:11). The spiritual seeker fails to find wholeness in the substance of bread and wine, but finds wholeness in the fulfillment of the type in the person of Christ.<sup>31</sup> Christ’s sacrifice undoes the sinful seeking of spirituality through a substance. The wine of the renewed relationship becomes the spiritual drink of Christ’s blood of sacrifice. Wine itself cannot bring life; it only reveals humanity’s need for life. Wine points to the blood of Christ as the fulfillment of humanity’s desire for blessing and life.

The two threads of judgment and promised blessing intersect at the Cross. Jesus uses the metaphor of a cup to describe His obedient submission to God’s will (John 18:11).<sup>32</sup> The cup of fellowship motif at the Last Supper carries through to Gethsemane and the motif of the cup as judgment. Jesus offers the cup to the disciples at the Last

---

<sup>31</sup> Tillich discusses the Protestant tendency to separate the elements rather than unify the elements as in the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. The bread points to daily sustenance in Christ while the wine along with the bread points to “the presence of the divine saving power in the natural basis of all spiritual life as well as in the spiritual life itself.” Tillich, 86.

<sup>32</sup> See also Mark 10:38.

Supper as fellowship and promise while He takes upon himself the cup of wrath and judgment. The two threads of the type of wine involving both judgment and restoration separate at the Cross. Jesus endures the judgment and gives His followers the restoration. The image of wine carries further as Jesus endures the Cross. He accepts suffering and judgment while refusing the relief of wine (Matt. 27:34, Mark 15:23). Sinful humans seek to alleviate the suffering of a sinful world through wine, but Christ endures the Cross without the numbing effect of wine. He takes the full effect of pain and judgment so fallen humanity can have the full effect of joy through grace.

Through the lens of the typology of wine God provides a message to humans seeking to use a substance to find spiritual restoration on their own terms. Addiction is a futile attempt at restoration through the application of more of a substance in spite of the fact the substance brings the user into further isolation from God. Efforts to find spiritual wholeness on human terms and in human control form addictions. Some of the Pharisees serve as an example. They interpreted and controlled the law in attempts to control God and other humans rather than relate to God and humans. Their addiction manifests through hair-splitting and rigid interpretations of the law that seek to make the failed human effort at spiritual wholeness work. Jesus mocks the errant Pharisees' futile efforts, and He stands in stark contrast to human efforts at spirituality. Jesus breaks human addiction by removing the pain of judgment and promising something better in a restored relationship with God.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Ray S. Anderson defines redeemed humanity as "free to hear and respond to God," "free to respond to the other person as a counterpart to one's own personhood," able to "find and fulfill one's nature and destiny in a symbiotic relation with the created world and its environment," and able to "be concretely 'this person' belonging to 'these people,' while at the same time open to and responsible for the good of all people." Anderson's description describes a life in community similar to life in community free from



Jesus ratifies the New Covenant with wine as He finishes His work on the Cross (John 19:29-30; Matt. 27:48; Mark 15:36).<sup>34</sup> Unlike the mixed wine He refuses before the crucifixion, the sour wine He receives is a drink of common fellowship. Jesus accepts the full force of punishment and offers fellowship and renewed relationship with common people. A new future of restoration, fruitfulness, and joy begins. Jesus makes all that has been promised and sought by humans available. Relational wholeness exists again on God's terms rather than human control.

### *Wine and the Spirit*

A group of believers wait in Jerusalem for the Spirit to restore all that the previous covenants promised.<sup>35</sup> The gathered believers will subdue the nations in mission, enjoy relational harmony with God and humanity, discover fruitfulness in terms of life and mission, and live in joy.<sup>36</sup> The type of wine reaches completion at the Cross and fully appears in the believers at Pentecost (Acts 2). Observers of the outpouring of Pentecost, however, fail to separate the blessing and judgment and immediately interpret the event as mere drunkenness (2:13). They fail to understand the work on the Cross as Christ taking their judgment on himself. To the observers the threads of judgment and

---

codependent dysfunction and expectations. Ray S. Anderson, *The Shape of Practical Theology: Empowering Ministry with Theological Praxis* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2001), 170.

<sup>34</sup> *The English Standard Version Study Bible*, 2065.

<sup>35</sup> Frank D. Macchia observes the two strands of judgment and restoration in the infilling of the spirit: "The wind of the spirit implies both judgment and purgation/restoration. The themes of sanctification and eschatology converge in John's description of the Messiah's act of baptizing in the Spirit." Frank D. Macchia, "Baptized in the Spirit: A Reflection on the Future of Pentecostal Theology," in *The Future of Pentecostalism in the United States*, ed. Eric Patterson and Edmund Rybarczyk, 15-25 (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2007), 22.

<sup>36</sup> Grenz sees Pentecost as the restoration of community violated in the Fall. It was both "inclusion in Christ's community and our participation in the Spirit." Grenz, 371.

blessing remain linked. At Pentecost the blessing of God is poured out, and Jesus takes the judgment on himself. The fulfillment previously sought in human effort flows freely without the judgment and addictive tendencies.<sup>37</sup>

Peter rises before the crowd of skeptics to explain that the outpoured blessing is more than drunkenness (Acts 2:15-16). Peter in essence says, “This is what we have looked for since humanity fell in the Garden.” The fulfillment of the promise of fruitfulness, dominion, relationship, and joy has appeared. Repentance brings the blessing of the Spirit (vv. 38-39). Humans must turn from seeking fulfillment on their own terms and accept God’s free gift on His terms. The Spirit draws the seeker forward toward fulfillment and reveals the insufficiency of human efforts. The perfection of the new makes the incompleteness of the old seem small.<sup>38</sup>

Many churches push the covenant relationships of God past covenant to the point of dispensation. The outpouring of the Spirit becomes an experience relegated to the first century, and the use of wine becomes simply a moral issue. Abstinence becomes another vain attempt to appropriate spiritual wholeness in human effort. Apart from the experience of Pentecost, a church often looks like most of the Jewish nation before Pentecost. Human strength or willpower becomes a pathway for seeking spiritual fulfillment. Churches often instruct the addict to be strong and stop the addiction in order to please God. Judgment reenters the story and the addict is again seen as a person facing

---

<sup>37</sup> Tillich describes Pentecost as the centering of humanity. Having lost their centeredness at the Fall, Pentecost reestablishes through ecstasy the centered unity of God through faith, relational unity, and universality expressed through mission. Tillich, 279-280.

<sup>38</sup> Anderson observes the supremacy of Pentecost to the previous life of separation from the fullness of the Spirit, “Pentecost promises a paraclete to everyone who stumbles and falls, to everyone who is weak and powerless, to everyone who is tormented and torn by the demons of doubt, discouragement and despair.” Anderson, 204.

judgment from God due to his or her weak moral fortitude. With Pentecost as the fulfillment of the type of wine, nothing could be further from God's plan. God provides freedom from addiction through forgiveness and relational fulfillment in the Holy Spirit. The Cross and Pentecost point out that the answer is not that humans must work harder for healing and salvation.

Many approaches to the issue of alcohol pull Scriptures from their context without understanding that the addicted person seeks spiritual fulfillment through his or her addiction. The addict may simply fail to realize that what they seek in the imperfect substance of wine is available in the presence of the Spirit. The church must model spiritual wholeness in terms of joy, relationship, fruitfulness, and missional effectiveness. The addict may well be more spiritual than the legalist Christian as the addict at least still searches for something more. The addict and the legalistic Christian are both addicted to substances or methods that fail to bring the promised results. The addict seeks more wine, and the legalist seeks more rules and control while attempting to force others into their addiction to rules and control.

The passages of Scripture relating alcohol use and the life of those in the church prove difficult to understand apart from a typological view of alcohol. When the type finds fulfillment, the type ceases to be useful.<sup>39</sup> Once the destination is reached, a map is useless. If spiritually fulfilled through the infilling of the Holy Spirit, the believer has no use for wine. Paul instructs deacons and elders, for instance, not to be "addicted to much wine" or "slaves to much wine" (1 Tim. 3:8; Titus 2:3). A person under the control of

---

<sup>39</sup> Anderson observes the new structure necessary; "The effects of sin are not overcome through a more rigorous form of spirituality but through a renewed structure of sociality." Ibid., 168. The Spirit redeems the community from dysfunction, and in the redeemed community the sinner finds salvation and holiness.

wine cannot lead others to fulfillment in the Spirit as they would still be searching themselves. The use of alcohol among leaders as a moral issue is not the point of the text; the direction of the believer who seeks fulfillment in wine or the fullness of the Holy Spirit is the issue.

Paul warns that drunkards will not inherit the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 6:10; Gal. 5:21). Since fulfillment of the Kingdom begins at the Cross and realizes in the believer in the overflowing experience of Pentecost, a person still under the addictive pattern of alcohol has failed to encounter the fulfillment of the Kingdom. They fail to inherit the Kingdom because they do not seek the Kingdom. They seek the benefits of the Kingdom in their own control through the illusion of control in a substance. Addiction carries the person further from the desired effects and deeper into the use of the substance. Whether the substance is alcohol, legalism, or any idolatry the issue is that the person has not repented or turned from their sinful desire to discover spiritual wholeness on their own terms and in their own illusion of control.

Paul portrays the drunkard as a person still in darkness: “Wake up from your drunken stupor, as is right, and do not go on sinning” (1 Cor. 15:34). He describes drunkenness as something done at night or in incomplete revelation (1 Thess. 5:7).<sup>40</sup> The addicted person is a spiritual person who in many cases is simply in darkness concerning the completeness offered in a relationship with Jesus through the infilling of the Holy Spirit. The church that fails to reveal the light of a renewed relationship in an active infilling of the Holy Spirit lives as much in the dark as the chemically addicted. The non-

---

<sup>40</sup> E. Earl Ellis reminds that Paul is “not concerned to lay down rules for society.” Paul instead “directs his apostolic teaching only to the Christian community.” E. Earl Ellis, *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1997), 54.

Spirit-filled church may free someone of chemical addiction, but they will likely replace the chemical addiction with other addictive behavior. Gossip, legalism, gluttony, and many other behaviors simply become sinful replacements for chemical addiction if the church community fails to meet the inner need for spiritual fulfillment.

A church that claims openness to an infilling experience in the Holy Spirit often replaces chemical addiction with pragmatism. For example, speaking in tongues loses its beauty as a fulfillment of a promise to the seeker and becomes a pragmatic experience to be counted and encouraged in human method rather than submission to God. The effects are sought in a way that looks more like addiction than seeking fulfillment in the presence of the Spirit. Paul addresses the issue in his letters to the church at Corinth. Self-promotion breaks fellowship with the Holy Spirit as the individual seeks to demonstrate personal superiority through various manifestations of the Spirit. Paul writes, “For in eating, each one goes ahead with his own meal. One goes hungry, another gets drunk” (1 Cor. 11:21). The Corinthians have taken the elements of the communion meant to point the seeker to relational and spiritual wholeness and turned them into another human means of seeking spiritual wholeness. The issue is not a moral breach in the use of alcohol; the issue is a spiritual breach in using the elements meant to point to the Spirit to exclude others.<sup>41</sup> The issue is not that wine caused the division; the issue is that they again seek the substance of wine for what only the Spirit can do. Addiction prevails in the church anytime the church seeks spirituality or fulfillment in anything other than the

---

<sup>41</sup> Ellis describes the Corinthian error in worship as egocentrism and lack of order or social decency. The Spirit was in essence used to exclude others and promote self. Ibid., 112.

Spirit's active presence. Attempts to control spirituality or pragmatically build a church look far more like addiction than Spirit-filled living.

Jesus calls His Church to be light to the darkness of addiction. Many still stumbling in chemical addiction can only see further darkness in a church exhibiting addictive and codependent behavior. The legalist in the church moralizes and uses chemical addiction and other behaviors as litmus tests for spirituality when he or she often remains as bound to addictive behavior as the chemically addicted. Patterns of darkness do not break by willpower or moral fortitude; they break by shining the light of God's complete revelation into the darkness.

Paul's focus on wine and the Holy Spirit in Ephesians 5:18 provides the centerpiece of the issue. A believer has no need for wine that leads a person further from the source of life. He or she should observe the spiritual desire typified by wine and recognize that the Spirit makes a far superior means of fulfillment available. Through the continual infilling of the Holy Spirit the believer has no use for the inferior type of wine. The Spirit makes the antitype freely available and the type is obsolete as the type only points to the need for fulfillment. Pleasing God through abstinence as a moral issue does not form the main point of the passage. Paul emphasizes acceptance of God's plan rather than consuming the fruit of prideful and fallen human effort.

### *Wine in the Last Days*

The presence of the Holy Spirit provides the primary typological image of wine in the Church Age. The image of the last days, however, continues the judgment motif of wine. Apocalyptic literature primarily uses wine as an image of God's anger against those who refuse the relationship offered through the Holy Spirit. For example, those who

follow the beast and receive the mark of the beast will “drink the wine of God’s wrath, poured full strength into the cup of his anger” (Rev. 14:10). The unrepentant are thrown “into the great winepress of the wrath of God” (v. 18). The bowls of wrath poured out on the Earth reference bowls or cups of destruction in terms of wine (16:19). Wine references the judgment Christ receives on the Cross in order to offer grace to fallen humans. The image, however, in Revelation appears as the price of blood paid by those who have refused Jesus as they encounter God’s presence. The image of wine in the judgment portions of Revelation symbolizes God’s wrath on unrepentant men instead of the comforting presence of the Holy Spirit to those who have repented and accepted grace. Judgment seen through the image of wine forms a profound image of the consequence of errant human choice. Like drunkenness, the choice to drink excessively in a vain effort to find spirituality apart from God leads to the pain and consequences of the behavior. Stephen J. Bramer observes the self-inflicted nature of judgment: “The image of drinking expresses the fact that those smitten by it execute judgment on themselves by their own acts.”<sup>42</sup> Judgment is not arbitrary but falls on those who, like the drunkard, have sought spirituality apart from God.

### *Wine in the New Creation*

Wine itself does not appear in the New Creation (Rev. 21-22). Wine has previously typified God’s presence or judgment. In the New Creation judgment exists in the past and God resides fully with His people. Wine as a type no longer serves a purpose. God’s presence is restored among His people, and they no longer need the

---

<sup>42</sup> Stephen J. Bramer, “Drink,” in *Baker Theological Dictionary of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996), 188.

soothing of wine to point to the promise of God's presence. The world has come full circle back to the presence of God, and the pain of sin disappears. Wine resembles the images of the temple, the sun, and the moon in that the new city no longer needs them because the fullness to which they point resides in God's presence in the city (21:22-23). Humans look to God instead of a substance for healing in the new city. Addiction is broken, and the cycle of human separation and decline reverses in God's presence.

### *A Summary of the Images of Wine*

The primary image of wine reflects the spiritual life. Humans have a God-given thirst for deeper spirituality and restored relationship. Pride causes humans to seek spirituality on human terms and in human control. The thirst, however, comes from God to draw fallen humans to the restoration of His presence paid for at the Cross. The substance abuser seeks a salve for the pain of fallen humanity. The salve proves temporary and leads the user further into the spiral of addiction in which the user seeks more of the substance in ever more futile attempts to ease the pain of the world. The addicted simply have never encountered the Spirit of God to which wine points in the Bible.

Humans try many things to control their spiritual journey such as consumerism, accumulation of wealth, popularity, or power. Humans by nature are prone to the spiral of addiction. When seeking to control their own future and spiritual condition, humans often seek more of the substance sought for spirituality in an addictive spiral rather than face the futility of the effort. Apart from forgiveness, repentance, and the infilling presence of the Holy Spirit, there will always exist some form of addiction whether to a substance or to power, popularity, and possession. Similarly, churches often seek to form human



controlled spiritual community and measure the community through pragmatic efforts and results rather than in the power of the Holy Spirit.<sup>43</sup> The fruit in the Garden provides the first example of human effort leading to decline and isolation, but each human in some form seeks his or her own forbidden fruit for spiritual fulfillment rather than the presence of God.<sup>44</sup> Rather than seeing the addicted as weak and morally corrupt, perhaps the church can see itself as sharing in the thirst for authentic spiritual presence.

Wine also points to fellowship. The cultural expectation of alcohol is one of friendship and shared experience. The so-called “social drinker” provides an example. The common cup of communion points likewise to the idea of fellowship. The problem in reliance on wine for the basis of fellowship is that it more often fractures relationship. Submitted and healthy relationships are only possible in the fellowship of the Spirit to which the type of wine points. Fellowship based on anything less than a common encounter with the Holy Spirit is only partial and leaves the community looking for more. Apart from the Holy Spirit, churches often base fellowship on commonality. They share common ethnicity, worship style, or following of a gifted leader. The result looks more like addiction than biblical fellowship.

Wine as a type points both to the Spirit and to judgment. All spirituality moves in one of two directions. Worship in the church, for example, can glorify the worshipper in an addictive spiral that leads him or her further from God and into judgment, or it can

---

<sup>43</sup> Frank D. Macchia observes the common tendency to focus on human effort; “Materialism, social influence, political agendas, social movements, or anything human, even things noble in themselves, can be made into destructive idols if granted the absolute significance that belongs alone to the triune God.” Frank D. Macchia, *The Trinity: Practically Speaking* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2010), 164.

<sup>44</sup> Duffield and Van Cleave observe the results of focusing on the wrong source for spiritual fulfillment; “The world’s spirits give a lift with a let-down; the believer’s anointing with oil and wine brings inspiration without desperation.” Duffield and Van Cleave, 117.

lead the worshipper to God and the fullness of the Spirit. Humans build relationships on many foundations that often lead to more expectation, hurt, and an addictive spiral ending in relational pain. Relationships can also be built on the presence of the Spirit and lead to authentic biblical community. The issue remains one of direction. The spiritual seeker can build his or her life on false spirituality and never encounter discipleship, or he or she can remove the blindness similar to drunkenness and begin a true discipleship process based on truth. Mission also advances in two directions: (1) drawing people in to satisfy the church's need for pragmatic numbers and finances, or (2) flowing out as an authentic spiritual community into the surrounding world. Wine as a type provides a lens through which the church may see its own addictive patterns.

### Ephesus as an Example of an Addictive System

Paul writes to the church in Ephesus<sup>45</sup> in order to encourage power over darkness demonstrated in the believer's walk in the light of Christ's power. The message communicates to the struggling person that hope for something better than the darkness of the present world exists in the light of God's active presence. Paul addresses those who were "dead in the trespasses and sins in which you once walked following the course of this world" (Eph. 2:1-2). Humans by nature seek some form of spiritual wholeness. Apart from Christ humans seek wholeness in terms of the "course of the world" or the pattern set forth by the "prince of the power of the air" (v. 2). The pattern of addiction reveals humanity's broken spirituality. Alcohol, sexual immorality, codependency, and the like

---

<sup>45</sup> While Pauline authorship is debatable, the inclusion of Ephesians in the canon is generally not debatable; therefore, Pauline authorship is not essential to this chapter's argument. This chapter will refer to Paul, however, as the author of Ephesians and include the epistle in Pauline epistles.

provide some sense of spiritual salve for fallen humanity, but they become patterns in which the human spirit is further damaged and drawn into deeper despair.

The pattern of human addictive spirituality remains deeply embedded in relationships.<sup>46</sup> Children of alcoholic parents, for example, more easily become alcoholics. The child seeking spiritual relief from the pain of the sin of the parent becomes “by nature children of wrath, like the rest of mankind” (Eph. 2:3). Cultural patterns and human thinking drive the brokenness of human spirituality. Sin drives addiction in that it seeks to provide spiritual wholeness through human effort. The enemy uses human effort to create a downward spiral in which the promise of spiritual salve through the substance perpetuates in spite of the overwhelming evidence that the substance itself creates further spiritual pain. The complex pattern of sin promulgates through the essential lie that more of the sinful behavior will eventually provide the result sought. Paul references the pain of human sinful patterns in terms similar to the downward spiral of addiction in the relational community of the church.

Although Paul never specifically mentions “addiction,” as it is a modern construct, the pain and despair of the downward spiral of sin described by Paul certainly resembles the pattern of the modern concept of addiction. The pattern of addiction manifests in many behaviors like sexual immorality and covetousness mentioned in Ephesians as works of darkness (Eph. 5:3-5). Sexual sin destroys a person as it leads further from wholeness and deeper into dark behavior. Internal thought patterns motivate

---

<sup>46</sup> Paul writes to the community of believers rather than individuals. Victor Paul Furnish states, “For him, moral action is never a matter of an isolated actor choosing from among a variety of abstract ideals on the basis of how inherently ‘good’ or ‘evil’ each may be. Instead, it is always a matter of choosing and doing what is good for the brother and what will upbuild the whole community of the brethren.” Victor Paul Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul*, 2nd ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2009), 233.

behavior.<sup>47</sup> The desire to seek spiritual wholeness through actions controlled by the person underlies sinful behavior. Sexual immorality, as an example, is at heart spiritual as it seeks spirituality in the union with another person apart from God's pattern of spiritual wholeness. The spiral of addiction begins and persons are drawn into the relational addiction of codependency.<sup>48</sup>

The downward spiral of addiction appears frequently within American churches. Spiritual seekers attempt to find spiritual wholeness through pragmatism or quick-fix experience rather than in God's plan. Addictive patterns of seeking spirituality in human terms and human control form the foundation of spiritual experience for many. For example, traditional Pentecostal altar services began as a means of relational connection to God through the Holy Spirit. The altar services, in many cases, became a pragmatic tool in which the substantial elements of the service are manipulated and controlled to provide an experience in which spirituality becomes more like a purchased experience than a relational encounter in God's control. As a result, persons often seek further control and manipulation of the experience rather than the Spirit. Louder music, repetitive choruses, brighter lights, and the like became the substance of addictive patterns of seeking spirituality. Likewise, codependent relationships in which another's spirit defines someone else's spiritual condition frequently appear in religious environments. Pastors, for example, often base their self-worth on the number of seats filled or the pragmatic

---

<sup>47</sup> Cognitive psychology provides the maxim that thoughts create feelings and feelings create behavior. While not the scope of this paper, all behavior is motivated, and underlying thought process motivates behavior. For example, Jesus supports this idea in Matthew 5:21-30 when He points to the underlying thought as the ultimate issue in behavior.

<sup>48</sup> Anderson states that pastoral care involves "an extension of God's grace, a transfer of spiritual power and the creation of a healing community." Anderson, 223. Pastoral care is therefore more about creating a healthy community of the Spirit than it is about teaching morality.

results of their efforts. Pride of self replaces the authentic spirituality of the Holy Spirit, and the result resembles an addictive spiral as it seeks pragmatic results through methodology.

Paul, in Ephesians 5:18 reaches the apex of his argument against addictive behavior in the church. Paul uses drunkenness to illustrate from Jewish religious tradition the foolishness of sinful lifestyles and the unwise Gentile lifestyle of the “old age.”<sup>49</sup> Paul emphasizes fullness or saturation in foolish culture in the relational context of the church.<sup>50</sup> Timothy G. Gombis clarifies Paul’s use of drunkenness in the passage:

Paul sets up drunkenness as the epitome of the ways of darkness and of shameful, foolish living. It is the very essence of the “old humanity” dynamic, which is to seek pleasure selfishly, indulging in behaviour that leads to destruction. Reading the contrast in this manner is consistent both with the immediate context and with Pauline usage elsewhere.<sup>51</sup>

Paul illustrates human sin manifested in the community of the church through his image of drunkenness.<sup>52</sup> He seeks the fullness of Christ in the church but observes the painful foolishness of drunkenness in the patterns of the church. The issue is one of control as it manifests in the systemic corporate dynamic of the church. Either the old nature or the Spirit controls believers in a corporate or systemic sense.

Paul’s letter to the Ephesian church acknowledges the downward spiral of sin and provides a pattern for deliverance and true spiritual health through being “made alive in

---

<sup>49</sup> Wendall Hollis, “Become Full in the Spirit: A Linguistic, Contextual, and Theological Study of *πληροῦσθ ἐν πνεύματι*” (Ph.D. diss. Trinity International University, 2001), 257.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 248.

<sup>51</sup> Timothy G. Gombis, “Being the Fullness of God in Christ by the Spirit: Ephesians 5:18 in its Epistolary Setting,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 53, no. 2. (2002): 266.

<sup>52</sup> Gombis points out that reading the command in 5:18 as directed to the individual creates problems in interpreting the five following participles and to the entire argument of Ephesians. He advocates a reading of 5:18 as directed to the community as a corporate body. Gombis, 259.

Christ” (Eph. 2:5). Similar to Paul’s despair in Romans 7 concerning the downward spiral of sin, the answer in Ephesians and in Romans 8 is God’s Spirit. Allowing God’s control breaks the sinful pattern of seeking spiritual wholeness through human controlled substances or codependent relationships. Spiritual wholeness comes through grace rather than human effort through substances or improper relationships (v. 8). Wholeness is a matter of being God’s “workmanship” (v. 10). Humans are not products of their own workmanship, effort, or attempts to find spiritual wholeness in human control.

### **Biblical Solutions for Addiction**

Wine prefigures joy in the Holy Spirit and the blood of Christ, and the question of a Christian drinking wine proves complex. Approached dogmatically, a person can answer the question in the positive or negative depending on the starting point. Approached through the unfolding of covenant theology the question no longer asks whether a Christian can drink wine or not. With the availability of the fullness of the Spirit, the question becomes, why would a Spirit-filled Christian need the effects of wine? Leonhard Goppelt observes the temporary nature of types once the antitype is available: “Types exist primarily as the result of the general relationship between becoming and being, between history and spirit, as we can observe in nature and history. In the child, for example, the man is prefigured.”<sup>53</sup> Wine prefigures the relationship with Christ available through the infilling of the Holy Spirit. Drinking wine or any addictive pattern therefore provides an experience far beneath the completeness available to the

---

<sup>53</sup> Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*, trans. C. Bertelsmann Verlag (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 11.

Christian in the Holy Spirit.<sup>54</sup> The issue relates to motive rather than dogma. The question of alcohol consumption by a Christian remains more about the motive of control and the original desire to seek spirituality apart from God's plan than it is of moral obligation.

Drunkenness or any addictive behavior carries judgment when relied upon as an end itself rather than a prefiguring of the more complete infilling of the Holy Spirit.<sup>55</sup>

Edmund P. Clowney observes God's tendency to withhold judgment in order to draw humans into relationship:

God withholds the burning revelation of His holy presence because He withholds the day of judgment that it must bring. The God of glory has already revealed himself as the Father of mercy by sending His Son into the world. He restrains the glory of His appearing so that men may respond to the call of His mercy and taste the wonder of His love.<sup>56</sup>

God seeks a full relationship with humans and allows judgment to prevent humans from relying on the incompleteness of addiction rather than God. Judgment, therefore, forms an aspect of God's blessing as it draws persons to a relationship. The addict experiencing loss is in fact blessed in that God has allowed a limited judgment to help him or her find the fullness he or she seeks. The foolishness of codependency as seen in Paul's metaphor of drunkenness in Ephesians 5:18 points to broken human relational patterns that draw humans toward completeness in the Christ through the Spirit.

---

<sup>54</sup> Duffield and VanCleave describe the incompleteness of seeking spiritual fulfillment through a substance rather than God; "The world seeks alcoholic wine for stimulation and merriment, but the Christian receives enhancement of his abilities and true joyfulness from the Spirit of God who indwells him. The world's spirits give a lift with a let-down; the believer's anointing with oil and wine brings inspiration without desperation." Duffield and VanCleave, 117.

<sup>55</sup> Gombis points out that the contrast between light and darkness and drunkenness and Spirit infilling in Ephesians 5:18 "has been developing up to 5:18, then, is between two distinct ways of life: light and darkness, wisdom and folly, the 'new humanity' being renewed and the 'old humanity' heading for destruction." Gombis, 265.

<sup>56</sup> Edmund P. Clowney, *The Unfolding Mystery: Discovering Christ in the Old Testament* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P and R, 1988), 99.

Churches must not address addiction as a simple moral issue. The drunkard seeks spirituality in the only known source in many cases. Mark R. Laaser, George Ohlschlager, and Tim Clinton observe the addict's hopeless search for fulfillment: "Addicts don't know a better life. In most cases addicts don't know true love and intimacy—they don't know a true relationship with God. Addictions are embraced as the perverse substitutes—false love and false intimacy."<sup>57</sup> The addict or codependent organization may simply seek the same thing the Spirit-filled believer has found except they are unaware of the greater antitype of the Holy Spirit and have accepted the lesser type of wine. A church must provide more than moral imperative to the addict concerning wine or drug use; it must demonstrate the completeness of a relationship with Jesus through the Holy Spirit. Laaser, Ohlschlager, and Clinton describe ministry to the addicted person seeking genuine spirituality: "One of the greatest challenges in working with addicts is in helping them exchange the short-term highs for long-term truth. Intimacy with God and others is so much more satisfying than the high of any addiction."<sup>58</sup> The Spirit-filled community of the church should freely offer everything the addict looks for in addiction. If God withholds judgment so the addicted may find a relationship with Him, it seems reasonable that the Spirit-led community would emphasize the joy of a relationship with God more than the judgment of the addict.

---

<sup>57</sup> Mark R. Laaser, George Ohlschlager, and Tim Clinton, "Addictions," in *Caring for People God's Way: Personal and Emotional Issues, Addictions, Grief, and Trauma* (Nashville: Nelson, 2005), 268.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.



The community as a healthy system is essential.<sup>59</sup> Gordon Fee discusses Ephesians 5:18 in terms of community as it relates to the sins listed before the verse and the songs, praise, and submitted living following the verse. He states that Paul emphasizes the formation of a Spirit-filled community “whose life is so totally given over to the Spirit that the life and deeds of the Spirit are as obvious in their case as the effects of too much wine are obvious to the other.”<sup>60</sup> The addict encountering the Spirit-filled community of God should easily see the completeness to which they have been looking in the incompleteness of addiction.

The issue then is more complex than absolute abstinence from wine. Paul’s instruction to Timothy to use a little wine for his stomach problems serves as an example (1 Tim. 5:23). Motive forms the core of the issue. Paul does not instruct Timothy to use wine to seek comfort from the world’s fallen state or to seek spirituality. Paul tells him to use wine medicinally as a person might take a prescription for a physical ailment. The substance of wine is not evil; the motive of the user makes wine use evil. Likewise, it seems likely that Jesus used wine at the marriage feast and at the Last Supper communion as a means of pointing to the coming outpouring of the Spirit. The motive was not to seek spirituality on human terms in the substance of wine; it was to point to deeper relationship with God.

---

<sup>59</sup> Roger Stronstad emphasizes the importance of spiritual community; “The difference between the charismatic activity of the Spirit throughout Israelite history and the age to come is one of magnitude; the gift of the Spirit to individuals or groups will give way to the gift of the Spirit to the community.” Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984), 26. The emphasis in the Spirit’s current activity in the church is therefore the community itself, and His activity within the community of believers is oriented toward the edification of the community rather than any one believer.

<sup>60</sup> Gordon Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 721.

Believers might find in Jesus' use of wine some reason for wine use by Christian missionaries in cultures in which wine is integral to fellowship. The user, as in any cross-cultural encounter, must be certain as to the motive. Absolute restriction of wine use by Christians does not seem to be the purpose of the biblical passages relating to wine.

Douglas A. Oss observes the biblical narrative's primary function in pointing the seeker to a relationship with Christ: "We have the Bible to lead us to a relationship with Jesus. Where the Bible does not split hairs we should not split hairs."<sup>61</sup> Motive remains the key issue concerning wine use among Christians.

The addict and many who attempt to live Christianity as a religion and not a relationship share many common characteristics.<sup>62</sup> Moral imperatives can become means of seeking spirituality on human terms rather than relationship. Some of the Pharisees of Jesus' day serve as an example. The moral imperative they discerned in the law became an addiction in its own right, and the resultant community was codependent in its reliance on false substance for identity. The addict wisely will refuse to respond to religious obligation, as there is little difference from their addiction to wine.

Religious addiction may well be a more absurd contradiction than substance abuse.<sup>63</sup> Churches who seek dogmatic morality and exhibit codependent relationships

---

<sup>61</sup> Douglas A. Oss, "Biblical Theology in Ministry" (class notes for Core 2 Course at Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, Springfield, MO, February 25, 2013).

<sup>62</sup> Victor Paul Furnish points out that the essential nature of Paul's ethic derives from "the experience of being 'in Christ.'" Victor Paul Furnish, *The Moral Teaching of Paul*. 3rd ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 2009), 19. Furnish describes Paul's focus and states that he "is not a philosopher-moralist addressing 'secular' men, but an apostle bearing a gospel to men who have been baptized 'into Christ.'" Victor Paul Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul*, 2nd ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009), 89.

<sup>63</sup> Roger Stronstad describes the church that sees itself as a didactic community "where sound doctrine is treasured above charismatic action" or as an experiential community where "the focus is on experience rather than on service" as churches that have left their prophetic heritage "for the pottage of

have little ability to reach the addicted in their community.<sup>64</sup> Freedom in Christ does not excuse further wine use. Freedom leads the seeker to life in the Spirit to which the type of wine points. William A. Dyrness observes the tendency of churches to ignore freedom's responsibilities: "Freedom is always defined negatively in terms of being free from restrictions, it is rarely defined in positive terms of being free for something in particular."<sup>65</sup> The missional church is free from moral imperative for the purpose of proclaiming freedom in the Holy Spirit. The addict does not need moral restriction as he or she is likely well aware of the futility of addiction and the judgment to which he or she is headed.<sup>66</sup> Addicts need to see a free and alive community of the Holy Spirit, which they have been seeking in their addiction.<sup>67</sup> The church must proclaim and live in the fullness of a relationship with the Holy Spirit.

The community living in the contradiction found in seeking works-based spirituality in restrictive religion will fail to reach the addict. Paul Tillich describes the

---

self-seeking experience and blessing." Roger Stronstad. *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology* (Cleveland, TN: CPT, 2010), 121.

<sup>64</sup> Anderson the underlying cause of the problem leading to ineffectiveness in mission; "The problem comes when any principle is made into a normative criterion and imposed as a rule or law that excludes the Spirit of Christ as the criterion that upholds the normative teaching of scripture." Anderson, 98.

<sup>65</sup> William A. Dyrness, *Invitation to Cross-Cultural Theology: Case Studies in Vernacular Theologies* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992), 135.

<sup>66</sup> Grenz describes true spiritual freedom; "Living in freedom does not mean living without restraint. On the contrary, freedom is God's gift bestowed on us through participation in community with Christ." Grenz, 438.

<sup>67</sup> Grenz emphasizes the importance of community to mission; "God directs his saving action towards the healing of interpersonal relationships. According to the New Testament the focal point of God's new reconciled society is the church of Jesus Christ." Ibid., 461. Addictive and relational dysfunction such as codependency would not be a soteriological community. Grenz continues, "In short, God's program is directed toward, and is experienced in, community. For this reason, the church is far more than a collection of saved individuals who band together for the task of winning the lost. The church is the community of salvation." Ibid., 481.

cognitive dissonance of living in contradiction: “Self-loss as the first and basic mark of evil is the loss of one’s determining center; it’s the disintegration of the centered self by disruptive drives which cannot be brought into unity. So long as they are centered, these drives constitute the person as a whole.”<sup>68</sup> Loss of identity and “center” are key indicators of codependency. The addict has a false center in a false identity as a hopeless addict. He or she is uninterested in further false identity in terms of religious obligation without the power of the Holy Spirit. The contradiction of the type of wine in terms of prefiguring relational wholeness, fruitfulness, and joy as it juxtaposes with judgment provides a contradiction of which the addict remains well aware. In contrast the Christian is often unaware of their tendency to seek spirituality in legalistic terms. Tillich continues his observation: “Self-contradiction drives toward self-destruction.”<sup>69</sup> The judgment inherent in religiosity or in addiction serves as a contradiction that leads both further from desired wholeness and into deeper judgment. Tillich provides a solution similar to the antitype of wine: “The Spirit takes the personal center into the universal center, the transcendent unity which makes faith and love possible.”<sup>70</sup> The solution for human religious contradictory efforts, which always lead to further addictive behavior whether legalism or substance abuse, is to look to the Spirit as the ultimate end to which all human efforts point.

The question of wine use among Christians is more than a simple moral issue or one of legal restriction. It is a question of why a person would seek the contradictory and

---

<sup>68</sup> Tillich, 243.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

impartial substance rather than the completeness of a relationship with Jesus through the Holy Spirit. The church as a missional community will have little power in the culture if it fails to stand apart from the culture. The church that seeks completeness in legalism, possessions, political power, and the like fails to stand apart from the culture of addiction as it still looks to something other than the Spirit for completeness. Prideful ambition and human controlled spirituality are not far removed from the sin of Adam and Eve in the Garden.

### Ephesus as a Model for Healthy Systems

The letter to the Ephesian church continues after Paul's imperative in 5:18 with instruction for living in community based on common salvation through the gift of grace.<sup>71</sup> Paul describes the condition of addictive systems as walking

as the Gentiles do, in the futility of their minds. They are darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them, due to their hardness of heart. They have become callous and have given themselves up to sensuality, greedy to practice every kind of impurity (Eph. 4:17-19).

The Gentiles as an example follow their own minds in the futility of the addictive spiral of sin. Darkened understanding has taken over, and they have been alienated from authentic relational spirituality due to ignorance and hardness of heart in a pattern similar to addiction. In spite of the obvious fact that their behavior leads them further from authentic spirituality, they continue in the addictive spiral of believing more of the sinful behavior will somehow bring the desired spiritual wholeness. Paul continues as he addresses the specific issues in the believers in Ephesus by encouraging them to follow

---

<sup>71</sup> C. Leslie Mitton states that "gathering for fellowship" is implied in Ephesians 5:18 in the directives for singing and making melody that follow. C. Leslie Mitton, *New Century Bible Commentary: Ephesians*, ed. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black (London: Oliphant's, 1976), 191.

the pattern learned in Christ (v. 20). Spiritual wholeness appears as the old self, “which belongs to your former manner of life and is corrupt through deceitful desires” is put off and the “new self” is put on through renewing the “spirit of your minds” (v. 23). The new self is “created after the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness” (v. 24). Once the falsehood of sin and its resulting addictive spiral are put away, the behavior changes. Paul lists speaking truth, controlling anger, honest work, kindness, and forgiveness examples of renewed behavior. Renewal on God’s terms brings relational health rather than codependent and controlling behavior.

Paul defines godly spirituality in terms of walking in light and human attempts at spirituality in terms of walking in darkness. Fee sees Paul’s list in chapter 5 as a continuation of Paul’s list at the end of chapter 4.<sup>72</sup> Paul lists sexual immorality, impurity, covetousness, filthiness, foolish talk, and crude joking as actions incompatible with a renewed spiritual mind. While Paul certainly had no theory of addiction or codependency in mind while writing the letter, as no theory of addiction existed in his day, the list describes sexual addictions and codependent relationships in terms much like the modern construct of addiction. The person seeking spiritual wholeness in the addictive and codependent pattern of the world “has no inheritance in the kingdom of God and Christ” (Eph. 5:5). The deception and empty words of sinful addiction make the “wrath of God” come upon “the children of disobedience” (v. 6). The pattern of addictive, sinful spiral breaks in Paul’s thinking through exposing the absurdity of the addictive spiral with the light of truth.<sup>73</sup> Darkness causes humans to believe more sinful behavior will somehow

---

<sup>72</sup> Fee, 158.

bring them spiritual wholeness, while light reveals that spiritual wholeness comes from God through faith and grace rather than the human control and manipulation of addictive patterns.

Paul reaches the centerpiece of his argument in Ephesians 5:15-21. He instructs the Ephesian church to be wise rather than foolish. They should seek God's will over their own foolish thinking. The "days are evil" and culture draws a person to enter into an addictive spiral of seeking the illusion of control over their spiritual journey through sinful behavior. Paul reaches the apex of his comparison in verse eighteen, "And do not get drunk with wine, for that is debauchery, but be filled with the Spirit" (Eph. 5:18). Paul uses the most common and stereotypical of addictive behaviors in contrast with the infilling of the Holy Spirit. Both actions focus on continual action on the part of the person.<sup>74</sup> Stop continually seeking spiritual wellness or salve through addictive behavior as in drunkenness because it only leads to debauchery or further spiritual alienation from

---

<sup>73</sup> Furnish describes God's intervention in human sinfulness; "To be rightwised means to be claimed and encountered by the power and love of God which reconciles and makes new. God's righteousness, with its twin aspects of judgment and grace, is met and received in Christ, who is righteousness 'for us' (1 Cor. 1:30)." Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 154.

<sup>74</sup> A. Skevington Wood observes the possibility that *en pneumatic* in 5:18 refers to the locus of the filling. Paul is in his view telling the reader where to be filled with the Spirit. The person with a broken spirit is to be filled in the human spirit with the Holy Spirit rather than addictive substances or dysfunctional relational patterns. A. Skevington Wood, "Ephesians," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Ephesians through Philemon*, ed. Frank A. Gæbelein (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1981), 72. William Hendriksen in contrast emphasizes *en pneumatic* as Spirit contrasted with drunkenness rather than the locus of the filling. In either case the Spirit is contrasted with the emptiness the person seeking wholeness through something less than the completeness of the infilling of the Spirit. William Hendriksen, *Exposition of Ephesians in New Testament Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1967), 239. Peter O'Brien states that understanding the passage as an instrumental dative indicating the means by which believers are to be filled (by the Holy Spirit) "is preferable and makes better sense." He translates the imperative as "be filled by the Spirit in the spirit." Peter T. O'Brien, "The Letter to the Ephesians" in *Pillar NT Commentary*, ed. D. A. Carson ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 391. Harold W. Hoehner states that understanding *en pneumatic* as simply human spirit is unlikely as Paul refers to spirit as something from outside a person thirteen times in Ephesians (1:13, 17; 2:2, 18, 22; 3:5, 16; 4:3,4,23,30; 6:17, 18). Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002), 702. He further observes that wine and the Spirit are contrasted two other times in the Bible (Luke 1:15; Acts 2:13-18). Both instances refer to the Holy Spirit and not the human spirit. *Ibid.*, 703.

God.<sup>75</sup> Instead, continually seek the presence of God through the infilling of the Holy Spirit which leads to the imperatives listed subsequent to verse 18. Fee observes the passage's emphasis: "Paul is not so much telling them not to get drunk—that is assumed under walking in the light and thus walking wisely—as he is urging them continually to live in/by the Spirit."<sup>76</sup> Continual focus on the infilling presence of the Holy Spirit breaks the pattern of systemic codependency and addiction.<sup>77</sup>

Paul's contrast of drunkenness and the infilling of the Holy Spirit reveals the heart of the issue.<sup>78</sup> Both lead to different results through continual action motivated by spiritual longing.<sup>79</sup> Drunkenness seems to appear from nowhere in the passage. Two possible reasons for the appearance of the reference to alcohol in verse 18 exist. The first possibility is a specific problem in the Ephesian church<sup>80</sup>, and the second possibility

---

<sup>75</sup> John Muddiman states that the word *asôtia* has the same root as *sôtêria* and implies general unhealthiness. John Muddiman, *The Epistle to the Ephesians* in *Black's NT Commentaries* (London: Continuum, 2001), 247.

<sup>76</sup> Fee, 720.

<sup>77</sup> Macchia calls the infilling described in 5:18-19 as a "charismatically interactive experience." Macchia, 254. Spirit infilling is a community experience that must affect the systemic dysfunction in the community as much as it must affect any individual within the community.

<sup>78</sup> Ernest Best observes that the contrast in the passage is not between two entities (Spirit and wine) but between two conditions (drunkenness and Spirit possession). Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*, *The International Critical Commentary*, ed. J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield, and G. N. Stanton (Edinburgh: T and T, 1998), 506.

<sup>79</sup> Hendriksen the use of alcohol to both alleviate pain and seek spiritual wholeness; "By the ancients, moreover, an overdose of wine was often used not only to rid oneself of care and to gain a sense of mirth but also to induce communion with the gods and, by means of this communion, to receive ecstatic knowledge, not otherwise attainable." Hendriksen, 240.

<sup>80</sup> J. L. Houlden, *Paul's Letters from Prison: Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians* (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1970), 328.



relates to the Ephesian cult of Dionysus.<sup>81</sup> The Ephesian cult looked to a narcotic spiked wine to provide relational unity and spirituality. The cult likely viewed drunkenness as possession by the spirit of Dionysus.<sup>82</sup> The relational unity found in the common experience of drunkenness and the perceived spiritual effect of the narcotic wine led to rampant sexual immorality in the cult.

Andrew T. Lincoln observes that the shift to the contrast between wine and the Spirit is a contrast between wisdom and folly involving the person coming under “the control of external power.”<sup>83</sup> Ernest Best describes the contrast as one between the anesthetizing response to darkness of wine and the response of light in the presence of the Holy Spirit.<sup>84</sup> It seems likely that Paul references the use of narcotic wine in the Ephesian cult in 5:18 as he leads up to the verse with the folly of sexual immorality and improper relationships and follows the verse with teaching on wisdom in sexuality in the marriage relationship and relational harmony within the church.

Paul’s choice of a common addiction to contrast with the fullness of the Holy Spirit proves significant. The verse in the structure of the passage forms the center of Paul’s argument. At first glance the verse seems to be a moral rule of abstinence among

---

<sup>81</sup> Markus Barth and M. Hengel hold this view. Markus Barth, *Ephesian 4-6: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1974), 580. M. Hengel, *Between Jesus and Paul* (London: SCM, 1983), 188.

<sup>82</sup> Craig S. Keener, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1993), 550.

<sup>83</sup> Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, Word Biblical Commentary 42, ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker (Dallas: Word, 1990), 344.

<sup>84</sup> Best acknowledges Barth’s view of wine as a reference to the Dionysus cult but uses the reference to point to darkness in general as a response to human pain. Best, 507. John Muddiman states that the direction of Ephesians 5:22 derives from 1 Thessalonians 5:6-8 and Romans 13:12 and points to worship direction as either the dysfunction of the Dionysus cult or genuine worship in the Holy Spirit. John Muddiman, *The Epistle to the Ephesians in Black’s NT Commentaries* (London: Continuum, 2001), 247.

other moral teachings. Paul, however, looks past moral imperative to the essential nature of addiction contrasted with life in the Spirit. Many translations use “and” to introduce the verse making it seem to be simply another example in the surrounding lists of behavior. The Greek *kai* introducing the verse may also mean “in particular.”<sup>85</sup> Assuming this meaning makes verse 18 the center of Paul’s contrast and comparison in chapters 4 and 5. The concepts of light and dark, foolishness and wisdom, and broken relationships and godly relationships are in particularly represented by the contrast of drunkenness with wine and the infilling of the Holy Spirit.<sup>86</sup> Drunkenness attempts to provide something which in reality only comes through the infilling of the Holy Spirit.<sup>87</sup> Markus Barth describes the possibility that the drunkard is seeking spiritual wholeness: “Perhaps misuse of alcohol is in itself an attempt to bridge the gap between the secular and the religious.”<sup>88</sup> Wine as a salve for the soul in turmoil and a builder of relationship remains a common theme even in current culture. Rather than a simple moral imperative, Paul references a new revelation or biblical mystery that he unfolds in the passage. Wine in past times and cultures represents a form of spirituality now replaced by the complete

---

<sup>85</sup> Harold W. Hoehner states that *kai* means more than “and” as it “points to further thought.” *Kai* “particularizes the foregoing statement.” Hoehner, 698.

<sup>86</sup> Rudolf Schnackenburg emphasizes the shift from general to particular in Paul’s use of *kai* to introduce 5:18. The shift from dative (with wine) to preposition (by the spirit) is important in Paul’s thought progression from examples of dysfunction to wholeness in the filling of the Spirit in the human spirit. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Ephesians: A Commentary*, trans. Helen Heron (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1991), 237.

<sup>87</sup> Lincoln writes that the contrast between drunkenness and the Spirit “both involve the self coming under the control of an external power, and the states of alcoholic and religious intoxication were often compared.” Lincoln, 344.

<sup>88</sup> Markus Barth, *Ephesian 4-6: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1974), 580.

revelation of the infilling of the Holy Spirit. Persons have the ability to choose their source of filling.<sup>89</sup>

Paul continues the letter with the results of Spirit-filled living. Believers live a communal life of “addressing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody to the Lord with your heart, giving thanks always and for everything to God the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, submitting to one another out of reverence for Christ” (Eph. 5:19-21).<sup>90</sup> With verse 18 as the structural pivot point of the passage rather than another moral imperative, the following verses describe a life of fullness in the Spirit contrasted with the emptiness of life in addictive sin.<sup>91</sup> Continual filling with wine results in debauchery, and continual filling with the Holy Spirit results in fellowship, worship, gratitude, and submission.<sup>92</sup> Paul never

---

<sup>89</sup> Stephen E. Fowl observes human power to choose; “If Paul admonishes the Ephesians to be filled by the Spirit, there must be some sense in which this is in their power.” Stephen E. Fowl, *Ephesians: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 177.

<sup>90</sup> Peter O’Brien states that Ephesians 5:18-21 is one long sentence with five modifying participles. The imperatives following 5:18 are all dependent participles based on the imperative command in 5:18. Peter T. O’Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians in Pillar NT Commentary*, D. A. Carson, ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 387. Contra O’Brien, Gombis believes the five commands following 5:18 are meant to indicate how to carry out the command of 5:18. Gombis, 269. In either case the five imperatives illustrate the dynamic life of continual filling of the Spirit. The five imperatives might indicate the result of infilling as they might also indicate the means of seeking further filling.

<sup>91</sup> O’Brien cites Paul’s earlier uses of “fullness” language in Ephesians 4:10, 11, 13 to point to the content of the filling as the Triune God. He states, “It is better, then, to understand 5:18 in terms of the Spirit’s mediating the fullness of God and Christ to believers. In other words, Paul’s readers are to be transformed by the Spirit into the likeness of God and Christ, ideas which are entirely consistent with the earlier exhortations of 4:32-5:2.” O’Brien, 392.

<sup>92</sup> Cynthia Briggs Kittredge identifies the unifying themes of Ephesians as unity and the *ekklesia*. The *exhortatio* section (4:1-6:9) are specifics related to unity and healthy relationships within the church. The *exhortatio* section is simply “an expanded image of the Body of Christ.” Cynthia Briggs Kittredge, *Community and Authority: The Rhetoric of Obedience in the Pauline Tradition* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1998), 134.

specifically draws the contrast, but the comparison seems hard to miss in the text.<sup>93</sup> The Spirit brings fellowship while addiction brings relational division similar to the modern concept of codependency. The Spirit brings selfless worship and identity in Christ while addiction brings further selfishness and false identity. The Spirit brings gratitude while addiction brings regret. The Spirit brings submission in relationship while addiction brings rebellion.

Paul uses the form of Greek household codes to illustrate healthy relationships in light of the infilling of the Holy Spirit.<sup>94</sup> In Ephesians 5:18, Paul gives hope to those who seek spiritual wholeness. Paul understands human desire for spirituality and wholeness in his readers. Drunkenness perhaps seems a reasonable response to the pain and hopelessness of sinful humanity. However, now that the mystery unfolds and the Holy Spirit is available, drunkenness and other addictive behaviors are revealed for what they truly are—a downward spiral. Paul refuses to shame the Ephesian church for immoral and addictive behavior; he simply states the imperfect results sought in the immoral and addictive behavior reside in the perfection of walking continually in the Spirit. Paul’s use of wine as a type in verse 18 reveals the antitype of the Holy Spirit. The results expected

---

<sup>93</sup> Harold W. Hoehner observes the contrast in Paul’s writing; “Paul has exhorted the Ephesian believers to conduct themselves circumspectly, not as unwise or foolish by doing the will of the flesh (2:3). Rather, they are to comprehend or understand the will of the Lord. The unwise are governed by the flesh, whereas the wise are governed by the mind as it understands the will of the Lord. Once they comprehend the will of the Lord, then they are to walk according to it. The will of the Lord is discerned by the gift of God’s insight and it is carried out by the power of God’s Spirit.” Hoehner, 698.

<sup>94</sup> LeRoy Bartel points out that Paul’s use of household codes differ from traditional Greek codes in that they are “reciprocal or mutually beneficial” and they appeal to a “different dynamic or motivation.” The code represents healthy relationships where the Greek codes were social control mechanisms. LeRoy Bartel, *Prison Epistles: Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, and Philippians: An Independent Study Textbook*, 3rd ed. (Springfield, MO: Global University, 2010), 50.

from wine in terms of relationships and spiritual joy remain imperfect and corrupted by the enemy, but the expectation points to perfection found in the Holy Spirit.

Ephesians concludes with instruction and examples of relational unity found in a continual relationship with the Holy Spirit. The *haustafeln* or household code form of the remainder of Ephesians indicates the healthy social dynamic of a community of faith living in the fullness of the Spirit rather than the folly of addiction or codependent relationship.<sup>95</sup> For example, the exhortation to put on the “armor of God” is a community discipline for strength against the enemy (Eph. 6:11). The strength itself comes from the continual infilling of the Holy Spirit in the lives of the believers in community. Paul’s letter from this perspective contrasts the imperfect form of spirituality seen in addictive and codependent behavior with the completed work of Christ extended through faith by grace and made alive through the continual infilling of the Holy Spirit. The use of wine, then, is a type of the Holy Spirit. The power of the letter to the Ephesians is perhaps found in the realization that those descending into addictive patterns seek what the Holy Spirit provides.

The imperatives of Ephesians are corporate in focus. They indicate broken relationships stemming from fallen humanity. They resemble many broken relational environments similar to today’s concept of codependency. The solution is seeking wholeness in Christ through the Spirit as a corporate people of God.

---

<sup>95</sup> David A. deSilva points out that the household codes following Ephesians 5 have become unpopular due to misuse: “The point of these codes is not mainly to urge women, slaves and children to be submissive but rather to set this submission (which was a given in the Greco-Roman and Jewish cultures) within the context of the distinctively Christian ethos of mutual submission.” David A deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship, and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2000), 238.

## **Conclusion**

Through the unfolding motif of wine and its fulfillment in the Holy Spirit churches can observe God's promise to the person seeking spiritual wholeness. The fullness of the Holy Spirit manifested in the community of the local church provides the only effective solution for an addicted culture. Likewise, churches must ensure that their systemic environment is not addictive through codependent tendencies to discover wholeness through any means other than the Holy Spirit's activity.

A church remains powerless in an addictive culture if its systemic environment is no less addictive than the environment in which the substance abuser lives. Individualistic moral imperatives against substance abuse are useless when issued from a church that in its systems exhibits the same addictive tendencies. Simply, the church must discover and admit its tendency to seek wholeness in things less than the fullness of the Spirit. The church must not seek growth or wholeness in things that lead it into debauchery; it must seek the continual activity of the Spirit and define its health in its level of the Spirit's activity in its systemic relationships.

## CHAPTER 3: GENERAL LITERATURE REVIEW

### **Introduction**

Codependency<sup>1</sup> originally described those affected by another person's alcoholism. Over time the concept has emerged to describe the condition underlying all addictive behavior. Codependency has also emerged as a concept to describe dysfunctional behavior in an organization. This chapter will review various definitions of codependency and describe its basic characteristics. It will relate codependency to pastoral ministry and the church organization and introduce the possibility that an understanding of the concept might bring strength to many frustrated pastors and congregations.

### **Codependency Defined**

A specific and generally accepted definition of codependency proves difficult to articulate. Codependency emerged as a concept several decades ago as a way to describe the behavior of persons involved with a person dependent on alcohol. The concept has enlarged to the place that its definition might apply to almost any dysfunctional relational behavior.

---

<sup>1</sup> The current accepted spelling for "codependency" does not include a hyphen. Older works and some who want to emphasize the relationship to the dependent use a hyphenated spelling for the term. This chapter will use the non-hyphenated spelling except in quotes to preserve the author's spelling.

Amy Carr and Daniel Buchanan trace the evolution of codependency theory through four stages.<sup>2</sup> Codependency theory's first stage emerged in Alcoholic Anonymous groups and was generally termed "co-alcoholic" or "para-alcoholic." The second stage of usage comes from a feminist view that describes women in terms of codependency and places much of the causation behind the dysfunction of codependency on social role expectations for women. Usage of the term today often brings associations of feminine behavior or of societal oppression of women. A third and most widely accepted usage views codependency as a developmental problem in which childhood "wounds" affect adult behavior. Third stage usage might expand usage of the term to include almost any human at some level. Codependency theory's fourth stage focuses on codependency as a systemic issue involving society as a whole.

### Early Definitions of Codependency

Early usage described a situation in which the partner or child of a chemically dependent person lives. Al-Anon family groups first used of the word "co-dependent." Codependency gained widespread usage with adult children of alcoholic groups in the early 1980s.<sup>3</sup> Early usage of the term implied that the codependent person developed codependency as a response to the alcoholic's addiction.

Early definitions prove somewhat ambiguous and no clear definition exists. Melody Beattie observes this ambiguity in most early definitions and writes that

---

<sup>2</sup> Amy Carr and Daniel Buchanan, "A Theological Analysis of Codependency Theories," *The Journal of Pastoral Care* 51, no. 3 (Fall 1997): 303-304.

<sup>3</sup> Adult Children of Alcoholics World Service Organization, *Adult Children of Alcoholics: Alcoholic/Dysfunctional Families* rev. ed. (Torrance, CA: Adult Children of Alcoholics World Service Organization, 2006), 20.



codependency "... has a fuzzy definition because it is a gray, fuzzy condition."<sup>4</sup> As the definition expanded, the number of persons deemed affected by the condition likewise expanded. Robert Hemfelt, Frank Minirth, and Paul Meier called codependence an "epidemic of staggering proportion" and estimated that 100 million Americans were affected by the condition.<sup>5</sup> Exact definitions of the concept remained elusive, and the concept frequently was used by popular psychology to include almost any dysfunctional relationship.

Most early definitions focus on the loss of self or identity in the codependent as he or she looks to someone or something outside of his or herself to establish self-worth. Nancy Groom, for example, observes, "Codependency is a self-focused way of life in which a person blind to his or her true self continually reacts to others being controlled by and seeking to control their behavior, attitudes, and/or opinions, resulting in spiritual sterility, loss of authenticity, and absence of intimacy."<sup>6</sup> Eileen R. Hannegan agrees:

Co-dependent men and women look to other people, authority, social and religious rules to define their own identity. Simply stated, a co-dependent person's self-image is defined by other people. His focus is outside of himself, primarily on authority figures, for validation, self-esteem, and worth. A co-dependent person is not in touch with who he is as an individual. He is not aware of his wants and needs, nor is he aware of how to meet his needs.<sup>7</sup>

The codependent in these perspectives has low self-worth and high levels of shame and looks to a source outside of self that is insufficient to restore worth or counter shame.

---

<sup>4</sup> Melody Beattie, *Codependent No More: How to Stop Controlling Others and Start Caring for Yourself*, 2nd ed. (Center City, MN: Hazelden, 1992), 33.

<sup>5</sup> Robert Hemfelt Frank Minirth, and Paul Meier, *Love is a Choice: The Definitive Book on Letting Go of Unhealthy Relationships* (Nashville: Nelson, 1989), 8.

<sup>6</sup> Nancy Groom, *From Bondage to Bonding* (Colorado Springs: Navpress, 1991), 21.

<sup>7</sup> Eileen R. Hannegan, *When Money is Not Enough: Resolving Co-dependency in the Workplace* (Lake Grove, OR: Northwest Pacifica, 1991), 2.

Virginia Curran Hoffman defines codependency as misplaced focus:

“Codependence is an unhealthy pattern of relating based on low self-esteem and on the belief that one’s worth depends on attachment to, or the approval of, some other person or group.”<sup>8</sup> The dependent in the relationship could be a substance, person, or organization, including the church itself. June Hunt observes the codependent relationship as one in which “you allow someone else to take the place that God alone should have in your heart.” She calls codependency a “misplaced dependency.”<sup>9</sup> Codependency exists when a person relies on a substance, person, or group for his or her identity. As a systemic issue, codependency in some way influences nearly all relationships within the church.

Robert Subby shifts the focus of the concept to the underlying relational system. He provides a definition of codependency resulting from systems in which oppressive rules exist. He defines codependency as “... an emotional, psychological, and behavioral condition that develops as a result of an individual’s prolonged exposure to, and practice of, a set of oppressive rules—rules which prevent the open expression of feeling as well as the direct discussion of personal and interpersonal problems.”<sup>10</sup> Subby shifts the emerging concept to the organizational system surrounding codependency and continues his definition of the concept as “a pattern of living, coping and problem-solving created

---

<sup>8</sup> Virginia Curran Hoffman, *The Codependent Church* (New York: Crossroad, 1991), 15.

<sup>9</sup> June Hunt, *Codependency: Balancing an Unbalanced Relationship* (Torrance, CA: Rose, 2013), 9.

<sup>10</sup> Robert Subby, “Inside the Chemically Dependent Marriage: Denial and Manipulation,” in *Co-Dependency, An Emerging Issue*, ed. Sharon Wegscheider-Cruse, (Hollywood, FL: HCI, 1984), 26.

and maintained by a set of dysfunctional rules within the family or social system.”<sup>11</sup> He calls codependency “the denial or repression of the real self based on an erroneous assumption that love, acceptance, security, success, closeness, and salvation are all dependent upon one’s ability to do ‘the right thing.’”<sup>12</sup> For Subby, the concept is systemic and is not simply one person’s response to another person’s addiction.

Hemfelt, Minirth, and Meier provide an example of the emerging view that codependency underlies most other addictions:

In its broadest sense, *codependency* can be defined as “an addiction to people, behaviors, or things.” Codependency is the fallacy of trying to control interior feelings by controlling people, things, and events on the outside. To the codependent control or the lack of it is central to every aspect of life. The codependent person may be addicted to another person. In this interpersonal codependency, the codependent has become so elaborately enmeshed in the other person that the sense of self—personal identity—is severely restricted, crowded out by the other person’s identity and problems.<sup>13</sup>

Codependency as a concept evolved rapidly from the spouse of an alcoholic to the concept of a systemic condition that might underlie all addiction.

Use of the term expanded to include relational systems, but the term lost its specificity as it tended to be applied to almost any relational dysfunction. Codependency forms a useful construct for viewing relational dysfunction, but much danger remains in overuse of the term or in popularized and fuzzy definitions of the term that strip the term of any real meaning. Natasha R. Lindley, Peter J. Giordano, and Elliott D. Hammer comment on the overuse of the term: “If the definition expands to the point that

---

<sup>11</sup> Robert Subby, *Lost in the Shuffle: The Co-dependent Reality* (Deerfield Beach, FL: HCI, 1987), 16.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>13</sup> Hemfelt, Minirth, and Meier, 5.

codependency describes every relationship then it actually describes nothing.”<sup>14</sup> They observe that the term will only remain useful through research that defines the term and determines accurate assessment methods.<sup>15</sup> Part of the problem may stem from attempts to isolate codependency as an individual phenomenon that can be diagnosed as a medical illness. Codependency exists as a social phenomenon and only manifests within relationships. The underlying needs and motivations might prove assessable in the individual, but assessment of codependency must include the system in which it manifests.

From a religious perspective codependents look to something less than God to gain worth and self-definition. Jeff VanVonderen provides an early example of a religious-focused definition: “Codependency is an addiction that results from an idolatrous relationship with someone who is chemically dependent. A codependent person turns to something other than God for his source of well-being.”<sup>16</sup> The codependent person places the dependent in the place of God.

### Emerging Definitions of Codependency

Sharon Wegscheider-Cruse and Joseph Cruse observe that the definition has “expanded in general usage to describe almost any persistent preoccupation a person may have.”<sup>17</sup> Expansion of the concept has unfortunately left it ambiguous to the point that the

---

<sup>14</sup> Natasha R. Lindley, Peter J. Giordano, and Elliott D. Hammer, “Codependency: Predictors and Psychometric Issues,” *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 55 (1999): 60.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Jeff VanVonderen, *Good News for the Chemically Dependent and those Who Love Them* (Minneapolis: Bethany, 1995), 92.

<sup>17</sup> Sharon Wegscheider-Cruse and Joseph Cruse, *Understanding Codependency: The Science Behind It and How to Break the Cycle*, rev. ed. (Deerfield Beach, FL: HCI, 2012), 2.

concept holds little applied meaning to specific situations. According to this definition, codependency among Americans tends to be as high as 98 percent of the population.<sup>18</sup>

Although the epidemic seems to affect nearly all of the population, Barry K. Weinhold and Janae B. Weinhold believe less than 1 percent of the population possesses an awareness of codependency and its effects.<sup>19</sup>

Mary Crocker Cook provides a current definition of codependency:

At its heart, Codependency is a set of behaviors developed to manage the anxiety that comes when our primary attachments are formed with people who are inconsistent or unavailable in their response to us. Our anxiety-based responses to life can include over-reactivity, image management, unrealistic beliefs about our limits, and attempts to control the reality of others to the point where we lose our boundaries, self-esteem, and even our own reality. Ultimately, Codependency is a chronic stress disease, which can devastate our immune system and lead to systemic and even life-threatening illness.<sup>20</sup>

Wegscheider-Cruse and Cruse define the codependent as “a person involved in a highly dependent relationship with someone who requires extra care or vigilance.”<sup>21</sup> They continue the definition: “They develop compulsions that help to suppress the negative feelings they have. They believe the solution resides outside themselves, and they live in an ‘if only’ world . . . . They might be described accurately as the ‘walking wounded.’”<sup>22</sup>

A person might look to a substance to numb shame and feelings of low self-worth, or he or she might look to another human or human organization to restore worth

---

<sup>18</sup> Barry K. Weinhold and Janae B. Weinhold, *Breaking Free of the Co-dependency Trap*, rev. ed. (Novato, CA: New World Library, 2008), 3

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Mary Crocker Cook, *Awakening Hope: A Developmental, Behavioral, Biological Approach to Codependency Treatment*, rev. ed. (Los Gatos, CA: Robertson, 2011), 9.

<sup>21</sup> Wegscheider-Cruse and Cruse, 4.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 6.

and eliminate shame. Relationally, codependency involves “two half-persons attempting to create one whole person.”<sup>23</sup> Hunt expands the definition of dependency to include unhealthy relationships as a focus of addiction equal to substances. She states that dependency is “an addiction to any object, behavior, or person that represents an underlying attempt to get emotional needs met.”<sup>24</sup>

Earlier definitions define codependency in terms of reaction to the dependent; however, emerging definitions establish codependency as a shared condition in which the codependent and dependent both depend on sources of self-worth unable to establish worth. The resultant society perpetuates the dysfunctional in an addictive spiral. An idolatrous search for significance in substances, persons, or organizations unable to meet the needs of the searcher further separates the searcher from significance and contributes to a societal downward spiral similar to the classic addictive spiral of the alcoholic.

### **The Characteristics of Codependency**

The codependent problem is a relational problem best seen in relational systems. Confusion exists, however, when solutions to the problem center on repairing the relational problems rather than the underlying systemic issue of codependency. Wegscheider-Cruse and Cruse observe that many analysts “have simplistically suggested that codependency is a ‘relationship’ problem rather than seeing that relationship problems are a *result* and *complication* of codependency.”<sup>25</sup> Codependency appears in its

---

<sup>23</sup> Weinhold and Weinhold, xii.

<sup>24</sup> Hunt, 12.

<sup>25</sup> Wegscheider-Cruse and Cruse, 85.

characteristic relational manifestations, but the solution should emerge from addressing the underlying causative dysfunction of codependency within the relational system.

### Early Views of Codependency's Characteristics

Beattie provides some common characteristics of the codependent person as defined in the early period of the concept's formation.<sup>26</sup> Codependents tend to be caretakers because they feel responsible for others. They generally feel pity for others and feel angry when unable to meet a person's needs or when others fail to meet their needs. A codependent person often fails to differentiate between needs and wants and finds his or her self attracted to needy people. Codependents, due to their caretaking role, find themselves bored without a crisis, overcommitted, and feeling victimized. Codependents possess a low sense of self-worth stemming from dysfunctional family histories. They further their low self-worth through denial of family history issues.

Beattie expands her definition to include the emerging view of codependence within a relational system. The codependent's low self-worth appears as he or she struggles with receiving criticism or praise, often feels different from other people, and fears making mistakes. He or she feels ashamed of his or her real self. The codependent gets an artificial sense of self-worth through helping others and will settle for feeling needed instead of loved. A codependent represses truth, as he or she fears any sense of his or her true self. He or she often appears rigid or controlling due to attempts to hide from truth. Obsessive behavior appears as he or she focuses excessively on people. Anxiety and worry often result from the obsession. Codependents control, not allowing

---

<sup>26</sup> Beattie, *Codependent No More*, 41-49.

events and people to exist as they are since reality confronts the repressions of the codependent. Often, the codependent feels he or she knows best how events should happen or people should behave. He or she often uses helplessness, guilt, coercion, threats, advice-giving, or manipulation to control others. As a result, however, the codependent feels controlled by events or persons. Codependents are prone to addictive denial, often ignore problems, and appear confused, depressed, and sick. They often cover truth through activities such as work or compulsive behaviors.

Beattie further observes that the codependent exhibits classic dependent behavior and her view prefigures the emerging view of codependency as a systemic addiction. Unhappy with self, the codependent person looks to things outside of self for happiness. They will fear the loss of any person or thing they feel brings them happiness or defines their identity. Codependents seek approval, equate love with pain, and feel they need other persons or things. They often fail to care for themselves as they give their attention to maintaining relationships and feel trapped by relationships. Codependents communicate poorly as they choose their words for effect not for communication. They have weak boundary systems that allow others to hurt them, and they often have unhealthy rigid boundaries in other areas in an attempt to maintain denials or prevent pain. Codependents often lack trust and feel angry with others or society as they have failed to meet the needs of the codependent. They also have sexual problems related to intimacy and possess a tendency toward the extremes of sexual anorexia or promiscuity.

Beattie describes her personal journey through codependency:

The base I operated from was fear, coupled with low self-esteem. I spent most of my time reacting to other people, trying to control them, allowing them to control me, and feeling confused by it all. I thought I was doing everything right. Aren't people supposed to be perfect? Aren't people supposed to be stoic? Shouldn't we



keep pushing forward, no matter how much it hurts? Isn't it good to give until it hurts, then keep giving until we are doubled over in pain? And how can we allow others to go about their life course? Isn't it our job to stop them, set them straight? Isn't that the right way, the good way, the Christian way?<sup>27</sup>

Her description demonstrates the hopelessness and frustration of a person trapped in the fruitless search for meaning through people and things that can never give a person meaning.

Jan Silvious offers another list of characteristics of codependency: bondage, control, exclusivity, anger, fixing, defensiveness, identity issues, romanticism, and inability to make choices.<sup>28</sup> Her list provides an early view that forms many current views of codependency as systemic addiction as she focuses on relational aspects of the condition rather than traits within the individual codependent.<sup>29</sup>

#### Emerging Views of Codependency's Characteristics

Pia Mellody provides a more current list of symptoms of codependency: difficulty expressing appropriate levels of self-esteem, often appearing grandiose, trouble setting appropriate boundaries and expressing reality, failure to take care of personal needs and wants, too dependent or anti-dependent, often fails to moderate, and will see relationships and needs dichotomously.<sup>30</sup> Mellody's list focuses on the individual, but most of the symptoms are only observable within a relational system.

---

<sup>27</sup> Melody Beattie, *Codependents' Guide to the Twelve Steps: How to Find the Right Program for You and Apply Each of the Twelve Steps to Your Own Issues* (New York: Fireside, 1990), 9.

<sup>28</sup> Jan Silvious, *Please Don't Say You Need Me: Biblical Answers for Codependency* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1989), 22-23.

<sup>29</sup> For examples of other lists of characteristics of codependency see appendices C through G.

<sup>30</sup> Pia Mellody, *Facing Codependence: What It Is, Where It Comes From, How it Sabotages Our Lives*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper, 2003), 4.

However one views the symptoms, the essential nature of the disease involves the codependent seeking self-worth and elimination of shame through something unable to bring the desired result. The symptoms all relate to subsequent lies, denials, and manipulations in order to maintain the illusion that the unmet needs can somehow be met. The illness seems in every way similar to classic addiction, and addiction itself may well be seen as a symptom of the broader concept of codependency. Classic views of codependency often see codependence as an addiction to people, but in most current views it appears as the underlying factor in all addiction to substances, processes, and people.

Anthony D. G. Marks, Rebecca L. Blore, Donald W. Hine, and Greg E. Dear place the characteristics of codependency into four core categories.<sup>31</sup> First is external focusing in which the codependent person focuses his or her attention primarily on the behavior, opinion, or expectations of other persons. Second is self-sacrifice in which the codependent person neglects personal needs to focus on the needs of another person. Third is a sense of interpersonal control in the codependent in which he or she believes that a person can fix another person's problems or change his or her behavior. Fourth is emotional suppression in which the codependent person deliberately suppresses or

---

<sup>31</sup> Anthony D. G. Marks, Rebecca L. Blore, Donald W. Hine, and Greg E. Dear. "Development and validation of a revised measure of codependency," *Australian Journal of Psychology* 64 (2012): 119-127.

demonstrates limited awareness of his or her emotions.<sup>32</sup> Many current instruments assess codependency in categories similar to the categories outlined by Marks et al.<sup>33</sup>

Wegscheider-Cruse and Cruse discuss the now common view that codependency is a progressive illness rather than a response to a relationship with a chemically addicted person: “Just as we develop tolerance to the effects of chemicals, we develop a tolerance to the effects of our behaviors.”<sup>34</sup> Progression of the illness moves from low self-worth and disabled spirituality to relational problems and disabled living to physical problems and disabled physical function.<sup>35</sup> The underlying spiritual issue eventually creates physical damage through stress, anxiety, self-harm, and personal neglect. Subby discusses the collateral effects of codependency: “In this process of relentless approval-seeking, we gradually deny much of who and what we really are. Always alert and focused on others to get our needs met, we never have time to focus on ourselves in any other than a superficial way.”<sup>36</sup> Ultimately, codependency destroys the codependent person. Silvious observes that the codependent suffers a loss of choices, creative energy, perspective, personhood, dreams, and ultimately fellowship with others and with God.<sup>37</sup> The codependent becomes “terminally miserable, enduring life, getting through, waiting

---

<sup>32</sup> For a discussion of the same four characteristics applied to South American cultural contexts see Appendix F. Biscarra, María Ayelén, Romina Antolela Brandariz, Aldana Lichtenberger, Raquel Peltzer, and Mariana Cremonte, “Construcción de una Escala de Codependencia,” *Revista Argentina de Ciencias del Comportamiento* 5 (2013): 42-51.

<sup>33</sup> The primary assessment instruments, Holyoake and Spann-Fischer to some degree assess based on these four categories.

<sup>34</sup> Wegscheider-Cruse and Cruse, 33.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 75-89.

<sup>36</sup> Subby, *Lost in the Shuffle*, 20.

<sup>37</sup> Silvious, 125-126.

for our reward in heaven, not knowing that there is a reward each day in being alive and living our own lives.”<sup>38</sup> Codependency exists on a continuum of levels. Accurate assessment of characteristics must assess codependency in degrees of intensity. Codependency may exist in some degree in all human relational environments. Assessment of various degrees of intensity of the characteristics proves essential in assessing the phenomenon.

### Characteristics within Relational Systems

In the emerging view of codependency as a systemic relational dysfunction assessment and identification require viewing the symptoms in relationship to each other and within the context of the broader relational system. Walter C. Jackson believes that the overuse of the concept stems from seeing any one of the characteristics in isolation from other characteristics: “It is only in the combination of symptoms that codependency may be recognized.”<sup>39</sup> He lists the symptoms that usually exist together in the codependent person as low self-esteem, compulsive helping attachments to addicts or other compulsive persons, preoccupation with others while ignoring personal care, extreme dependence on others, withholding emotions, functional relational enmeshment, inability to respect other’s boundaries, depression, hyper-vigilance, unrelieved anxiety, stress related physical illness, and rigid self control. A codependent person, according to Jackson, almost always exhibits some other form of addiction. The primary indicator tends to be that the codependent person has been in a relationship with an addicted person

---

<sup>38</sup> Beattie, *Codependents’ Guide to the Twelve Steps*, 18.

<sup>39</sup> Walter C. Jackson, “Codependence and the Christian Faith: An Introduction to Compassion Addiction,” *Review and Expositor* 91 (1994): 33.

lasting longer than two years. Accurate assessment of symptoms, therefore, must include the primary categories of symptoms and assess the symptoms in degrees of intensity while focusing diagnosis on intensity within the relational system and across the symptoms rather than intensity in any one symptomatic category.

Within the relational system codependency can emerge with several characteristics. James V. Potter and Paula M. Potter provide a list of common systemic characteristics: conflictual and enmeshed relationships, group identity that overrides individual identity, poor personal boundaries, rigid rules, control and manipulation, guilt, shame, violence, and abuse.<sup>40</sup> Within the system the individual experiences interpersonal and intra-personal conflict, external focus at the expense of personal care, low self-identity, low self-confidence, self-hate or self-loathing, corporate identity that overrides personal identity, and the inability to express his or her real personality within the relational system.<sup>41</sup> Philip St. Romain provides a list of the systemic characteristics of codependency using family system theory: many covert rules; little freedom to talk about feelings; secrets; rigid rules enforced through extreme punitive measures; shamed individuals; feelings of tiredness, tenseness, and anger; attempts to present a picture of “having it all together” to the world; and emotional bonding primarily occurs through negative feelings.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> James V. Potter and Paula M. Potter, *Conquering Codependence: Restoring Your Self-Identity* (N.p.: AFS, 2011), 30.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 38-39.

<sup>42</sup> Phillip St. Romain, *Freedom from Codependency: A Christian Response* (Wichita, KS: Contemplative Ministries, 2010), 21.

In summary, some form of codependence exists in almost all humans as any person to some degree displays symptoms. The symptoms point to a deeper issue in society. Many illnesses, compulsions, defective systems, relational dysfunctions, and the other larger issues in society resemble codependency. Individuals, organizations, or society as a whole might show characteristics. Accuracy in assessment of codependency may best occur through assessment of the system as a whole rather than assessment of any isolated individual within the system. It may be best to say that a person is involved in a codependent system rather than that the person is a codependent.

### **The Causes of Codependency**

#### **Codependency as a Progressive Condition**

Codependency progresses in three stages.<sup>43</sup> Delusion begins the process. The ultimate delusion that humans can function or find fulfillment apart from God forms the foundation. The delusion begins in human thinking. Adam and Eve, for example, began the delusional process as they sought wholeness through the substance of the forbidden fruit rather than relationship with God. Delusional thinking unconsciously ignores reality and filters reality to support the delusion. Eventually the delusion moves to disassociation as the initial lie separates the person from the truth and creates a thought process on which the person bases behavior.

The second stage of progression is repression of feelings. To support the delusional thinking, the person must filter or deny feelings. Adam and Eve engaged this filter as they hid from God and began the process of manipulation and denial. From an

---

<sup>43</sup> Wegscheider-Cruse and Cruse, 48-69.

addiction viewpoint it is at this stage a person might numb their feelings with a substance in order to maintain the initial delusion. The codependent person begins the process of disassociation with reality resulting in a fragmented soul. Many mental illnesses might develop at this point, such as depression, anxiety disorders, eating disorders, or multiple personality disorders.

Codependency progresses in the third stage into a behavioral compulsion influencing the person's relationships. Delusional and repressed behavior fails to bring the desired self-worth and relief from shame and likely reinforces feelings of low self-worth and shame. The cycle then repeats with further delusion based on the new level of shame. As in any addiction, the codependent is trapped in a spiral that brings him or her further from the true source of worth found in God.

#### Codependency's Emergence within Family Systems

A primary theory of codependency's origin places the blame on the person's family system of origin. The codependent develops codependency as he or she interacts within the childhood family system. Subby calls codependency "the product of delayed or interrupted identity."<sup>44</sup> Developmental theories often use Erik Erikson's theory of stages of psychosocial development. Codependency emerges in the individual through Erikson's first two stages, trust and autonomy. A child who fails to develop trust through lack of nurture in the first year of life develops codependency, and a child who fails to develop autonomy through object permanence in the second to third year of life will

---

<sup>44</sup> Subby, *Lost in the Shuffle*, 55.

develop counter-dependence.<sup>45</sup> An affected child will demonstrate anxious attachment as codependence and avoidant attachment through counter-dependence.<sup>46</sup> A codependent child fails to progress through Erikson's subsequent stages of initiative, industry, identity, and intimacy.<sup>47</sup>

Cook observes the effects of childhood dysfunction on latter health: "The challenges of stages not successfully completed may be expected to reappear as problems in the future."<sup>48</sup> Hunt describes codependency as a form of arrested development or immaturity: "Codependent people are grown-ups who have never grown up."<sup>49</sup> Some truth may appear in the developmental theory of codependence as it relates to the Christian doctrine of original sin. Shame exists inherently in humans, and parents will always fail to provide perfect nurture or security to a child.

In this view the family as a system introduces shame to the individual and introduces the individual to inadequate coping mechanisms. Classically, abuse and chemical dependence were primary contributors. William R. Miller, Alyssa A. Forchimes, and Allen Zweben divide the family systems theory into three hypotheses.<sup>50</sup> First, the disturbed spouse hypothesis reflects the classic view of codependency as

---

<sup>45</sup> Codependency is the tendency to draw into relationships and counter-dependency is the tendency to push away from relationships. Most codependents tend to be both codependent and counter-dependent in various situations. Bowen theory uses the same concept and terms the behaviors as withdrawal and pursuit.

<sup>46</sup> Cook, 24-27.

<sup>47</sup> Weinhold and Weinhold, 49-50.

<sup>48</sup> Cook, 109.

<sup>49</sup> Hunt, 34.

<sup>50</sup> William R. Miller, Alyssa A. Forcehimes, and Allen Zweben, *Treating Addiction: A Guide for Professionals* (New York: Guilford, 2011), 200-201.



introduced into a family system by an individual with dependency issues (generally alcohol). Second, the distributed family system hypothesis posits that codependency forms in the family system through dysfunctional patterns in the system itself such as rules, expectations, or shame. Finally, the codependence hypothesis points to the interlocking of the illnesses of all family members and believes illness in each member manifests in the system and perpetuates the illness itself.

From an organizational standpoint, family systems theory would indicate codependency in an organization such as a church relates equally to the primary leader, the system itself, and the dynamic of every relational interaction within the organization. Sin and shame permeate every area. “Codependents escape their families of origin only to create other codependent families.”<sup>51</sup> The codependent person creates the system in which codependency flourishes and further sinks into codependency through the system.

### Codependency and Spiritual Dysfunction

A common theory of causation of codependency emerges from a spiritual view. The twelve-step recovery standpoint forms much of the theory and the underlying causation comes from efforts of individuals within the system to be God. VanVonderen argues that the “heart of all harmful dependencies is the issue of idolatry.”<sup>52</sup> Where there is care, unawareness, and shame, harmful codependent relational patterns will emerge.<sup>53</sup> From the spiritual viewpoint, the person who introduces codependency into the system proves less important than the original problem of shame and idolatry shared by all

---

<sup>51</sup> Potter and Potter, ii.

<sup>52</sup> VanVonderen, 17.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 65-66.

humans. Every person, to some degree, contributes to the codependent system as “all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God” (Rom. 3:22).<sup>54</sup> Whether introduced to the child as early as six months old or introduced in a system through leaders, the system itself, or all within the system, the issue is one of coping with sin and separation from God through substances or persons that actually draw the person or system further from relational wholeness. Darlene Lancer argues from a spiritual viewpoint: “Low self-esteem is at the center of nearly all symptoms of codependency.”<sup>55</sup> A person experiencing spiritual shame may further descend into codependency if the religious system emphasizes shame, judgment, or human powerlessness. Paul’s words to Ephesus come to mind. An addicted person must choose to break the addictive cycle of drunkenness which leads to further isolation and encounter the infilling of the Holy Spirit (Eph. 5:18).<sup>56</sup>

Other theories of causation focus on medical, situational, or social origins.<sup>57</sup> Peter L. Steinke, for example, sees systemic dysfunction similar to codependency as an issue of pain toleration across two axes: toleration of pain in self and in others.<sup>58</sup> Low toleration in both axes creates helplessness. Low toleration for others and high for self creates the classic codependent, while high toleration for others and low for self creates the classic

---

<sup>54</sup> All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from the English Standard Version.

<sup>55</sup> Darlene Lancer, *Conquering Shame and Codependency: 8 Steps to Freeing the True You* (Center City, MN: Hazelden, 2014), 94.

<sup>56</sup> For a controversial but interesting view of codependency and human initiative in holiness see Leo Booth, *The Happy Heretic: Seven Spiritual Insights for Healing Religious Codependency*, N.p.: HCI, 2012. Booth advocates a Pelagian view of holiness which emphasizes human initiative in holiness. He points out that complete reliance on God for growth may be simply another external focus for a codependent person.

<sup>57</sup> Carr and Buchanan, 304.

<sup>58</sup> Peter L. Steinke, *How Your Church Family Works: Understanding Congregations as Emotional Systems* (Washington, DC: The Alban Institute, 2006), 66.

addict. A healthy person, according to Steinke, tolerates pain as a motivation for change in both axes rather than seeking the numbing effects of addiction to substances or unhealthy relationships. To Steinke, addiction and codependency form from immature methods of coping with pain. Jackson, as an example of diverse views of causation, sees codependency as caused by Western society itself.<sup>59</sup> He classifies codependent persons as primary or secondary codependents based on whether the codependency emerged through primary family systems or through interaction later in life with dysfunctional systems. His classification may prove useful in tracing the development of codependency in a system such as a church.

### **Codependency in Systems**

The idea of organizational addiction is a fairly new concept. Anne Wilson Schaef and Diane Fassel provide a primary observation of the tendency of organizations to behave similar to individuals in addiction: “Organizations themselves function as addicts, and because they are not aware of this fact of their functioning, become key building blocks in an addictive society, even when this dramatically contradicts their espoused mission or reason for existence.”<sup>60</sup> They define addiction as “any substance or process that has taken over our lives and over which we are powerless.”<sup>61</sup> An addictive organization possesses many characteristics: denial, confusion, self-centeredness, dishonesty, perfectionism, scarcity models, crisis orientation, depression, stress, abnormal

---

<sup>59</sup> Jackson, 33.

<sup>60</sup> Anne Wilson Schaef and Diane Fassel, *The Addictive Organization: Why We Overwork, Cover Up, Pick Up the Pieces, Please the Boss, and Perpetuate Sick Organizations* (New York: HarperCollins, 2013), 54, Kindle.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 57.

thinking processes, forgetfulness, dependency, negativism, defensiveness, projection, tunnel vision, fear, and ethical deterioration.<sup>62</sup> Schaef and Fassel estimate that up to 96 percent of the United States population could be classified in some way as co-dependent.<sup>63</sup>

Schaef and Fassel believe the organization can form more than just the setting for addictive behavior; it can form the actual substance of addiction.<sup>64</sup> Schaef and Fassel observe the tendency of an unhealthy organization to promote lofty goals over basic systems operations in a way that masks addictive dysfunction:

The organization becomes the addictive substance for its employees when the employees become hooked on the promise of the mission and choose not to look at how the system is really operating. The organization becomes an addictive substance when its actions are excused because it has a lofty mission. We have found an inverse correlation between the loftiness of the mission and the congruence between stated and unstated goals.<sup>65</sup>

From this perspective issues in many organizations may stem from addictive tendencies in that they continue to focus on a methodology unable to produce the results desired. Focus increasingly shifts to lofty visions while denying the reality of systemic dysfunction. The focus, for instance, may remain on numerical results while the organization ignores inherent weaknesses in their core product or leadership. Schaef and Fassel link the denial that is common in addiction to organizational tendencies to ignore reality: “Denial occurs when we are presented with painful information about ourselves, information that suggests we need to make a deep change. Denial is one of several clear

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 62-68.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 96.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 118.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 123.

paths toward slow death. When we practice denial, we work on the wrong solution or no solution at all.”<sup>66</sup> Schaefer and Fassel conclude: “We feel that there is no real possibility for change and transformation in the organization unless those involved recognize that they are addictive and function the same as an active addict. In fact, we believe that the key to organizational transformation lies in this truth.”<sup>67</sup>

Systems thinking can illuminate underlying organizational addictive tendencies.

Peter M. Senge, for example, discusses addiction in organizational systems:

Almost all forms of addiction have shifting the burden structures underlying them. All involve opting for symptomatic solutions, the gradual atrophy of the ability to focus on fundamental solutions, and the increasing reliance on symptomatic solutions. By this definition, organizations and entire societies are subject to addiction as much as are individuals.<sup>68</sup>

Addictive denial prevails in the organization as it chooses to ignore the truth of needed change and continues to rely on methods unable to produce desired results. Kenneth A. Halstead describes the issue in terms of systemic negative feedback loops: “Stuckness is a problem resulting from repeatedly mishandling a difficulty in a continuing feedback loop.”<sup>69</sup> Behavior that no longer brings desired results but serves to ease the pain of actually changing the system distorts reality and “serves as a ‘fix’” as it becomes addictive to the organization.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 142-143.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 138.

<sup>68</sup> Peter M. Senge, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* (New York: Doubleday, 2006), 108-109.

<sup>69</sup> Kenneth A. Halstead, *From Stuck to Unstuck: Overcoming Congregational Impasse* (Herndon, VA: Alban, 1998), 18.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 16.

Observers may see issues within an organization from a systemic addictive organizational perspective involving two process loops. Senge calls the two loops reinforcing and balancing loops.<sup>71</sup> The reinforcing loop creates movement away from or toward a desired outcome through a behavior or thinking process. The balancing loop limits the desired outcome through a systemic issue. For example, a car gains speed through the reinforcing loop of pushing the accelerator. The power of the engine, however, limits the speed and ultimately a limiting loop restricts the desired outcome of more speed. Time delay occurs between acceleration and reaching the limit creating a condition in which the driver tends to push harder on the accelerator based on past results in spite of the reality that his or her efforts fail to produce the desired results.

A church, for example, may focus on outreach and produce the desired result of more attendees. Limiting loops like building size or leadership strength eventually restrict growth. Steps may be taken to eliminate the restricting factors and reengage the reinforcing loop or the organization may ignore the limiting factors and continue its over-focus on results gained from previous methods. Problems occurs when the limiting loop reappears at the next level. Addictive elements enter the system at this point. Leaders often fail to admit inherent weaknesses in the system and over-focus on the former effectiveness in the reinforcing loop without addressing the real issues in the limiting loop. Due to the time delay in addressing the limiting loop factors subsequent unhealthy limiting loops appear that take the church further into dysfunction and leave the church at risk for splits and division.

---

<sup>71</sup> Senge, 79.

Codependent behavior appears similar to an alcoholic seeking relief through the substance of alcohol rather than true relief through emotional health. Instead of submitting to the lengthy process of working for emotional health, the alcoholic seeks instant relief through alcohol in spite of the fact that it creates the opposite of the desired results. He or she denies reality by creating an alternate loop around the emotional growth process and builds the false illusion of health. Lofty desires to create a larger organization, for example, often lead to placing unqualified and even dangerous people in positions of leadership in complete denial of the actual needed process of core leadership development. Senge observes that the alternative loops around the real solution always lead to instability and breakdown.<sup>72</sup> From the perspective of basic orientation, outside-in models that previously worked well prove inadequate for the emerging organization. Systemic addictive tendencies damage the organization through overreliance on previous models and denials of current reality.<sup>73</sup>

Awareness of the underlying issue forms the first step to create the healthy systems required. Senge observes the entrapping environment of systems that fail to address underlying systemic dysfunction: “Structures of which we are unaware hold us

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 89.

<sup>73</sup> Bowen Theory provides a useful lens for looking at systemic codependency. Bowen’s early works analyze codependency in systems and emerge to describe dysfunctional systems and their traits. For useful discussions of Bowen systems theory, see Peter L. Steinke, *Healthy Congregations: A Systems Approach*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: The Alban Institute, 2006); Peter L. Steinke, *How Your Church Family Works: Understanding Congregations as Emotional Systems* (Washington, DC: The Alban Institute, 2006); Ronald W. Richardson, *Creating a Healthier Church: Family Systems Theory, Leadership and Congregational Life* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1996); and Ronald W. Richardson, *Polarization and the Healthier Church: Applying Bowen Family Systems Theory to Conflict and Change in Society and Congregational Life* (Toronto: CreateSpace, 2012).

prisoner.”<sup>74</sup> The twelve-step process used successfully in personal addictions provides some hope for future organizational effectiveness.

### **Codependency in Church Systems**

Halstead observes that the powerlessness of human effort and reliance on God found in most recovery methods provide hope for church organizational health: “Viewing stuckness as forms of addiction implies that stuck congregations are powerless to overcome their problems and must rely on God’s power in a process of continuing recovery.”<sup>75</sup> Recovery begins when the person or organization admits the problem and their powerlessness and seeks God’s power for change. Within the church codependency might emerge through any of the previously discussed theories. The pastor as primary leader, however, must identify his or her role in introducing codependent issues in the system of the church. Mark A. Laaser and Kenneth M. Adams discuss the moral failure of sexual addiction in pastors as a result of codependent dysfunction. They state that pastors

have learned how to care for others and not for themselves. They may assume their worth is derived from how well they care for others. This constitutes a form of ‘pastoral codependency.’ These pastors judge their worth on the basis of external approval and outward signs of success. This may result in a ‘righteous’ workaholism and consequent burnout.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Senge, 93.

<sup>75</sup> Halstead, 16.

<sup>76</sup> Mark. R. Laaser and Kenneth M. Adams, “Pastors and Sexual Addiction,” in *Clinical Management of Sex Addiction*, ed. Patrick J. Carnes and Kenneth M. Adams (New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2002), 286.



Many issues in church life may result from codependent patterns introduced by leaders.

Nancy Van Dyke Platt and Chilton R. Knudsen argue that leaders are not the only source of codependency in the organization, but they are likely the primary source:

In codependent congregations, the addicted minister is probably the most common underlying factor, but this should never be tagged as the sole cause of congregational dysfunction. The congregation is already fertile soil for one reason or another. They have no resiliency or spiritual foundation, as well as little experience with addiction that would help them to identify the dysfunction caused by their own behavior and that of the minister.<sup>77</sup>

Codependent dysfunction might arise within the systemic environment of the church from many sources.

In like manner, within the organization, codependency manifests as conformity, denial of reality, crisis and confusion, self-centeredness, dishonesty, perfectionism, control, promises of reward, invalidation of divergent viewpoints, dualism, and branding of persons as loyal or disloyal.<sup>78</sup> VanVonderen describes the similarity between church systems and family systems: “Like families, entire church systems can adjust to accommodate and maintain the unhealth of their members.”<sup>79</sup> The codependent church tends to fail to confront behavior, and it tends to take responsibility for other’s behavior.<sup>80</sup> An accommodated environment hiding many sins and dysfunctions forms in such churches.

---

<sup>77</sup> Nancy Van Dyke Platt and Chilton R. Knudsen, *So You Think You Don’t Know One?: Addiction and Recovery in Clergy and Congregations* (Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse, 2010), 13.

<sup>78</sup> Hannegan, 65.

<sup>79</sup> VanVonderen, 201.

<sup>80</sup> Gary L. McIntosh and Samuel D. Rima, Sr., *Overcoming the Dark Side of Leadership: The Paradox of Personal Dysfunction* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1997), 123.

Aubrey Malphurs, for example, sees the primary motivation behind excessive clergy-laity distinction that fails to empower members as “problems of co-dependency on the part of the pastor.” He continues: “A church consultant once asked a non-Christian psychiatrist his opinion of church pastors in general. The surprising response was that a number of them are co-dependent. They derive a sense of significance from feeling needed.”<sup>81</sup> At its worst, codependency turns into spiritual abuse within the church. Ray S. Anderson describes spiritual abuse from leaders likely suffering from misplaced codependent tendencies: “Spiritual abuse on the part of a spiritual leader results whenever spiritual mentoring, teaching, or guidance is used to gain control and reinforce the authority of the leader rather than to empower and nurture the ones who are led.”<sup>82</sup> When the congregation exists to build a leader’s identity and cover his or her shame, an abusive and codependent environment will emerge. Anderson continues: “When a leader entrusted with a role of providing spiritual direction, teaching, and pastoral care uses the authority of the role to conceal his or her own human weaknesses and needs, there is a corresponding blindness to the human value of others under their care.”<sup>83</sup>

The net result of codependency in the congregation is loss of missional effectiveness. Platt and Knudsen observe of the codependent congregation: “these congregations genuinely mean to carry out Jesus’ work and follow him, but given that much of their efforts are marred by codependency they fail to grasp the whole message of

---

<sup>81</sup> Aubrey Malphurs, *Planting Growing Churches for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998), 155.

<sup>82</sup> Ray S. Anderson, *The Soul of Ministry: Forming Leaders for God’s People* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 191.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 193.

the gospel and discipleship as a lifestyle.”<sup>84</sup> Congregational health declines as codependency spreads like leaven. The “individual needs for power and control, distraction from the real mission of the congregation, and boundary blurring become more and more frequent until dysfunction itself becomes normative.”<sup>85</sup>

Platt and Knudsen provide a checklist of behaviors indicating underlying codependency within the church system or its leaders: ongoing substance abuse problems seen in issues such as marital problems and employment issues; over-functioning of individuals to the point of personal neglect; compulsive caretaking and looking for needy persons or causes; highly dependent personalities who put clergy on false pedestals; family issues such as physical abuse, sexual abuse, and boundary issues; sexual compulsions and orientation issues; over-controlling persons or families; chronic illnesses; religious addiction that is more escapist than nurturing; highly unrealistic goals and vision; food addictions; pathological lying; high anxiety manifested as resistance to change; triangulation in communication; clergy children with unresolved issues; unresolved guilt; addiction to certain caregivers; compulsive risk-taking and financial irresponsibility; verbal abuse and bursts of temper; and addiction to excitement.<sup>86</sup>

Although any of these issues alone may not indicate codependency in leadership or the church system, taken together they may indicate the need to look further into the system.

---

<sup>84</sup> Platt and Knudsen, 8.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 26-27.

### Leadership within the Church Relational System

Platt and Knudsen provide an additional checklist of issues found in leaders that indicate underlying codependent dysfunction: obsesses about events or people; works hard to please everyone; inappropriately steps out of his or her professional role; denies obvious congregational problems; bases self-worth on church performance indicators such as attendance, stewardship, or success of certain pet projects; overworks and fails to care for personal needs and health; enables others through rescuing and covering up; has difficulty referring people to specialized care; lies to others to save face; frequently feels disappointed and angry when not appreciated; has persistent fantasies of escape or revenge; unable to delegate tasks; refuses to evaluate self or staff; projects problems onto other people or systems such as denominational structures; exhibits favoritism; refuses to take part in personal or professional development; has difficulty articulating priorities; over-controls; and does not practice personal spiritual disciplines.<sup>87</sup> Again, any isolated indicator may not reveal codependency in leadership, but any item may indicate the need for further investigation into a leader.

Helping professions, due to the nature of the professions, often attract codependent personalities. Schaefer and Fassel point to the issue: “Co-dependents frequently spend much of their time taking care of others. Many enter professions that allow them to continue caring for others: nursing, counseling, social work, the ministry, medicine, psychology.”<sup>88</sup> Daniel L. Langford also links codependency and helping professions: “Employment in a helping vocation is a sign of an unhealthy susceptibility to

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 27-28.

<sup>88</sup> Schaefer and Fassel, 74.

codependency.”<sup>89</sup> He observes that ministry in particular may draw dysfunctional persons: “The dark afflictions that may influence a person to enter ministry may also create a behavior called *codependence*.”<sup>90</sup> The helping nature of pastoral leadership combined with the perception of control attracts those seeking wholeness through codependent relationships.

McIntosh and Rima link frustrated spiritual leaders and codependency: “It is not difficult to see why codependents end up in positions of spiritual leadership. It is the ultimate venue for taking care of others. Unfortunately the person with severe codependency will experience great frustration in ministry.”<sup>91</sup> A person damaged in previous systems seeking identity through the church often seeks to enter pastoral leadership, but the person likely finds further frustration in ministry due to codependency within the system of the church.

Accordingly, churches may draw leaders with codependent tendencies, but the system itself may also create codependent leaders. Schaef and Fassel observe the tendency to promote “workaholism” as an example of systemic promotion of codependency in church systems:

Since we have worked with many church organizations, it is difficult for us to miss the role of the church in actually promoting workaholism. Theologically and in practice, the church puts before us the picture of the good Christian as one who works hard. The good martyr is the typical codependent who works selflessly for others and never attends to his or her own needs. We have heard of “designer

---

<sup>89</sup> Daniel L. Langford, *The Pastor's Family: The Challenges of Family Life and Pastoral Responsibilities* (Binghamton, NY: Haworth, 1998), 74.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 75.

<sup>91</sup> McIntosh and Rima, 122-123.

drugs”; workaholism may be the designer drug for the church as well as for the corporation.<sup>92</sup>

The system, the members in the system, and the leaders can all exhibit codependence and promote the codependence of the others and the system as a whole. Schaefer and Fassel observe the complex interaction between the individual within the system and the system as a whole: “It becomes obvious that the system functions as an addict and reflects the addictive characteristics of the individual, while the individual reflects the addictive process of the system.”<sup>93</sup> Paradoxically, the instability of dysfunction within the system creates the illusion of individual control, a primary component of codependency.

Anderson observes the illusion of stability within an unstable, dysfunctional system: “A dysfunctional system is the most stable of all because it is extremely rigid.”<sup>94</sup> Leaders within a dysfunctional system feel secure in a false sense of stability and control created by the rigidity perpetuated by the problematic system. As in society, many churches foster the illusion of control through broken and codependent systems creating further codependency through shame and loss of self. Relational structures within the church itself can engage with leaders in a codependent spiral similar to a family system where the codependent fuels the dependent who likewise fuels the codependent.

### Codependency in Larger Church Structures

At the macro level, the church’s larger structures appear similar to the local churches in tendency toward codependent behavior. Denominations often create a system

---

<sup>92</sup> Schaefer and Fassel, 135.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., 53.

<sup>94</sup> Anderson, 205.

in which performance equates with spirituality. Leaders push aside authenticity and honesty to promote pet causes and special ministries. Often the only questions asked of the local pastor relate to attendance and finance. Performance-based culture leaves pastors "... either feeling ashamed because of his inadequate performance, self-righteous because of his successful performance, or too paralyzed to try for fear of failing or even making a mistake."<sup>95</sup> Equating a local pastor's worth with performance metrics devalues the individual and promotes a system of shame that promotes seeking of worth outside of the pastor's individual spirituality. Some church systems may actually promote the moral failures and dead spirituality they exist to prevent.

### Codependency in Pentecostal Churches

Pentecostal churches also provide fertile ground for the emergence of codependence. Religion can itself provide an addictive substance preventing a person from eliminating shame and finding self-worth in Jesus. Religious environments often promote workaholicism that prevents self-care, present a God who is frightening and unpleasable, and they often use Scripture to avoid real problem solving.<sup>96</sup> For example, preaching may promote strict abstinence from alcohol and drugs but fail to address the underlying hurt and pain. Silvius observes the link between dysfunctional relationships and rigid morality: "The very people who support abstinence from alcohol and drugs because of their addictive nature are some of the same people who can't see their own ungodly addiction to a relationship."<sup>97</sup> Individuals in the rigid system cope with pain

---

<sup>95</sup> VanVonderen, 202.

<sup>96</sup> Mellody, 196-197.

<sup>97</sup> Silvius, 35.

through more culturally acceptable codependent practices rather than more visible substance addictions.

The charismatic nature of many Pentecostal leaders may also contribute to the emergence of codependency in the church. Silvius observes a link between charismatic leadership and codependency: “Christian ministries often are led by appealing, charismatic people whose very temperament and personality attracts dependent people. Ministry, then, often becomes the perfect setup for codependencies to surface.”<sup>98</sup> The demanding nature of Pentecostalism may also contribute. A strong culture of conformity exists in most Pentecostal churches in which persons form identity in the culture as much or more than from Christ. Hannegan observes the tendency: “Conforming to the image and likeness of the church is the strong ‘It’ of this identity format, with the added reinforcement that encouraging conformity is ‘being right with God.’ The family will use ‘God’s way’ to manipulate the behaviors of all the members.”<sup>99</sup> Anderson links legalistic and rigid religious environments and codependency: “Spiritual abuse is the addictive power of a legalistic theology that creates guilt in order to dispense grace, leaving us spiritual cripples bound to one another by the invisible cords of co-dependency.”<sup>100</sup> A Pentecostal church that has replaced the presence of God with legalism provides fertile ground for codependent and abusive behavior.

Pentecostal churches often use religion as escapism. VanVonderen observes religious escapism that fails to confront reality: “If a relationship with Christ does not

---

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 110.

<sup>99</sup> Hannegan, 5.

<sup>100</sup> Anderson, 210.



drive us *into* the events that have caused us pain in order to face them, but instead serves as an escape which enables us to avoid problem relationships, then it has become as much of an escape to reality as chemicals.”<sup>101</sup> Hoffman likewise observes the tendency to use religion to escape reality:

If our desire is to escape from reality into a warm haze where we can avoid what we do not want to face and where we can feel reassured that we are safe but helpless children, we may be using religious ritual the same way some use alcohol or drugs, for mood-altering, anesthetizing, making the world go away.<sup>102</sup>

Religion used as escapism fosters a denial of reality promoting dysfunction within the system.

Pentecostal and charismatic churches often reduce Christianity to a familiar formula that brings a spiritual high through music and dramatic preaching. It seems lively, but at heart it may form the substance of addiction and codependency in the congregation. Schaefer and Fassel observe the common tendency to substitute religious practice for authentic spirituality: “Whenever we confuse religion with spirituality, we are opting for the structure, control, and rules of an addictive system.”<sup>103</sup> Schaefer and Fassel link the church to an addictive substance that may actually prevent relational wholeness: “We recently began to realize we were seeing something more than the organization as a setting for addictive behavior: in many instances, the organization was itself the addictive substance. It was both setting and substance.”<sup>104</sup> A codependent

---

<sup>101</sup> VanVonderen, 37.

<sup>102</sup> Hoffman, 134.

<sup>103</sup> Schaefer and Fassel, 67.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., 118.

church spends its time distracting members from the obvious underlying faults in a way that is similar to the denial and delusion of the addicted person.

### Codependency as Misplaced Priority

A common intervention in plateaued or declining churches involves emphasizing mission and vision statements. Schaef and Fassel however conclude that overemphasis on mission and vision may actually prevent an organization from confronting the issues that form the actual dysfunction: “When organizations function as the addictive substance, it is in their interest to keep promoting the vision of the mission, because as long as the employees are hooked by it, they are unlikely to turn their awareness to the present discrepancies.”<sup>105</sup> Future health in declining or plateaued churches may come from looking to Jesus for personal identity formation rather than the latest programs or the next mission initiative.

Moreover, the fact that many religious environments see many traits of codependency as admirable complicates the issue. Jennifer Sowle points out that many religious behaviors may appear codependent but that labeling them as such may not be entirely accurate. She provides the Amish woman living in a rigid society in which she lives happy and balanced as an example.<sup>106</sup> The key differentiation is that many in religious environments exhibit “admirable traits” like self-sacrifice, subservience, hard work, and deprivation but resentment does not exist.<sup>107</sup> Within religious systems the

---

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., 125.

<sup>106</sup> Jennifer Sowle, *The Everything Guide to Codependency: Learn to Recognize and Change Codependent Behavior* (Avon, MA: Adams, 2014), 58.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid., 59.

problematic issues may appear mostly in resentment among participants stemming from boundary violations of other participants.

Potter and Potter list several boundary violations in religious systems that may indicate dysfunction and codependency within the system: excessive ritual participation, no identifiable spirituality, empty or meaningless forms, no prayer or gratitude expressed, excessive or rigid rules, God is seen as an angry deity to be feared, little innate sense of right or wrong, little freedom to express individual religious belief, punishment for not following the “family faith,” relationships with those outside the church are discouraged, visiting other churches is discouraged, overzealousness or fanaticism, overly mystical or occultist practices, religious separatism, hatred for outsiders, gender-based deity being used to oppress the opposite gender, overemphasis on evil, demonizing what is not understood, lack of value for children, purist views in which the church is seen as the only “real church,” no exposure to alternate religious views, isolationism, arrogant and unapproachable leaders, seduction by leaders, emotional fervor forming the basis of religious expression, terror, or mindless prayers and chants.<sup>108</sup>

Differentiation between healthy spirituality and dysfunctional codependency proves difficult in religious environments. St. Romain points out that “Ministry is about helping, serving, and giving—all of which codependents do in a distorted manner.”<sup>109</sup> Characteristics of codependent ministers include over-responsibility, self-neglect, unassertiveness, inability to set boundaries, non-confrontive leadership, approval-seeking, people-pleasing, controlling behavior, rigidity, defensiveness, distorted teaching,

---

<sup>108</sup> Potter and Potter, 53-54.

<sup>109</sup> St. Romain, 81.

comparing, niceness, resentfulness, emotional numbness, depression, and loss of self.<sup>110</sup>

Jackson observes that compassion-based ministry may serve as an example of distortion that looks good to outside observers but may form a dysfunctional search for identity:

There is a level of compassion which is faithful to the genius of the Gospel. However, compassion itself may become frozen into a pattern which has the helping individual's security, esteem, and meaning invested in the collective acts of helping. The compassionate helpers can arrive at a state in which life itself is a "living, moving, and having its being," in the humans served. Surely such functional idolatry is an object of concern to Christians.<sup>111</sup>

The end result is that "the life of ministry becomes a dessert of narcissistic searching for one's own reflection rather than striving to be one of the true representatives of the Christ of God."<sup>112</sup> A primary differentiator between healthy serving and codependent attachment appears in self-differentiation among ministers. A minister must take identity in his or her relationship with Christ through the Spirit rather than the descent into debauchery that results from false identity in substances or persons, even if the ministry appears to be successful in terms of human compassion (Eph. 5:18).

### **Assessment Instruments for Codependency**

Awareness of dysfunction proves essential for creating a healthy church. Steinke observes the need for a congregation to face its dysfunctions: "A healthy congregation is one that actively and responsibly addresses or heals its disturbances, not one with an absence of troubles."<sup>113</sup> Codependency's existence systemically in the church requires a

---

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 81-83.

<sup>111</sup> Jackson, 40.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., 41.

<sup>113</sup> Steinke, *Healthy Congregations*, 13.

means of assessing the level of codependency within the systemic environment. A congregation seeking health must face the reality of dysfunction, and an adequate testing instrument would help the struggling congregation to begin the process of discovering healthy relational dynamics.

Assessing the level of codependency within a system proves problematic. Richardson observes the difficulty in assessing a relational system: “Assessing any emotional system is an ongoing process. Emotional issues may lay hidden for some time and only emerge in special times or particular circumstances of anxiety. And an assessment of any large system is difficult simply because of the complexity and the multiplicity of dynamics.”<sup>114</sup> All current assessment tools are designed to assess codependency in individuals rather than relational systems. This seems contradictory as codependency only manifests within the relational system.

Current instruments used to assess codependency within individuals are primarily the Holyoake instrument and the Spann-Fischer scale.<sup>115</sup> Although other instruments exist, several studies have indicated the validity of using these instruments to predict accurately codependency in individuals.<sup>116</sup> Lindley, Giordano, and Hammer found the Spann-Fischer scale, which measures external focus, lack of open expression of feeling, and attempts to derive purpose through relationships as “useful for prediction as a

---

<sup>114</sup> Richardson, 159.

<sup>115</sup> For examples of Spann-Fischer, Holyoake, and other current assessment instruments see appendices C through G.

<sup>116</sup> Examples of studies demonstrating the validity of both instruments for predicting codependency are Biscera et al.; Lindley Giordano, and Hammer; and Marks et al.

composite instrument for all current instruments.”<sup>117</sup> Adaptation of the Spann-Fischer from an individual assessment instrument to an instrument for evaluating systemic relations may prove useful for assessing codependency in systems.

### **Toward Solutions**

As in recovery from addiction, recovery from codependence emerges from a step-by-step journey done in relational system. Wegshcheider-Cruse and Cruse observe that recovery from the relational dysfunction of codependency must be done in relational systems: “It is difficult to recover from codependency in secret.”<sup>118</sup> Recovery for individuals or institutions involves confronting delusion with new information, creating safe atmospheres where feelings can surface, and creating environments where detoxification and detachment can occur.<sup>119</sup> Addressing the issue and discovering genuine identity and health for individuals and the church system require the development of teaching that can reveal the entrenched denials and delusions keeping the codependent stuck. The church should model counter-cultural life in Christ, and assuming the statistic that over 90 percent of Americans manifest codependent tendencies, the church must prevail against the culture of codependency.<sup>120</sup>

Subby calls recovery a “process that takes time, hard work and a willingness to change.”<sup>121</sup> Recovery means change from the false illusions of identity and control that

---

<sup>117</sup> Lindley, Giordano, and Hammer, 59.

<sup>118</sup> Wegscheider-Cruse Cruse, 109.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 125-126.

<sup>120</sup> Weinhold and Weinhold, 3.

<sup>121</sup> Subby, *Lost in the Shuffle*, 101.

keep the individual or organization from finding true identity in Christ. Subby continues: “Change means having to risk losing control—losing control over our feelings, our relationships, our lives.”<sup>122</sup> Recovery means acknowledging powerlessness and embracing God’s control. Church leaders must acknowledge their codependent tendencies and teach the church through example that personal identity comes only from relationship with Christ. Change never occurs until the pain of the present reality exceeds the fear of change. The present reality for the American church involves powerlessness, compromise, and missional ineffectiveness. Mellody observes American culture in general: “I believe we are a nation of very immature people who don’t have the willingness to experience the pain that leads to authentic wisdom. We haven’t learned how to tolerate pain and deal with it as an agent of positive change.”<sup>123</sup> Acknowledging the pain of the church’s present situation and the possibility that the church can often function as an institution that actually prevents formation of Jesus’ identity in believers forms the first step toward wholeness. Rather than modeling new life in Christ, the church has often simply reflected the prevailing codependent culture.

Discipleship, for example, must shift from creedal memorization and cultural conformity to a prevailing church culture of Christ formed identity. Worship, likewise, must shift from performance that often celebrates common false identity to a genuine relational encounter that forms true identity. A healthy pastor must lead the process and examine his or her identity in Christ. Church life must aim for a life lived in interdependence with God and each other rather than the extremes of codependent

---

<sup>122</sup> Ibid.

<sup>123</sup> Mellody, 68.

enmeshment or counter-dependent disengagement. Mellody reminds, “In a functional family the members know that EVERYBODY is imperfect.”<sup>124</sup> The only perfect person in the church is Christ, and only He possesses the ability to eliminate the shame and false identity underlying codependency.

VanVonderen observes that recovery from dysfunction is an intentional process: “Individuals and families become dysfunctional by accident. But they get well on purpose.”<sup>125</sup> Recovery involves embracing life. VanVonderen continues: “The way to have life is not by trying hard not to be dead. It is by coming to what can give life.”<sup>126</sup> Pastors must lead their churches in recovery from false identity and shame as they embrace new life in identity with Christ. Once initiated in individuals the system begins changing. “The health of the members depends, to a great degree, on the health of the system of which they are a part. And the health of the entire system depends, to a great degree, upon the health of the members who comprise it.”<sup>127</sup> Accurately identifying codependent tendencies within the church organizational system forms the first step in addressing the problem and bringing health to the church.

Training pastors in identifying codependency in their churches and helping them to see codependent tendencies introduced to the church by the pastor or acquired by the pastor through the church, forms the next step in recovery for the dysfunctional church. Platt and Knudsen describe the necessary role of pastoral health in systemic function: “As

---

<sup>124</sup> Ibid.

<sup>125</sup> VanVonderen, 13.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 18.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid., 205.



the health of the clergy improves, so does the recovery of the congregation.”<sup>128</sup> Shifting culture involves change and risk. Platt and Knudsen conclude:

The congregation is not going to be transformed by anything less than a critical mass within its membership. As the center of gravity shifts, and the group norm changes, those who are more impaired have less influence and may leave the congregation to find another that is more tolerant of their character defects and dysfunctional behavior.<sup>129</sup>

A pastor seeking to shift the culture of his or her church must engage the congregation from a healthy position and the pastor must be willing to endure challenges and opposition without personalizing the challenges and losing identity or developing shame.

Commitment forms a critical factor in change from codependent congregation to healthy congregation.<sup>130</sup> Whatever the cost, the congregation, its leaders, and its members must face the pain of present reality and work through the process of recovery. Paul wrestles with false identity formation in the church at Galatia. He calls the church “little children, for whom I am again in the anguish of childbirth until Christ is formed in you!” (Gal. 4:19). He warns the church at Ephesus to “not get drunk with wine, for that is debauchery, but be filled with the Spirit” (Eph. 5:18). Christ’s presence must fill the church so it can find forgiveness from shame and identity only in Him. It must not numb the pain through addiction or seek another source to fill it.

Addictive thinking disempowers the organization. Enemies outside always seem to prevent success. Ineffective behavior wastes energy and hurts the organization. Lies, cover-ups, denials, and the demands of the addictive organization leave the members of

---

<sup>128</sup> Platt and Knudsen, 10.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid., 41.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid., 86.

the organization tired and disheartened. Larry Bossidy and Ram Charan observe, “A bad organization will defeat a good person every time.”<sup>131</sup> Organizations or individuals should gladly leave addictive patterns and thinking for new ideas filled with the possibility of effectiveness. For many reasons, people dogmatically persist in their addictive behaviors and organizations do likewise. Senge describes a possible reason for resistance: “Systems thinking is especially prone to evoking defensiveness because of its central message, that our actions create our reality.”<sup>132</sup> Most refuse to change until forced to change by the consequences of their addictive behavior. Unfortunately, the change often comes too late. In order to transform the church from addictive thinking to systems thinking, the church must accept the consequences of actions and accept responsibility for the future. Paul expresses systems thinking as he dismisses outside circumstances and takes responsibility for his own future in the declaration, “I can do all things through him who strengthens me” (Phil. 4:13). Once the church accepts responsibility for its own future and accepts that its actions have consequences, the shift to a learning environment can begin.

An organization must assume responsibility for its actions and future as a whole rather than expecting the actions of one or a few within the organization to shape the organization. Senge observes the necessity of viewing health as the responsibility of all participants: “In mastering systems thinking, we give up the assumption that there is an individual, or individual agent, responsible. The feedback perspective suggests that

---

<sup>131</sup> Larry Bossidy and Ram Charan, *Execution: The Discipline of Getting Things Done* (New York: Crown Business, 2002), 177.

<sup>132</sup> Senge, 220.

everyone shares responsibility for problems generated by the system.”<sup>133</sup> Each individual in the system must accept responsibility for the health of the entire system. Systems thinking therefore must be taught throughout the church and become part of the culture.

Learning within the organization exists on two levels. Single loop learning in which reflection stabilizes existing structures forms the first level. Double loop learning in which learning leads to questioning the system itself to discover why an error or fault occurred in the first place forms the second level.<sup>134</sup> Chris Argyris discusses double loop learning as learning that seeks values transformation rather than just behavioral modification.<sup>135</sup> J. Melvyn Ming describes the levels of learning as synthesis, analysis, and system.<sup>136</sup> A healthy church must regularly engage in the challenging practice of thinking past current problems to the system creating the problem. Timelines of thought must expand as far in the past and into the future as possible in order to see a larger picture than the immediate problem and short-term solution. Often resolving problems in the simplest or fastest manner simply leads to more problems just as an addictive fix leads to more problems as a result of the quick fix of the addiction. Jim Herrington, Mike Bonem, and James H. Furr observe the complexity involved in transitioning from simple quick-fix solutions to systems thinking: “One of the paradoxes of systems thinking is that the apparent problem and the real problem may be entirely different, which means the

---

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., 79.

<sup>134</sup> Michael J. Marquardt, *Building the Learning Organization: Achieving Strategic Advantage through a Commitment to Learning*, rev. ed. (Boston: Nicholas Brealey, 2011), 41.

<sup>135</sup> Chris Argyris, *Overcoming Organizational Defenses: Facilitating Organizational Learning* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1990), 94.

<sup>136</sup> J. Melvyn Ming, Martha Ming, and Steven R. Mills, *LDR Church Development Process Workbook* (Snoqualmie, WA: Leadership Development Resources, 2010), 163.

apparent solution is not necessarily the right one.”<sup>137</sup> The healthy church must do the hard work of higher-level systems thinking.

Honesty and authenticity form the essence of the change to systems thinking from addictive thinking. A church must honestly assess present realities that prevent it from achieving the desired future. Senge states that the essential skills are “seeing interrelationships rather than cause-effect chains” and “seeing processes rather than snapshots.”<sup>138</sup> A healthy church needs vision that extends further than simply fixing the current problem. Likewise the vision cannot loom so large that it forms a foil to honestly looking at the shorter-term vision and its possible execution. Both simple problem solving and elevated vision separate the church from the reality of the present and the steps required to actually accomplish an attainable vision. Like a recovery program, short-term goals must exist to lead to long-term vision, and realism must exist around the attainment of the short-term goals.

Systemic solutions must replace short-term fixes that serve as a foil for the change actually needed. Marquardt suggests developing the skills of systems thinking, using mental models, personal mastery, self-directed learning, and dialogue to develop systems thinking in the organization.<sup>139</sup> Dialogue must open between diverse leaders as the church seeks new perspectives. Robert E. Quinn describes the organization that dies the slow death of attempting to preserve the “normal state” as externally-driven, internally closed,

---

<sup>137</sup> Jim Herrington, Mike Bonem, and James H. Furr, *Leading Congregational Change: A Practical Guide for the Transformational Journey* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000), 156.

<sup>138</sup> Senge, 73.

<sup>139</sup> Marquardt, 24.

self-focused, and comfort-centered.<sup>140</sup> Each of these describe the condition of a dysfunctional church driven by seekers outside the organization, closed to internal growth, focused on its own preservation, and centered by the desires of many members who seek comfort or personal preference over growth. Quinn describes the well-led learning organization as other-focused, externally open, internally directed, and purpose centered.<sup>141</sup> Healthy change process involves the organization as a whole working through a recovery process that begins with acknowledging its own powerlessness and looking to God to restore sanity and health. Accurate assessment of codependency in the church system is a necessary first step in empowering the church to discover health.

### **Conclusion**

While no formal definition of codependency exists in current literature, many theorists attempt to define the concept. Most definitions use terms related to lost or misplaced identity, shame, loss of self, or dependence on another person to establish worth. Estimates that codependency affects nearly all of American society point to codependency as a primary underlying cause of addictions and societal dysfunction. For example, Capitalism itself may well stem from an underlying ethos that looks to position, power, popularity, or possessions to define worth and eliminate personal shame. In religious terms, codependency functions systemically as the idolatrous tendency of fallen humans to establish identity apart from a relationship with God. Patterns of addiction,

---

<sup>140</sup> Robert E. Quinn, *Building the Bridge as You Walk on It* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2004), 19.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

abuse, relational dysfunction, and broken societal systems may well result from codependency rather than cause codependency.

Using codependency as a construct to evaluate the organization is an emerging trend. The use of current thinking related to systemic codependency suggests the possibility of exploring a new concept in church health. Congregations often demonstrate the family systems dynamic of codependency, and these congregations are plateaued or declining. Church growth may depend more on addressing the underlying systemic health of the congregational system than on applying concepts or methods from a healthy system to a dysfunctional system. Awareness serves as the key to addressing the issue, and accurate assessment forms the first step in creating awareness.

Many churches exhibit the characteristics of codependent systems that are described in the literature. Systemic issues leading to a growth plateau in a church, for example, may relate to organizational addiction. Many of the systemic issues preventing growth in the American church could result from organizational addictive tendencies that reflect the tendencies of the individuals within the church and the church as a system. Schaef and Fassel's observation that the organization can form the actual substance of addiction appears to be relevant to the church.<sup>142</sup> The tendency of the church to attract those at the bottom of an addictive cycle to lofty goals may indicate that churches prove more susceptible to codependent tendencies than secular organizations. In response the church may increasingly focus on lofty visions of new buildings and mega-church attendance while denying the reality of systemic dysfunction. Changing the culture of the

---

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., 118.

church to healthy and biblical patterns of growth requires acknowledging the prevalence of systemic addiction in the church organization.

## CHAPTER 4: DESCRIPTION OF FIELD PROJECT

### **Introduction**

Chapter 2 of this project discusses theology of addiction as seen through the use of wine as it unfolds through the biblical record. Chapter 3 discusses codependency as a manifestation of addiction in the systemic relational environment and the theory that codependency exists within the systemic relational networks of an organization including the church. The following question arises: if codependency exists in addicted family systems and in organizational systems as outlined in chapter 3, then does it likewise exist in ecclesiastical settings, and can a person measure codependency in the organizational or ecclesiastical setting? Chapter 4 now discusses a survey designed to measure codependency in the systemic organizational environment of the church. It also explores the possibility of a corollary relationship between codependency and church health and the possibility that the existence of codependency predicts church health.

### **Preparation of the Project**

I have encountered many churches demonstrating dysfunction and poor health. When presented with new ideas or current best practices, some churches ignore the possibility of health and remain in their previous patterns of dysfunction. Frequently, churches are closed to the possibility of new practice or change that might move them toward health. Resistance to change and discovery of truth manifests within the systemic relational environment of the church. I have observed that many churches function similar to a codependent family functioning as a closed system that resists change or the



possibility of outside help. The church frequently bases its worth on things less than Christ and His mission, and the church often has an identity based on tradition rather than the active presence of God. It seems reasonable that systemic codependence might exist in the church environment and that there may be a correlation between church health and the concept of codependence. The existence of codependency and a correlation between its existence and overall church health would indicate that a new approach to church health might be warranted in many churches. If codependency relates to ill health in some church environments, then interventions should reflect strategies that address codependence rather than the superficial problems often addressed by many current church health strategies. The underlying relational system forms the primary focus in the codependent system, and formation of identity and alleviation of shame through repentance might best help the codependent church.

In discussing my thesis with church consultants and denominational leaders I discovered a general agreement that there are numerous plateaued or declining churches and that traditional methods seemed ineffective to assist some churches. A general frustration exists among many leaders and consultants as the cause of the dysfunction within these churches remained unclear. When presented with a description of systemic codependence, many leaders and consultants agreed that the possibility of systemic codependence's existence in the church environment might describe the underlying causes of many churches' dysfunction. Every problem within the church does not indicate codependence, but the behavior observable within some churches seems to indicate that codependence exists as a significant problem within their environment. The scope of this project was to determine whether codependency could be measured in the

systemic environment of the church and if there is a correlation between measured codependency and church health. The ability to measure the phenomenon provides a means of designing an effective intervention, and it prevents the tendency to label all church dysfunction as codependent.

### Survey Sample

I designed the project to survey an initial group of twelve churches ranging from small to large and across racial and denominational lines. Eight of the twelve churches were Assemblies of God (AG) congregations, and the remaining churches were Baptist, Methodist, and independent congregations. I had some level of preexisting relationship with each of the churches participating in the survey and attempted to select churches that represented both numerically declining and growing churches. I provided each church with twenty-five surveys<sup>1</sup> and a cover sheet for general church demographics.<sup>2</sup>

My contact in each church was the senior pastor, who was only aware that this was a doctoral project designed to measure a particular systemic issue within the church. I instructed the pastors to obtain as many completed surveys as possible and to distribute the survey to leaders or those they felt most likely to be aware of the underlying issues within the church. A cover sheet attached to each survey told the participants, “You are invited to participate in a study of systemic church health. I hope to study specific factors related to general church health.” The cover sheet also informed the pastors, “The scope of this project is to determine whether there are ways of approaching church health that have not been considered.”

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A, “Project Survey.”

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix B, “Church Cover Sheet.”

I made every attempt to ensure the pastors were not informed of the exact nature of the survey as the results might have been skewed by the awareness that I was attempting to measure codependence or addictive dysfunction in the church. The nature of codependency would suggest that truly codependent churches would either reject participation in the survey or skew the responses to hide the dysfunction within the closed environment. The participants were only aware they were helping me with a doctoral project. I promised anonymity to each participant and to each pastor choosing to participate in the survey.<sup>3</sup>

### Survey Questionnaire

Each question in the survey was a five-point Likert Scale ranging from “I Disagree Strongly” to “I Agree Strongly.” The questions were designed with superlative adjectives in order to avoid mid-level responses. Words such as “always,” “very,” and “never” were designed into the questions to provoke strong responses on the Likert Scale. The instrument assesses church health in the first eight items and codependency within the church system in the remaining thirty-two items. The highest possible score on the church health indicator would be forty while the highest possible score on the codependency items would be 160.

Each survey begins with eight questions designed to gauge the participant’s opinion with respect to the general health of his or her church. Questions were designed to gain the participant’s opinion on general church health, level of excitement about the

---

<sup>3</sup> Participants consented to the research through a cover sheet supplied with each survey.

church, the status of discipleship, missional effectiveness, numerical growth, and community involvement.

Table 1. Items 1-8: Church Health Assessment

|        |   |
|--------|---|
|        |   |
| Item 1 | We are a healthy and growing church.  |
| Item 2 | We are excited about the future of this church.                                   |
| Item 3 | In the last year I have experienced significant spiritual growth in this church.  |
| Item 4 | This church is making a difference in the world.                                  |
| Item 5 | This church has grown significantly in the last year.                             |
| Item 6 | Our services are very exciting.   |
| Item 7 | There are many examples of people who have grown in the past year in this church. |
| Item 8 | Our community is a much better place because of this church.                      |

The remaining thirty-two questions were adaptations of the standard Spann-Fischer codependence survey,<sup>4</sup> a sixteen-question instrument. My instrument adapts each question of the Spann-Fischer instrument through two corresponding questions. Adaptations were designed to preserve the focus of Spann-Fischer while asking the participant to rate the systemic environment of his or her church. Participants were instructed at the beginning of the survey instrument to think of the “church as a whole” in each of their responses. Each participant’s estimation of codependency in the systemic environment of the church rather than the participant’s personal level of codependency forms the basis of the design of the survey. Language used in each question was designed to focus the respondent on the church as a system rather than the respondent’s individual feelings or level of codependency. The instrument was designed to assess the level of codependency in the system rather than the sum total of the level of codependency in the individuals within the system.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix C, “Spann-Fischer Instrument.” The Spann-Fischer Instrument may also be accessed at <http://courses.ttu.edu/jfischer/Questionnaires%20Inventories/codependency%20scale.htm>.

Table 2. Items 9-40: Codependency Indicators

|         |   |
|---------|---|
|         |   |
| Item 9  | Decision-making is very difficult in this church.   |
| Item 10 | This church has too many ministries and activities.   |
| Item 11 | It is always awkward when someone gets recognized for doing something good here.  |
| Item 12 | It seems like we are always creating problems here.   |
| Item 13 | We <i>never</i> do things for people that they are capable of doing themselves.   |
| Item 14 | We often feel guilty when the church decides to do something for itself.  |
| Item 15 | We <i>are not</i> worried about the future of this church at all.   |
| Item 16 | Things will get better here when certain people change what they are doing.   |
| Item 17 | It seems like we are often there for people but they are rarely there for us.   |
| Item 18 | We are often in the situation of helping one person and then later feeling that we have neglected other relationships or responsibilities.      |
| Item 19 | We seem to have a lot of painful relationships in this church.  |
| Item 20 | We rarely present the real “us” to visitors or the community.   |
| Item 21 | When we are uncomfortable with someone we tend to hold it in and then sometimes the issue explodes.   |
| Item 22 | We go to any lengths to avoid open conflict in this church.   |
| Item 23 | I have a sense of dread or impending doom when thinking of this church.   |
| Item 24 | We are always putting the needs of others above our own needs.  |
| Item 25 | It seems like decisions are hard to make here.  |
| Item 26 | This church starts a lot of new ministries and projects.  |
| Item 27 | It feels uncomfortable when I get recognized for doing good things here.  |
| Item 28 | Problems energize us.   |
| Item 29 | We <i>do not</i> help people unless they are helping themselves.  |
| Item 30 | The church’s efforts should be focused on people outside the church.  |
| Item 31 | It seems as if we <i>are not</i> worried about our community and the church in our culture.   |
| Item 32 | This church has had problems with the community, past members, or district leaders that have contributed significantly to our current problems. |
| Item 33 | We help a lot of people that never attend or help the church.   |
| Item 34 | We are always willing to put everything on hold to help one person.   |
| Item 35 | The people we build relationships with hurt us later.   |
| Item 36 | We always hide our problems here.   |
| Item 37 | We put off confronting discipline issues, and this has led to some explosions due to us waiting too long.                                       |
| Item 38 | We rarely have conflicts.   |
| Item 39 | I sometimes feel like something bad is about to happen in this church.  |
| Item 40 | We focus on the needs of those outside the church more than our own needs.  |

### *Comparison of Survey Instruments to Categories of Codependence*

As discussed in chapter 3, Anthony D. G. Marks, Rebecca L. Blore, Donald W.

Hine, and Greg E. Dear place the characteristics of codependency into four core

categories.<sup>5</sup> First is external focusing in which the codependent person focuses his or her attention primarily on the behavior, opinion, or expectations of other persons. Second is self-sacrifice in which the codependent person neglects personal needs to focus on the needs of another person. Third is a sense of interpersonal control in the codependent in which he or she believes that a person can fix another person's problems or change his or her behavior. Fourth is emotional suppression in which the codependent person deliberately suppresses or demonstrates limited awareness of his or her emotions. Items 9 through 40 assess codependency and use these four categories as the basis for the formulation of the survey questions. Each question in the instrument relates to one of the four categories outlined by Marks et al. Each question also groups with its corresponding question from the original Spann-Fischer instrument since two questions were developed from each Spann-Fischer question.<sup>6</sup>

### External Focusing

Codependents tend to have trouble forming personal identity and tend to base identity on the expectations or opinions of others. Items 9 and 25 assess decision-making ability, as codependents tend to have difficulty making decisions. They tend to wait until they can make a response based on the expectations of others. Questions 10 and 26 assess the ability of the church to say "no" by asking if the church has too many ministries.

Codependents tend to have difficulty saying "no" as they want to please people, have few

---

<sup>5</sup> Anthony D. G. Marks, Rebecca L. Blore, Donald W. Hine, and Greg E. Dear, "Development and Validation of a Revised Measure of Codependency," *Australian Journal of Psychology* 64, issue 2 (2012): 119-127.

<sup>6</sup> Table 9 in this chapter illustrates the grouping of each question within the four categories along with the pairing of each question with its corresponding question in the Spann-Fischer instrument.

boundaries, and little focus. Codependent churches would therefore have many ministries and little focus.

Items 12 and 28 assess the level of felt crisis in the church. Codependents tend to create problems and thrive in chaos as they rescue others from the problems they have created. The tendency is one of shifting the focus to a locus outside the individual. A sense that people create crisis in the church or that the church is energized by crisis would indicate a codependent characteristic. Questions 16 and 32 assess the tendency to shift to an outside focus by blaming others. A codependent person has little sense of his or her own ability to change his or her environment, and the codependent church would likewise focus on external issues that they feel prevent their growth while ignoring the real internal issues needing addressed. The codependent has an inflated sense of his or her ability to change others, and he or she has an inflated sense of other's ability to control his or her future and emotions. Items 20 and 36 assess the tendency of codependents to reflect the expectations of others rather than revealing their true selves. A codependent person has little sense of personal identity, and the codependent church simply borrows its identity from other churches or popular culture. A church might, for example, take its identity from a mega-church or denominational initiative rather than forming a unique local identity.

### Self-Sacrifice

Codependents tend to feel they are martyrs and that they live a life of sacrifice for others. Constant external focus leads to the feeling that the codependent's needs are not important. Items 11 and 27 assess the level of comfort with being singled out or recognized. Codependents tend to be uncomfortable when others focus on them. A

codependent church then avoids recognition or calling attention to itself. It may exist in a community almost anonymously, and many members may feel anonymous. Items 14 and 30 assess the level of self-care. Codependents rarely care for their own needs, as they over-focus on the needs of others. The codependent church has likely focused on the needs of the community or missions to the neglect of church health or stewardship of property. While this item might seem paradoxical in that focusing on community needs proves essential to mission, neglect of internal strength and general lack of stewardship ultimately prove detrimental to the long-term health of the ministry. For this reason the codependent church might look good to the outsider in the community or to denominational officials while it masks serious internal problems that ultimately will destroy the ministry. Items 17 and 33 assess overall feelings of victimization in the church. Codependents tend to feel they serve others and later are the victims of those they serve. The codependent church feels victimized by those they help.<sup>7</sup> Eventually all helping in the church arises from the need to feel victimized in order to excuse underlying dysfunction. Items 18 and 34 assess the churches external focus and neglect of self-care. The codependent church feels strong because they can point to ministries in the community or missionary support, but the outside focus is not based on the church's health. The external focus finds its basis in the desire to cover internal weakness.

### Interpersonal Control

Codependents overestimate their ability to control or influence the behavior of others. Their external focus and self-sacrificing attitude makes them feel that they exist to

---

<sup>7</sup> The Karpman Drama Triangle is an illustration of this concept from Bowen Systems Theory. Stephen B. Karpman, "Fairy Tales and Script Drama Analysis," *Transactional Analysis Bulletin* 7, no. 26, (1968): 39-43, accessed May 29, 2015, [http://www.karpmandramatriangle.com/dt\\_article\\_only.html](http://www.karpmandramatriangle.com/dt_article_only.html).



fix the problems of others. They tend to have a high estimation of their ability to change others while feeling they are mostly powerless to change their own situation or behavior. Items 13 and 29 assess the tendency to “fix” others and do for them what they could do for themselves. Codependents tend to help even when help is unneeded. A codependent church feels responsible for the behavior of individuals within the church and outside the church. They focus on the dysfunction of others and neglect attention to dysfunction within the church itself. Codependent churches often appear arrogant to their communities as they present themselves as the solution for every problem outside its walls while ignoring the problems within its walls. Questions 19 and 35 assess the tendency to choose painful relationships that the codependent feels he or she can change. A codependent church often attempts ministry to the most helpless and least likely to change while ignoring a large percentage of the community that is receptive to change and the church’s ministry. The codependent church eventually feels a sense of pain and dislike for the community as the community they attempt to reach proves unresponsive. Codependent churches feel taken advantage of by their community. Items 24 and 40 assess the codependent church’s tendency to over-focus on others for the purpose of controlling behavior. A codependent church might focus on one new visitor to the point of excess, and it might find one new believer and focus all of its efforts on changing one person. Again, the church ignores necessary internal change for external focus as it overestimates its ability to change others and underemphasizes its ability to change itself.

### Emotional Suppression

Due to external focus, self-sacrifice, and a sense of interpersonal control the codependent tends to suppress his or her emotions. A codependent church has little sense

of its true emotional state and little feeling based on its own identity. Items 21 and 37 assess the church's ability to confront others. Codependent churches usually struggle with church discipline. They tend to suppress their feelings and eventually explode with anger or dysfunction. Codependent churches mistake grace for failure to confront deviant behavior of doctrine. Confrontation or church discipline tends to upset the status quo and the illusion of identity under which the church operates. The church avoids reality and fails to confront real issues. Items 22 and 38 assess conflict avoidance within the system. Codependent persons will avoid conflict and deny the existence of conflict. Likewise, the codependent church often feels there is perfect peace reflecting church health in spite of the obvious problems ignored by the church and the obvious indicators of dysfunction hidden in the illusion of peace. Small issues explode, and the church feels ignorant of the true cause. Question 38 assesses denial of conflict within the system. Healthy churches admit conflict and see it as an opportunity to grow while unhealthy churches ignore conflict. Items 23 and 39 reflect general feelings of doom or dread within the system created by the avoidance of conflict and suppression of emotions. Tension in the system resembles a panic attack in a codependent individual. Denial of reality and masking underlying problems fails to completely hide the underlying dysfunction. The environment reflects the underlying tension masked by codependent behavior, but under the masks reality surfaces as feelings of doom, dread, and anxiety.

### **Execution of the Project**

I called each participating pastor on April 3, 2015 to ask him or her to participate in the survey. Each pastor agreed, and I distributed seven survey packets by hand to local pastors while five survey packets were mailed with a return envelope to the five out-of-

area churches. I told the pastors I would like to have their completed surveys by May 1, 2015. As the surveys were returned the data was recorded in a spreadsheet. Nine of the twelve surveys were returned before May 9, 2015. Three surveys were not returned.

## **Results of the Project**

### *Demographics*

Participating churches primarily represented rural churches: seven in rural areas, four in suburban areas, and one in an urban area. I did not record the age of the individual participants, but the age of the individual churches range from 197 years old to a decade old. Pastoral tenure ranged from twenty-three years to four years, and four pastors were founding pastors. The survey did not record the racial makeup of the churches, but I observed that eleven churches are predominantly white while one church (Church 8) is predominantly African-American.

Table 3. Age of Responding Churches, Pastoral Tenure, and Setting

|           | <i>Church Age</i> | <i>Tenure of Current Pastor</i> | <i>Setting</i> | <i>Attendance<br/>2014</i> | <i>Attendance<br/>2010</i> |
|-----------|-------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Church 1  | 12                | 12                              | Rural          | 95                         | 223                        |
| Church 2  | 10                | 10                              | Rural          | 82                         | 52                         |
| Church 3  | 23                | 23                              | Suburban       | 1650                       | 1242                       |
| Church 4  | 197               | 21                              | Suburban       | 393                        | 511                        |
| Church 5  | 65                | 4                               | Suburban       | 240                        | 150                        |
| Church 6  | 72                | 21                              | Rural          | 225                        | 322                        |
| Church 7  | 80                | 13                              | Rural          | 120                        | 119                        |
| Church 8  | 18                | 18                              | Rural          | 148                        | 110                        |
| Church 9  | 183               | 9                               | Rural          | 165                        | 110                        |
| Church 10 | 30                | 5                               | Urban          |                            |                            |
| Church 11 | 55                | 18                              | Rural          |                            |                            |
| Church 12 | 43                | 5                               | Suburban       |                            |                            |

### *Response Analysis*

Nine of the twelve churches returned completed surveys. Many of the churches returned less than the twenty-five surveys sent. Aggregate data therefore represents each church unequally. The number of responses for each participating church is represented

in Table 4. Data in Table 4 reflects the uneven representation of each church in the total sample. Churches 1 and 6 have the largest representation in the total sample with 13.4 percent of the total while church five represents only 7.5 percent of the total survey.

Three churches failed to respond to the survey after promising to participate. Although it remains impossible to prove the cause of their refusal to participate, it seems likely that their refusal indicates a closed system in which high levels of codependency exists. One pastor responded after receiving the survey that he could not see how participating would benefit his church and that his church did not need any outsiders looking into its health. Another pastor simply avoided my phone calls after receiving the survey. Both pastors are personal friends. Both churches are in decline and are increasingly closed to outside assessment. The third non-responding church is a numerically growing church in an urban environment. The cause of this church's non-response is unclear, and the pastor indicates he is working on completing the survey. It seems likely that refusal to assess church health may often indicate codependency as well as the instrument itself.

Table 4. Number of Responses from Participating Churches

|          | <i>Respondents</i> | <i>Percent</i> |          | <i>Respondents</i> | <i>Percent</i> |
|----------|--------------------|----------------|----------|--------------------|----------------|
| Church 1 | 25                 | 13.4           | Church 6 | 25                 | 13.4           |
| Church 2 | 23                 | 12.4           | Church 7 | 19                 | 10.2           |
| Church 3 | 15                 | 8.1            | Church 8 | 22                 | 11.8           |
| Church 4 | 20                 | 10.8           | Church 9 | 23                 | 12.4           |
| Church 5 | 14                 | 7.5            |          |                    |                |

### *Findings*

The following tables represent the mean scores for each responding church and the minimum and maximum responses for each responding church.<sup>8</sup> Table 5 illustrates

---

<sup>8</sup> For complete data results see Appendix H.

the scores on church health indicators in the first eight questions of the survey. The maximum score in the first eight items would be forty.

Table 5. Mean Church Health Score (Items 1-8)

|          | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std. Deviation</i> | <i>Std. Error</i> | <i>95% Confidence Interval Mean Lower Bound</i> | <i>95% Confidence Interval Mean Upper Bound</i> |
|----------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| Church 1 | 25       | 34.20       | 4.252                 | .850              | 32.44   | 35.96   |
| Church 2 | 23       | 37.91       | 1.649                 | .344              | 37.20   | 38.63   |
| Church 3 | 15       | 32.60       | 4.137                 | 1.068             | 30.31   | 34.89   |
| Church 4 | 20       | 26.75       | 5.389                 | 1.205             | 34.23   | 29.27   |
| Church 5 | 14       | 29.07       | 5.284                 | 1.412             | 26.02   | 32.12   |
| Church 6 | 25       | 37.92       | 3.861                 | .772              | 36.33   | 39.51   |
| Church 7 | 19       | 31.47       | 4.742                 | 1.088             | 29.19   | 33.76   |
| Church 8 | 22       | 31.05       | 6.959                 | 1.484             | 27.96   | 34.13   |
| Church 9 | 23       | 31.48       | 3.654                 | .762              | 29.90   | 33.06   |
| Total    | 186      | 32.85       | 5.740                 | .421              | 32.02   | 33.69   |

Table 6 illustrates the mean scores for the thirty-six questions designed to measure codependency within the church. The maximum score for each church would be 160.

Table 6. Mean Codependency (Items 9-40)

|          | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std. Deviation</i> | <i>Std. Error</i> | <i>95% Confidence Interval Mean Lower Bound</i> | <i>95% Confidence Interval Mean Upper Bound</i> |
|----------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| Church 1 | 25       | 76.04       | 10.302                | .421              | 71.79   | 80.29   |
| Church 2 | 20       | 70.74       | 9.808                 | 2.045             | 66.50   | 74.98   |
| Church 3 | 15       | 83.47       | 11.332                | 2.926             | 77.19   | 89.74   |
| Church 4 | 20       | 86.65       | 12.500                | 2.795             | 80.80   | 92.50   |
| Church 5 | 14       | 78.21       | 13.902                | 3.715             | 70.19   | 86.24   |
| Church 6 | 25       | 67.84       | 6.401                 | 1.280             | 65.20   | 70.48   |
| Church 7 | 19       | 70.79       | 10.748                | 2.466             | 65.61   | 75.97   |

|          |     |       |        |       |       |       |
|----------|-----|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| Church 8 | 22  | 86.00 | 12.244 | 2.610 | 80.57 | 91.43 |
| Church 9 | 23  | 81.87 | 12.436 | 2.593 | 76.49 | 87.25 |
| Total    | 186 | 77.55 | 12.754 | .935  | 75.70 | 79.39 |

Tables 7 and 8 represent the minimum and maximum scores reported in each church in both the church health indicators and the codependency indicators. Table 9 shows the mean scores within the four categories used to develop the questions along with the standard deviation of each mean score.

Table 7. Minimum and Maximum Reported Church Health Scores by Church (Items 1-8)

|          | <i>Minimum</i> | <i>Maximum</i> |
|----------|----------------|----------------|
| Church 1 | 22             | 40             |
| Church 2 | 35             | 40             |
| Church 3 | 23             | 39             |
| Church 4 | 18             | 37             |
| Church 5 | 21             | 40             |
| Church 6 | 25             | 40             |
| Church 7 | 23             | 39             |
| Church 8 | 12             | 38             |
| Church 9 | 24             | 40             |

Table 8. Minimum and Maximum Reported Codependency Scores by Church (Items 9-40)

|          | <i>Minimum</i> | <i>Maximum</i> |
|----------|----------------|----------------|
| Church 1 | 56             | 99             |
| Church 2 | 56             | 84             |
| Church 3 | 67             | 106            |
| Church 4 | 65             | 113            |
| Church 5 | 60             | 106            |
| Church 6 | 56             | 80             |
| Church 7 | 52             | 92             |
| Church 8 | 51             | 110            |
| Church 9 | 67             | 125            |

Table 9. Mean Scores for Items 9-40 Grouped by Category

|                              | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std. Deviation</i> | <i>N</i> |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------|
| <b>External Focusing</b>     |             |                       |          |
| Item 9                       | 2.19        | 1.307                 | 170      |
| Item 25                      | 1.91        | 1.145                 | 170      |
| Item 10                      | 1.95        | 1.171                 | 170      |
| Item 26                      | 3.11        | 1.275                 | 170      |
| Item 12                      | 1.49        | .944                  | 170      |
| Item 28                      | 2.90        | 1.253                 | 170      |
| Item 16                      | 2.35        | 1.199                 | 170      |
| Item 32                      | 2.14        | 1.278                 | 170      |
| Item 20                      | 1.69        | 1.055                 | 170      |
| Item 36                      | 1.72        | .992                  | 170      |
| <b>Self-Sacrifice</b>        |             |                       |          |
| Item 11                      | 1.58        | 1.025                 | 170      |
| Item 27                      | 1.99        | 1.159                 | 170      |
| Item 14                      | 2.01        | 1.136                 | 170      |
| Item 30                      | 3.18        | 1.144                 | 170      |
| Item 17                      | 2.16        | 1.208                 | 170      |
| Item 33                      | 3.72        | 1.236                 | 170      |
| Item 18                      | 2.05        | 1.095                 | 170      |
| Item 34                      | 3.01        | 1.182                 | 170      |
| <b>Interpersonal Control</b> |             |                       |          |
| Item 13                      | 3.92        | 1.026                 | 170      |
| Item 29                      | 4.15        | 1.024                 | 170      |
| Item 19                      | 1.84        | 1.106                 | 170      |
| Item 35                      | 2.01        | 1.151                 | 170      |
| Item 24                      | 2.95        | 1.426                 | 170      |
| Item 40                      | 2.45        | 1.245                 | 170      |
| Item 15                      | 2.99        | 1.501                 | 170      |
| Item 31                      | 3.98        | 1.345                 | 170      |
| <b>Emotional Suppression</b> |             |                       |          |
| Item 21                      | 1.92        | 1.125                 | 170      |
| Item 37                      | 2.04        | 1.206                 | 170      |
| Item 22                      | 2.64        | 1.312                 | 170      |
| Item 38                      | 3.02        | 1.292                 | 170      |
| Item 23                      | 1.27        | .677                  | 170      |
| Item 39                      | 1.44        | .813                  | 170      |

The represented data suggests that the responding churches can be placed in three subsets. In the items related to church health (1-8) church 4 has the lowest score; churches 5, 6, 7, and 9 are in a second group, while churches 1, 3, 2, and 6 are in a third group. In the items related to codependence (9-40) the churches may be placed in three

groups with church 6 having the lowest score; churches 2, 7, 1, 5, 9, and 3 the middle scores; and churches 8 and 4 the highest scores.

The following charts report the data in groups. Significant overlap exists between sets. The data reported uses a harmonic mean sample size of 19.862. Since the group sizes are unequal the harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type one error levels are not guaranteed.

Table 10. Church Health Means for Groups in Homogenous Subsets (Items 1-8)

|          | <i>N</i> | <i>Subset 1</i> | <i>Subset 2</i> | <i>Subset 3</i> |
|----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Church 4 | 20       | 26.75           |                 |                 |
| Church 5 | 14       | 29.07           | 29.07           |                 |
| Church 8 | 22       | 31.05           | 31.05           |                 |
| Church 7 | 19       | 31.47           | 31.47           |                 |
| Church 9 | 23       | 31.48           | 31.48           |                 |
| Church 3 | 15       |                 | 32.60           | 32.60           |
| Church 1 | 25       |                 | 34.20           | 34.20           |
| Church 2 | 23       |                 |                 | 37.91           |
| Church 6 | 25       |                 |                 | 37.92           |
| Sig.     |          | .236            | .142            | .108            |

Table 11. Codependency Means for Groups in Homogenous Subsets (Items 9-40)

|          | <i>N</i> | <i>Subset 1</i> | <i>Subset 2</i> | <i>Subset 3</i> |
|----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Church 6 | 25       | 67.84           |                 |                 |
| Church 2 | 23       | 70.74           | 70.74           |                 |
| Church 7 | 19       | 70.79           | 70.79           |                 |
| Church 1 | 25       | 76.04           | 76.04           | 76.04           |
| Church 5 | 14       | 78.21           | 78.21           | 78.21           |
| Church 9 | 23       |                 | 81.87           | 81.87           |
| Church 3 | 15       |                 | 83.47           | 83.47           |
| Church 8 | 22       |                 |                 | 86.00           |
| Church 4 | 20       |                 |                 | 86.65           |
| Sig.     |          | .367            | .113            | .334            |

Items assessing church health (1-8) demonstrated internal consistency with an overall reliability coefficient of .891 (as measured by Cronbach's Alpha). Items representing codependency (9-40) demonstrated internal consistency with a Cronbach's Alpha of .745. The data suggests that the two constructs of this instrument (Church Codependency and Church Health) provide a measure of construct reliability. The data



seems to support the primary thesis of this work—that codependency exists and can be measured in the systemic church environment.

The secondary thesis, that there is a corollary relationship between church health and codependence, requires a comparison of the two sets of data.<sup>9</sup> There is a statistically significant correlation between Church Health and Church Codependency ( $r = -.431$ ). This is a moderate negative correlation suggesting that an inverse relationship exists between church health and codependency. In other words, when church health increases, codependency decreases.

Table 12. Correlations Between Church Health and Codependency

|                      |                     | <i>Church Health</i> | <i>Codependency</i> |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Church Health</i> | Pearson Correlation | 1                    | -.431*              |
|                      | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                      | .000                |
|                      | N                   | 186                  | 186                 |
| <i>Codependency</i>  | Pearson Correlation | -.431*               | 1                   |
|                      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                 |                     |
|                      | N                   | 186                  | 186                 |

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The data tends to support codependency's existence within the church as a system and the idea that codependency can be measured within the system. Several questions within each category indicate codependency. Correlation between church health assessment and codependency exists at a moderate level. Some individuals within churches ranking higher in codependency indicated a high level of church health in contrast to the data provided on the cover sheet. For example, church 1 reported a 42.6 percent decline in attendance over five years while twenty-two individuals in the church responded with “moderately agree” or “strongly agree” to item 1 which states, “We are a healthy and growing church.” Likewise, in the same church fourteen respondents

---

<sup>9</sup> For other corollary relationships within the data see the chart in Appendix I.

indicated “moderately agree” or “strongly agree” to the statement, “This church has grown significantly in the past year.” Seven respondents strongly agreed with the statement. It seems reasonable that high-level codependents might respond as they feel they are expected to respond rather than how they actually feel. Correlation might increase if the assessment of church health was tied to objective data or assessment rather than participant opinion.

Overall, the survey indicates that codependency in some form exists in the systemic environment of the church, and codependency can be measured within the system using the adapted questionnaire, which displays a significant construct reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha = .891 for the one scale and .769 for the other). Codependency also correlates with church health indicators in that higher levels of codependency indicate lower levels of church health (correlation is significant at the 0.01 level).

### **The Project's Contribution to Ministry**

Church networks spend large amounts of money and effort on revitalizing churches. In spite of the efforts a significant number of churches continue to decline and eventually close. While church planting is effective, it seems reasonable to utilize existing churches and assist them in discovering health. The problem, however, remains in that new methodology or renewed mission statements in many churches prove ineffective in bringing long-term health.

This project's thesis is that codependency exists in the systemic environment of some churches and that codependency is measurable. The findings of this project suggest a new approach to church health in some plateaued or declining churches. Rather than

new methods and mission statements many declining churches need intervention similar to addiction intervention. Awareness of the tendency for the system to develop codependent tendencies likewise suggests that training church leaders in the concept might prevent the development of codependency within the system and ensure long-term church health.

Individual churches and leaders might benefit from awareness of the systemic issues of codependency. Denominational officials might also better assist the churches they serve if they could identify codependent tendencies within the system before the usual numbers reported by the church indicate a plateau or decline. A renewed focus on overall health rather than church size would likely create more effectiveness and missional results than simply focusing on attendance data. This project provides a possibility for assessing church health in other metrics than attendance numbers.

### **Conclusion**

Adapting the standard Spann-Fischer instrument to a systemic environment has provided data through this project that systemic codependency might be measured as a function in the system itself. As discussed in chapter 3, some organizational theorists suggest the existence of codependency as a systemic phenomenon. This project has measured the existence of codependency in the system using a standard individual assessment instrument adapted to the systemic environment. Overall, the project indicates that codependency in some form exists in the systemic environment of the church and codependency can be measured within the system using the adapted questionnaire, which displays a significant construct reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha = .891 for the one scale and .769 for the other). Codependency also correlates with church health

indicators in that higher levels of codependency indicate lower levels of church health (correlation is significant at the 0.01 level). Hopefully this project will continue to raise awareness that the church is a relational system and that health may best increase through addressing the system itself.

## CHAPTER 5: PROJECT SUMMARY

### **Introduction**

Chapter 5 reflects on the process and implications of this project. This summary includes an overall evaluation of the project focusing on the keys to project effectiveness and keys to developing future research. The implications of the project are discussed with recommendations for denominational leaders and church leaders. I will also observe some possible directions for future researchers.

### **Evaluation of the Project**

This project measured codependency as a systemic issue within the relational environment of the church and correlated the measurement with church health. It provided a lens through which the church might be viewed both as a system of complex relationships and as a possible location of addictive dysfunction within the system. Following sections will discuss the keys to the project's effectiveness and ways in which the project might be improved.

### **Keys to Project Effectiveness**

Use of the Spann-Fischer instrument, a standard individual assessment instrument for the basis of developing the questions for this project's survey, proved effective. This project remained focused on the systemic environment of the church as an organization rather than on the effectiveness of the questions themselves. Spann-Fischer has proved reliable in measuring individual codependency for decades, but it has not been adapted

for use in assessing a relational system. Measures of codependency within the relational system and the correlation of the measurement with church health rather than investigating the existence or measurability of codependency in the individuals within the system remained the focus of the project. Some correlations, however, appeared to reflect church position. The use of two survey questions corresponding to each Spann-Fischer question helped to assess the accuracy of the adaptation.

A second key to effectiveness was using pastors with whom I had an existing relationship. In its present form, the survey could be intimidating as a stand-alone instrument. Three of the twelve pastors did not return the survey. The remaining nine pastors took the responsibility for the assessment in their churches, and without their assistance the survey would not have been possible.

### Keys to Project Improvement

Project validity would likely increase with a larger sample of churches. Although the data support the thesis that codependency is measurable within the system and that codependency correlates with church health, the data would have been more conclusive with a broader sample. Some correlations appeared based on church position and with reported attendance numbers, but the limited sample size prevented a valid correlation.

One difficulty arises in the instrument as presented in this project. A shorter survey that is conducted along with other surveys might ease the intimidating nature of the survey. No addict wants to admit his or her addiction, and churches are reluctant to use the verbiage of addiction to describe systemic dysfunction. A researcher might include the individual questions within the survey in a broader assessment to ease the respondent's anxiety concerning questions directed at codependency. Although the

sample of individual respondents was large enough to validate the correlation between codependency and church health and to demonstrate codependency's measurability in the system, the project might have revealed other correlations in a sample of two hundred or more churches. If we assume the validity of the instrument as presented in this project, the project suggests further research with a larger sample using a smaller instrument given along with a larger assessment of other church metrics.

Codependent persons rarely answer questions based on their real opinion or feelings. Rather, they tend to answer questions as they feel the questioner wants them to respond. In this assessment there was certainly some of this effect. As described in chapter 4, churches with significant decline in attendance answered questions indicating that the church had significant numerical growth in the past year. Questions similar to number 26 scored high in every church. Question 26 states, "This church starts a lot of new ministries and projects." A high score seems to indicate a healthy church, but the reality is that starting new projects is indicative of a codependent tendency.

It seems that many respondents answered based on expectations rather than actual feelings. The surveys were collected and returned with the promise of anonymity, but many respondents perhaps did not feel certain of the promise. One church, for instance, asked for their score on the survey and expressed confidence that they would score better than the other churches. Codependent family systems are prone to focusing on the appearance of the system to outsiders rather than addressing the system itself. The project could be improved by finding ways to ensure anonymity and preventing the desire to present a good image to outsiders. The correlation between codependency and church health would likely be stronger.

### **Implications of the Project**

Results of this project support the usefulness of looking at the church as a living system of relationships rather than a static object. Viewing the church as a family system has many biblical foundations. Assuming that the church forms a living family system supports the idea that if dysfunction exists it exists within the system itself rather than in any one or group of individuals within the system. Individuals or groups within the system might introduce dysfunction, but the system itself supports and allows the individuals or groups to introduce the dysfunction. Current church growth methods involving the creation of new mission and vision statements and introduction of current best practice to various sub-groups within the church remains effective in some environments, but many environments remain dysfunctional or declining even with biblical mission statements and awareness of current best practice.

Many churches require a more holistic approach that addresses the systemic dysfunction of the entire system of relationships rather than any one part of the church. On one hand this project suggests a difficult program of intervention and recovery. It suggests that the same darkness that afflicts human addiction can exist within many church environments and that many churches are environments existing far from the biblical promise of Spirit-filled community. On the other hand it suggests the possibility of health to a segment of churches that have been abandoned or ignored. It suggests that it is possible to leave the declining debauchery of addiction for continuous filling with the Spirit of God.



### **Recommendations for Denominational Leaders**

This project does not suggest that codependency forms the underlying cause of all church problems. It suggests that addictive dysfunction within the church system underlies some church problems. It likewise suggests that some systemic dysfunction might also exist within a denomination or network. Officials and leaders may find it helpful to become familiar with systems theory, addiction, intervention strategies, and recovery methods as part of their normal operation. Awareness of the issue forms a key part of the solution.

In any network, churches exist that are plateaued or declining. These churches often slowly drift from the relational network into isolation. Many churches are likely growing in codependency as they form increasingly hidden environments and shield the dysfunctional relational system from outside interference. Just as a family with addiction or dysfunction increasingly isolates itself from neighbors, the codependent church isolates itself from its network of churches. Early recognition of isolationist tendencies would help many of these churches if the leaders of the ministry network could intervene with an effective intervention strategy and help the system recover from dysfunctional relationships.

Codependency might also exist within the systems of relationships in the network or denomination as a whole. Ineffective denominational initiatives, blindness to declining numbers, or overall declining fellowship within a network may serve as examples of underlying relational dysfunction. Leaders of dysfunctional or declining groups tend to feel a sense of shame and loss of identity in the decline or when the group does not respond as expected. Shame compounds the systemic problems and prevents the leader from intervening in the system.

Leaders also tend to exhibit interpersonal control issues in that they overestimate their ability to influence a group. Leaders of declining and increasingly dysfunctional systems frequently blame their leadership ability rather than focusing on health within the system. Once shame and identity loss occur codependency increases in the system. Viewing a network or denomination as a system frees the leader from feelings of personal responsibility for the system's health and allows the leader to maintain identity without shame as they address the underlying systemic dysfunction. I suggest that leaders familiarize themselves with systemic relational principles, dysfunction within the system including codependency, and effective intervention and recovery strategies as part of ongoing healthy leadership.

### **Recommendations for Pastoral Leaders**

Pastors often personally identify with a church and over-function within the system; they frequently feel isolated and shameful about their ability and often form personal and professional identity based on church attendance numbers. Attending network events often leaves the pastor feeling less capable and more shameful as he or she compares his or her church to others. Pastors, therefore, are prone to codependency through loss of identity and shame. It is possible that the pastor could be a significant source contributing to codependency within the system. Many pastors form new mission and vision statements and attend the latest conference hoping to find the new thing that brings the desired results in their ministries. Over time the mission, vision, and new methods form another source of frustration as the system remains as dysfunctional as before or worse. An honest look at the church as a system to which the pastor might bring

health might prevent the shame and loss of identity that leads to the addictive spiral of codependency.

Biblically, the church compares to a body in which each member forms a part. A church forms a living organism or system rather than a collective of individuals. Pastors might cultivate awareness of systems theory as it relates to the church and view themselves as interventionists and catalysts for creating healthy systems able to confront dysfunction within the system. Resistance in a dysfunctional system would prove high, but the pastor in the dysfunctional system likely faces resistance and ineffectiveness regardless of whether or not he or she attempts to intervene in the system.

With the proper skills the pastor would gain the confidence necessary to face the resistance of changing a dysfunctional system and might enjoy the possibility of effective mission. Once pastors and key leaders are aware of codependent behavior they can confront the behavior. Most resources from a family systems theory perspective describe relational dynamics related to addiction.<sup>1</sup> A leader can more easily confront dysfunction once he or she has an awareness of the principles.

Ultimately, shame and loss of identity dominate the potential of the codependent church. This project suggests a systems approach in which leaders might find freedom to gain confidence in intervening in dysfunction and recovering health rather than shame and feelings of powerlessness and failure. It also suggests an approach in which a pastor might form a Christ-centered identity apart from his or her church. Many good pastors lead churches that demonstrate dysfunction introduced from sources beyond the pastor's

---

<sup>1</sup> The Karpman Drama Triangle and Bowen System Theories provide examples of theories that might prove helpful in creating solutions.

control. Viewing the church as a relational system filled with complex dynamics helps the struggling pastor to maintain a professional and personal identity apart from his or her church environment. Once the pastor has a Christ-centered identity and confidence rather than shame, he or she is in a healthier position to lead the systems of the church toward confidence and identity as the body of Christ.

### **Recommendations for Future Study**

This project represents a first step in applying addiction theory and systems theory to the relational systems of the church. Identifying the existence of addictive tendencies forms the first step in intervention. Much work remains in addressing the issue, but much potential exists for helping churches that are stuck in dysfunction. The ability to measure codependency in the system forms an important first step. Demonstrating correlation between the phenomenon of codependency and church health also forms a necessary step in addressing the issue. Without further research, however, this project could increase shame and loss of identity as it might apply the label of codependent with its addiction-related stigma to churches. Many leaders without understanding the issue might feel defeated by the stigma attached to addiction theory as applied to a church environment. A further danger exists as individuals begin to explore his or her tendencies toward codependency. Initial exploration might lead to over-correction and labeling of everyone and everything as codependent. Without additional research and application tools, this project demonstrates the same possibility.

An experiment demonstrating some causation within the correlation described by this project might form a possible next step. Codependency and church health correlate in the data provided by this project, but the dynamics of causation were not addressed. A

research experiment in which several churches are tracked for a significant length of time and codependency alone is addressed within the system might be compared to a control group in which more traditional church growth methods are applied. Conducting the experiment might prove difficult, but a researcher might simplify the project by developing a coaching session for pastors and church leaders that addresses codependency and systems theory and comparing the churches pastored by those in the training with a control group.

A further step might be development of an intervention strategy for pastors and denominational leaders. Much research exists for intervention in individuals addicted to substances, and the methods of addiction intervention might prove adaptable to the church and its systems. Without effective intervention strategies, the ability to measure and label codependency would likely push the dysfunctional church further into codependency and isolation through the shame associated with addiction. A researcher might develop a project in which he or she adapts various methods of intervention to the systemic church environment. Measurement tools developed in this project could assess the project for effectiveness.

Development of training for leaders in the area of systems dynamics and codependency may form the most effective next step. Bowen Systems Theory provides a likely starting point for adapting systems theory to the church environment.<sup>2</sup> Effective training would help leaders identify codependent behavior and build healthy boundaries

---

<sup>2</sup> Resources that apply Bowen Systems Theory to the church include: Ronald W. Richardson, *Creating a Healthier Church: Family Systems Theory, Leadership and Congregational Life* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1996); Ronald W. Richardson, *Polarization and the Healthier Church: Applying Bowen Family Systems Theory to Conflict and Change in Society and Congregational Life* (Toronto: CreateSpace, 2012); Peter L. Steinke, *Healthy Congregations: A Systems Approach*, 2nd ed. (Washington, DC: The Alban Institute, 2006); and Peter L. Steinke, *How Your Church Family Works: Understanding Congregations as Emotional Systems* (Washington, DC: The Alban Institute, 2006).

in their organization. A researcher might adapt the instrument used in this project to study a sample of churches before and after the training. Once leaders are aware of systemic dysfunctional tendencies, the leaders might teach the basics of relational health through a sermon series or small group training modules. The Bible provides rich material for healthy relationships, and gentle positive teaching that avoids labels and blame might help the church to begin seeing the possibility of relational health.

A further possibility arises from a renewed focus on developing identity in Christ in leaders and the church while avoiding shame based assessments and measurements. Honoring each relational network as a part of the body of Christ and each pastor as a Christ-called leader no matter how his or her church compares to others might alleviate the shame often experienced by pastors when his or her church does not perform as expected. Many struggling pastors view denominational events as painful and a source of shame. Current tendency to compare and promote those who experience numerical success often leads to more shame for the struggling pastor.

A strategy to encourage each pastor and each church as an expression of God's Kingdom might help intervene in the addictive spiral of codependence within a ministry network or denomination. Developing denominational events with the purpose of helping to break the shame cycle and forming Christ-focused identity within pastors would help break the cycle. A researcher might develop a project that measures health across a time span in a district or network committed to helping break the cycle of shame as it forms Christ-centered identity in its pastors.

## **Conclusion**

Hopefully, this project brings a new perspective to many frustrated pastors and leaders. When the church is able to see itself as a body of connected believers and a system of relationships it can avoid the shame and loss of identity that spirals into codependency and decline. Addictive denial will only lead the church further into shame, isolation, and decline. At best I hope that awareness increases for the church as a relational system rather than a group of individual consumers assembling on Sunday.

My prayer is that the ability to measure codependency in the church as a system is not used to bring further shame and loss of identity to the church or the leaders of the church. Instead, it should lead to effective intervention strategies and fresh approaches to church health. Pastors of dysfunctional or declining churches often feel a deep sense of shame and loss of identity. No pastor entered into the challenges of ministry expecting failure. The issue may arise from how the church currently measures success. My prayer is that pastors and churches find success in being the pastor and church Jesus desires as they each form a deeper identity in Christ. Consumerist measurements leave many pastors feeling that there is something wrong with them personally. The church that fearlessly faces reality without the lies, denials, and manipulations of addiction finds freedom to accept itself as it exists, to be an expression of Christ's identity within its community, and to discover responsibility for the future.

## APPENDIX A: PROJECT SURVEY

Instructions for survey:

Please distribute all 25 surveys (if less than 25 in attendance, distribute to each participant). Collect all surveys and seal in return envelope to ensure anonymity.

**Read the following to all participants:**

**You are invited to participate in a study of systemic church health. I hope to study specific factors related to general church health. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because I want to survey a broad selection of churches. This research is for a Doctor of Ministry project at The Assemblies of God Theological Seminary.**

**If you decide to participate, I, through the survey, will ask you questions regarding your general feelings toward the church. There are forty questions. Please answer the questions as honestly as possible. Your first answer will likely be the most accurate. Once completed the surveys will be compiled to create a composite of the church. All answers and the identity of your church will be kept anonymous. Your answers will be sealed in an envelope and returned to me without being read by your church leadership. The data will be analyzed, and hopefully provide insight into the church in general that will prove useful for church health**

**Any information obtained in connection with this study that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. In any written reports or publications, no one will be identified or identifiable and only aggregate data will be presented.** The completed project will be made available through publication and it will be furnished to Potomac District leadership.

**Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your future relations with the church in any way. If you decide to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time without affecting such relationships.**

**By completing and returning the survey, you are granting consent to participate in this research.**



Thinking about your church as a whole please read the following statements and mark your answer by making a cross in the numbered box that best reflects your answer. You can use the following guide for a meaning to each of the numbers:

1 Strongly Disagree; 2 Moderately Disagree; 3 Neither agree nor disagree;  
4 Moderately Agree; 5 Strongly Agree.

1. We are a healthy and growing church.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

2. We are excited about the future of this church.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

3. In the last year I have experienced significant spiritual growth in this church.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

4. This church is making a difference in the world.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

5. This church has grown significantly in the last year.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

6. Our services are very exciting.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

7. There are many examples of people who have grown in the past year in this church.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

8. Our community is a much better place because of this church.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

9. Decision-making is very difficult in this church.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

10. This church has too many ministries and activities.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

11. It is always awkward when someone gets recognized for doing something good here.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

12. It seems like we are always creating problems here.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

13. We *never* do things for people that they are capable of doing themselves.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

14. We often feel guilty when the church decides to do something for itself.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

15. We *are not* worried about the future of this church at all.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

16. Things will get better here when certain people change what they are doing.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

17. It seems like we are often there for people but they are rarely there for us.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

18. We are often in the situation of helping one person and then later feeling that we have neglected other relationships or responsibilities.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

19. We seem to have a lot of painful relationships in this church.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

20. We rarely present the real “us” to visitors or the community.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

21. When we are uncomfortable with someone we tend to hold it in and then sometimes the issue explodes.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

22. We go to any lengths to avoid open conflict in this church.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

23. I have a sense of dread or impending doom when thinking of this church.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

24. We are always putting the needs of others above our own needs.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

25. It seems like decisions are hard to make here.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

26. This church starts a lot of new ministries and projects.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

27. It feels uncomfortable when I get recognized for doing good things here.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

28. Problems energize us.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

29. We *do not* help people unless they are helping themselves.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

30. The church's efforts should be focused on people outside the church.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

31. It seems as if we *are not* worried about our community and the church in our culture.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

32. This church has had problems with the community, past members, or district leaders that have contributed significantly to our current problems.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

33. We help a lot of people that never attend or help the church.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

34. We are always willing to put everything on hold to help one person.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

35. The people we build relationships with hurt us later.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

36. We always hide our problems here.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

37. We put off confronting discipline issues, and this has led to some explosions due to us waiting too long.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

38. We rarely have conflicts.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

39. I sometimes feel like something bad is about to happen in this church.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

40. We focus on the needs of those outside the church more than our own needs.

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |                  |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|
| I Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | I Agree Strongly |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|

I am a \_\_\_ Pastor; \_\_\_ Director/Elder; \_\_\_ Leader; \_\_\_ Regular Attendee; \_\_\_ Casual Attendee

## APPENDIX B: CHURCH COVER SHEET

### Cover sheet for church survey:

Thank you for participating in this valuable research project. The scope of this project is to determine if there are ways of approaching church health that have not been considered. Your participation is important!

Be assured that all responses and the identity of your church will be kept confidential.

For control purposes please answer the following questions about your church:

Average attendance:

2014 \_\_\_\_\_  
2013 \_\_\_\_\_  
2012 \_\_\_\_\_  
2011 \_\_\_\_\_  
2010 \_\_\_\_\_

Number of baptisms:

2014 \_\_\_\_\_  
2013 \_\_\_\_\_  
2012 \_\_\_\_\_  
2011 \_\_\_\_\_  
2010 \_\_\_\_\_

Year church established \_\_\_\_\_

Year current pastor started at this church \_\_\_\_\_

Number of churches planted or campuses started in last five years

\_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX C: SPANN-FISCHER INSTRUMENT

### The Spann-Fischer Codependency Scale

Read the following statements and place the number in the spaces provided that best describes you according to the following list: 1 Strongly Disagree; 2 Moderately Disagree; 3 Slightly Disagree; 4 Slightly Agree; 5 Moderately Agree; 6 Strongly Agree.

1. It is hard for me to make decisions.
2. It is hard for me to say "no."
3. It is hard for me to accept compliments graciously.
4. Sometimes I almost feel bored or empty if I don't have problems to focus on.
5. I usually *do not* do things for other people that they are capable of doing for themselves.
6. When I do something nice for myself I usually feel guilty.
7. I *do not* worry very much.
8. I tell myself that things will get better when the people in my life change what they are doing.
9. I seem to have relationships where I am always there for them but they are rarely there for me.
10. Sometimes I get focused on one person to the extent of neglecting other relationships and responsibilities.
11. I seem to get into relationships that are painful for me.
12. I don't usually let others see the "real" me.
13. When someone upsets me I will hold it in for a long time, but once in a while I explode.
14. I will usually go to any lengths to avoid open conflict.
15. I often have a sense of dread or impending doom.
16. I often put the needs of others ahead of my own.

To obtain a scale score, reverse score items 5 and 7 and sum all the items.

## APPENDIX D: HOLYOAKE CODEPENDENCY INSTRUMENT

### **Self Sacrifice:<sup>1</sup>**

I always put the needs of my family before my own needs.

Because it is selfish, I cannot put my own needs before others.

No matter what happens the family comes first.

What I feel isn't important as long as those I love are OK.

It is my responsibility to devote my energies to helping loved ones solve their problems.

### **External Focus:**

In order to get along and be liked I need to be what people want me to be.

I live too much by other people's standards.

I find that I need to make excuses or apologize for myself most of the time.

I put on a show to impress people; I know I am not the person I pretend to be.

Very often I don't try to become friends with people because I think they won't like me.

### **Reactivity:**

The effects of my partner's behavior are a constant threat to me.

I could manage things properly if only my partner would change.

My life is controlled by my partner's behavior.

---

<sup>1</sup> Greg E. Dear, "The Holyoake Codependency Index: Further Evidence of Factorial Validity," *Drug and Alcohol Review* 21, issue 1 (2002): 49.

## APPENDIX E: CO-DEPENDENTS

### ANONYMOUS CHECKLIST

#### **Denial Patterns<sup>2</sup>**

Codependents often:

- Have difficulty identifying what they are feeling.
- Minimize, alter, or deny how they truly feel.
- Perceive themselves as completely unselfish and dedicated to the well-being of others.
- Lack empathy for the feelings and needs of others.
- Label others with their negative traits.
- Think they can take care of themselves without any help from others.
- Mask pain in various ways such as anger, humor, or isolation.
- Express negativity or aggression in indirect and passive ways.
- Do not recognize the unavailability of those people to whom they are attracted.

#### **Low Self-esteem Patterns**

Codependents often:

- Have difficulty making decisions.
- Judge what they think, say, or do harshly, as never good enough.

---

<sup>2</sup> “Patterns and Characteristics of Codependence,” Co-Dependents Anonymous, accessed September 24, 2015. <http://coda.org/index.cfm/meeting-documents/patterns-and-characteristics-2011/>.

- Are embarrassed to receive recognition, praise, or gifts.
- Value others' approval of their thinking, feelings, and behavior over their own.
- Do not perceive themselves as lovable or worthwhile persons.
- Seek recognition and praise to overcome feeling less than.
- Have difficulty admitting a mistake.
- Need to appear to be right in the eyes of others and may even lie to look good.
- Are unable to identify or ask for what they need and want.
- Perceive themselves as superior to others.
- Look to others to provide their sense of safety.
- Have difficulty getting started, meeting deadlines, and completing projects.
- Have trouble setting healthy priorities and boundaries.

### **Compliance Patterns**

Codependents often:

- Are extremely loyal, remaining in harmful situations too long.
- Compromise their own values and integrity to avoid rejection or anger.
- Put aside their own interests in order to do what others want.
- Are hypervigilant regarding the feelings of others and take on those feelings.
- Are afraid to express their beliefs, opinions, and feelings when they differ from those of others.
- Accept sexual attention when they want love.
- Make decisions without regard to the consequences.
- Give up their truth to gain the approval of others or to avoid change.



**Control Patterns**

Codependents often:

- Believe people are incapable of taking care of themselves.
- Attempt to convince others what to think, do, or feel.
- Freely offer advice and direction without being asked.
- Become resentful when others decline their help or reject their advice.
- Lavish gifts and favors on those they want to influence.
- Use sexual attention to gain approval and acceptance.
- Have to feel needed in order to have a relationship with others.
- Demand that their needs be met by others.
- Use charm and charisma to convince others of their capacity to be caring and compassionate.
- Use blame and shame to exploit others emotionally.
- Refuse to cooperate, compromise, or negotiate.
- Adopt an attitude of indifference, helplessness, authority, or rage to manipulate outcomes.
- Use recovery jargon in an attempt to control the behavior of others.
- Pretend to agree with others to get what they want.

**Avoidance Patterns**

Codependents often:

- Act in ways that invite others to reject, shame, or express anger toward them.

- Judge harshly what others think, say, or do.
- Avoid emotional, physical, or sexual intimacy as a way to maintain distance.
- Allow addictions to people, places, and things to distract them from achieving intimacy in relationships.
- Use indirect or evasive communication to avoid conflict or confrontation.
- Diminish their capacity to have healthy relationships by declining to use the tools of recovery.
- Suppress their feelings or needs to avoid feeling vulnerable.
- Pull people toward them, but when others get close, push them away.
- Refuse to give up their self-will to avoid surrendering to a power greater than themselves.
- Believe displays of emotion are a sign of weakness.
- Withhold expressions of appreciation.

## APPENDIX F: ESCALA ARGENTINA DE CODEPENDENCIA

### 1. Self-Confidence Factor<sup>1</sup>

- I blame or criticize a lot.
- Sometimes I do not really know how I feel.
- It is difficult for me to make decisions.
- I feel that my overall health is worse than that of my family and friends.
- I do not trust myself when facing new situations as much as I would like.
- I find it hard to know what I really want to do with my life.
- I feel tired, exhausted, or sick.
- I find it difficult to handle unexpected situations.
- I apologize too much to others for what I say or do.
- I worry a lot about the problems of others.
- I agree to take care of too many things and then wonder why I did it.
- I tend to have a better opinion of others than myself.

### Factor 2. Focus on the other

- I try to convince others of what they should think and how they should feel.
- I feel forced to help other people solve their problems.

---

<sup>1</sup> María Ayelén Biscarra, Romina Antolela Brandariz, Aldana Lichtenberger, Raquel Peltzer and Mariana Cremona, "Construcción de una Escala de Codependencia," *Revista Argentina de Ciencias del Comportamiento* 5 (2013): 42-51. Translated by F. Wesley Shortridge.

- I think that most other people are unable to care for themselves.
- I tend to get involved in relationships that are painful for me.
- I feel resentful or angry when others do not allow me to help.
- I tend to have relationships where I am always for others but they are rarely there for me.
- I feel that I need to establish relationships or links with others.
- Sometimes, I concentrate on one person to the point of neglecting other relationships or responsibilities.

### **Factor 3. Complacency**

- I set aside my own values and integrity to avoid the rejection or anger of others.
- When someone hurts my feelings or does something I do not like, I find it hard to tell them.
- I put aside my own values or convictions for the acceptance of my partner.
- I avoid expressing my opinion when it is different from my partner or other people.
- I value the opinions and feelings of others more than my own opinions and feelings, and I am afraid to express them when they are different from others.
- I find it hard to talk to someone in authority (boss, teacher, parents, police, etc.).

### **Factor 1. Escasa autoconfianza**

- Me culpo o critico mucho
- A veces no sé realmente como me siento
- Es difícil para mí tomar decisiones
- Siento que mi salud general es peor que la de mis familiares y amigos
- No confío en mi mismo frente a situaciones nuevas tanto como yo quisiera
- Me resulta difícil saber lo que realmente quiero hacer de mi vida
- Me siento cansado, agotado o enfermo
- Me resulta difícil manejar situaciones inesperadas
- Me disculpo demasiado con los demás por lo que digo o hago
- Me preocupo mucho por los problemas de los demás
- Acepto hacerme cargo de demasiadas cosas y después me pregunto porque lo hice

- Tiendo a tener mejor opinión de los demás que de mi mismo

## **Factor 2. Focalización en el otro**

- Intento convencer a los demás sobre lo que deberían pensar y sobre cómo se sienten verdaderamente
- Me siendo forzado a ayudar a otras personas a resolver sus problemas (por ej. ofreciéndoles consejos)
- Creo que la mayoría de las otras personas son incapaces de cuidarse a sí mismos
- Tiendo a involucrarme en relaciones que son dolorosas para mi
- Me siento resentido o enojado cuando los demás no me permiten que los ayude
- Tiendo a tener relaciones donde yo siempre estoy para los demás pero ellos rearas veces están para mi
- Tengo que sentir que me necesitan para establecer relaciones o vínculos con los demás
- A veces me concentro en una persona hasta el punto de descuidar otras relaciones o responsabilidades

## **Factor 3. Actitud Complaciente**

- Dejo de lado mis propios valores e integridad para evitar el rechazo o enojo de los demás
- Cuando alguien lastima mis sentimientos o hace algo que no me agrada me resulta un poco difícil decírselo
- Hago a un lado mis propios valores o convicciones por aceptar los de mi pareja
- Evito expresar mi opinión cuando se que es diferente a la de mi pareja o ala de otras personas
- Valoro las opiniones y sentimientos de las otras personas más que mis propios opiniones o sentimientos, y tengo temor de expresarlos cuando son diferentes a los de los demás
- Me resulta difícil hablar con alguien con autoridad (jefe, profesor, padres, policía, etc)

## APPENDIX G: ORIGINAL SPANN 38-ITEM

### CODEPENDENCY SCALE

The following is Lynda Spann's original codependency scale.<sup>1</sup>

1. I have a hard time knowing what I am feeling.
2. I feel like I should not burden other people with my problems.
3. I like to focus on my problems more than on other people's problems.
4. When I don't say what I want to say it is often in order to avoid another person's anger.
5. It is easy for me to talk about what I am feeling at the moment.
6. I often find myself trusting the wrong people.
7. It is hard for me to make decisions.
8. It is easy for me to trust people.
9. I usually pay more attention to other people's needs than my own.
10. It is hard for me to say "no."
11. It is hard for me to accept compliments graciously.
12. Several of my friendships are with people who have serious problems.
13. Sometimes, I feel almost bored or empty if I don't have problems to focus on.
14. I usually do not do things for other people that they are capable of doing for themselves.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lynda Anne Spann, "Developing a Scale to Measure Codependency," (Master of Science Thesis, Texas Tech University, 1989).

15. It is harder for me to identify and solve someone else's problem than it is for me to identify and solve my own.
16. It is easy for me to let other people do things for me.
17. When I do something nice for myself I usually feel guilty.
18. I think a lot about what other people think of me.
19. I focus as much energy on myself as I do on other people.
20. Sometimes I am unable to quit thinking about another person or event.
21. I do not worry very much.
22. I do not usually abandon my routine when I'm upset about somebody or something.
23. People very close to me say I am always telling them what to do.
24. I seem to have relationships with people where we spend a lot of time struggling for power.
25. I usually face my problems head on and try to solve them as soon as they come up.
26. I tell myself that things will get better when the people in my life change what they are doing.
27. I seem to have relationships where I am always there for them, but they are rarely there for me.
28. I don't have time for what I need to do for myself.
29. Sometimes I get focused on one person, to the extent of neglecting other relationships and responsibilities.
30. The way I feel about myself often depends on the way that others feel about me.
31. When I am alone, I rarely get bored or restless.
32. I seem to get into relationships that are painful for me.
33. I don't usually let others see the "real" me.
34. I feel as if I have to walk on eggshells when I'm around some people.
35. When someone upsets me, I hold it in for a long time, but once in a while I explode.

- 36. I will usually go to any lengths to avoid open conflict.
- 37. I often have a sense of dread or impending doom.
- 38. I remain loyal even after people hurt me.



# APPENDIX H: DATA FROM RESPONDING CHURCHES

| <i>Church</i> | <i>Attend2014</i> | <i>Attend2013</i> | <i>Attend2012</i> | <i>Attend2011</i> | <i>Attend2010</i> |
|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1             | 95                | 121               | 135               | 216               | 223               |
| 2             | 82                | 74                | 69                | 55                | 51                |
| 3             | 1650              | 1600              | 1443              | 1456              | 1242              |
| 4             | 393               | 439               | 453               | 472               | 511               |
| 5             | 240               | 258               | 229               | 187               | 150               |
| 6             | 225               | 275               | 275               | 325               | 322               |
| 7             | 120               | 118               | 122               | 123               | 119               |
| 8             | 148               | 98                | 153               | 188               | 110               |
| 9             | 165               | 150               | 130               | 121               | 110               |

| <i>Baptism<br/>2014</i> | <i>Baptism<br/>2013</i> | <i>Baptism<br/>2012</i> | <i>Baptism<br/>2011</i> | <i>Baptism<br/>2010</i> | <i>Plants</i> | <i>Score1</i> | <i>Score2</i> |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 8                       | 7                       | 9                       | 18                      | 26                      | 0             | 34.2          | 76.04         |
| 3                       | 3                       | 6                       | 3                       | 1                       | 1             | 37.91         | 71.29         |
| 54                      | 92                      | 76                      | 99                      | 94                      | 8             | 32.60         | 83.73         |
| 18                      | 18                      | 17                      | 31                      | 29                      | 0             | 26.75         | 86.65         |
| 8                       | 5                       | 13                      | 4                       |                         | 1             | 29.31         | 78.42         |
| 70                      | 55                      | 40                      | 33                      | 13                      | 3             | 37.92         | 68.25         |
| 4                       | 5                       | 4                       | 6                       | 5                       | 0             | 31.47         | 71.39         |
| 8                       | 5                       | 15                      | 12                      | 19                      | 0             | 31.23         | 87.69         |
| 9                       | 15                      | 14                      | 19                      | 7                       | 0             | 31.48         | 82.08         |

| <i>Church</i> | <i>Item1</i> | <i>Item2</i> | <i>Item3</i> | <i>Item4</i> | <i>Item5</i> | <i>Item6</i> | <i>Item7</i> | <i>Item8</i> |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1             | 4            | 5            | 5            | 2            | 2            | 5            | 3            | 2            |
| 1             | 4            | 5            | 5            | 5            | 5            | 5            | 5            | 4            |
| 1             | 3            | 4            | 4            | 4            | 3            | 4            | 5            | 2            |
| 1             | 4            | 5            | 5            | 4            | 4            | 5            | 4            | 4            |
| 1             | 4            | 5            | 4            | 4            | 3            | 4            | 4            | 3            |
| 1             | 5            | 5            | 5            | 5            | 5            | 5            | 5            | 4            |
| 1             | 4            | 5            | 5            | 4            | 4            | 4            | 4            | 4            |
| 1             | 4            | 4            | 5            | 3            | 4            | 3            | 4            | 4            |
| 1             | 4            | 5            | 5            | 3            | 4            | 4            | 4            | 3            |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 |   | 4 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 7 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| 7 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 7 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 7 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 7 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| 7 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 7 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 8 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 8 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 8 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 8 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| 8 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 8 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 8 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 8 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 8 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 |   |
| 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 8 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 9 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 9 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 9 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 9 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 9 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| 9 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 |

| Item9 | Item10 | Item11 | Item12 | Item13 | Item14 | Item15 | Item16 |
|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 2     | 1      | 2      | 1      | 3      | 2      | 3      | 1      |
| 4     | 2      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 4      | 3      | 4      |
| 2     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 1      | 4      | 4      |
| 3     | 2      | 4      | 1      | 3      | 3      | 2      | 3      |
| 2     | 1      | 3      | 1      | 3      | 3      | 2      | 4      |
| 1     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 4      | 2      | 1      | 2      |
| 2     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 1      | 2      | 2      |
| 3     | 3      | 4      | 4      | 3      | 2      | 4      | 3      |
| 2     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 4      | 2      | 4      | 4      |
| 3     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 1      | 5      | 1      |
| 1     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 1      | 1      | 1      |
| 2     | 2      | 1      | 1      | 4      | 2      | 2      | 3      |
| 1     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 3      | 3      | 3      |
| 1     | 1      | 1      | 2      | 3      | 2      | 2      | 2      |
| 2     | 5      | 3      | 1      | 2      | 3      | 1      | 3      |
| 4     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 4      | 3      | 3      | 3      |
| 1     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 1      | 1      |
| 1     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 2      | 5      | 2      |
| 1     | 2      | 1      | 5      | 2      | 1      | 1      | 4      |
| 1     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 3      | 2      | 1      |
| 2     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 5      | 2      |
| 5     | 1      | 3      | 3      | 2      | 1      | 4      | 4      |
| 2     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 3      | 3      |
| 2     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 3      |
| 1     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 5      | 1      |
| 4     | 1      | 1      | 2      | 4      | 2      | 2      | 3      |
| 1     | 3      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 1      | 3      | 3      |
| 4     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 1      | 5      | 1      |
| 3     | 3      | 3      | 3      | 3      | 1      | 5      | 5      |
| 2     | 2      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 5      | 1      |
| 1     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 2      | 4      | 3      |
| 1     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 5      | 1      |
| 1     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 5      | 1      |
| 1     | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 1      | 1      |
| 1     | 1      | 4      | 1      |        | 1      | 2      | 1      |
| 1     | 2      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 2      | 1      |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |   |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 |



|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |   | 2 |   |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 |   | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 2 |   | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 |   |
| 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

| Item17 | Item18 | Item19 | Item20 | Item21 | Item22 | Item23 | Item24 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 2      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 3      | 2      | 1      | 3      |
| 2      | 3      | 3      | 1      | 2      | 2      | 1      | 4      |
| 4      | 2      | 2      | 2      | 4      | 5      | 1      | 3      |
| 4      | 2      | 3      | 2      | 4      | 1      | 1      | 3      |
| 4      | 2      | 3      | 2      | 2      | 2      | 1      | 4      |
| 1      | 5      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 5      |
| 3      | 3      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 2      | 1      | 4      |
| 4      | 3      | 4      | 1      | 3      | 2      | 2      | 3      |
| 3      | 3      | 3      | 2      | 4      | 3      | 1      | 3      |
| 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 4      |
| 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 3      |
| 1      | 4      | 3      | 5      | 5      | 4      | 1      | 4      |
| 2      | 1      | 2      | 1      | 1      | 2      | 1      | 4      |
| 2      | 2      | 3      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 2      |
| 3      | 2      | 2      | 1      | 1      | 2      | 1      | 4      |
| 2      | 2      | 3      | 2      | 3      | 3      | 1      | 5      |
| 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      |
| 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 2      | 2      | 1      | 1      |
| 3      | 2      | 2      | 1      | 2      | 2      | 1      | 3      |
| 3      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 4      |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |   | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
|   | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |   | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 2 |   | 2 |   | 2 | 1 | 1 |   |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |

| Item25 | Item26 | Item27 | Item28 | Item29 | Item30 | Item31 | Item32 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1      | 3      | 2      | 3      | 1      | 4      | 5      | 4      |
| 2      | 1      | 4      | 2      | 4      | 2      | 4      | 5      |
| 3      | 1      | 2      | 2      | 3      | 5      | 2      | 4      |
| 2      | 1      | 5      | 4      | 2      | 4      | 2      | 5      |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 |



|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 |   | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 |   | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 |   | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 |   | 2 | 2 | 5 |   |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
|   | 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 |   | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |   | 4 | 4 |   |
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| 4 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 |

| Item33 | Item34 | Item35 | Item36 | Item37 | Item38 | Item39 | Item40 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 2      | 4      | 3      | 2      | 3      | 3      | 1      | 3      |
| 4      | 3      | 3      | 1      | 2      | 2      | 1      | 3      |
| 2      | 2      | 3      | 2      | 5      | 2      | 2      | 2      |
| 4      | 2      | 2      | 2      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 2      |
| 2      | 2      | 3      | 1      | 3      | 3      | 1      | 3      |
| 5      | 5      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 5      |
| 4      | 3      | 3      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 1      | 2      |
| 3      | 2      | 4      | 1      | 3      | 2      | 3      | 3      |
| 2      | 2      | 2      | 3      | 3      | 2      | 1      | 2      |
| 4      | 4      | 4      | 1      | 3      | 2      | 1      | 4      |
| 5      | 5      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 2      | 1      | 1      |
| 4      | 2      | 1      | 2      | 2      | 2      | 1      | 2      |
| 2      | 1      | 3      | 1      | 1      | 2      | 1      | 3      |
| 3      | 3      | 3      | 1      | 4      | 3      | 2      | 3      |
| 4      | 3      | 3      | 2      | 2      | 3      | 2      | 4      |
| 3      | 2      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 3      | 2      | 3      |
| 5      | 5      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 1      |
| 2      | 3      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 2      |
| 2      | 2      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 2      | 1      | 3      |
| 1      | 3      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 4      | 1      | 3      |
| 5      | 5      | 2      | 1      | 1      | 2      | 1      | 1      |
| 2      | 1      | 3      | 4      | 5      | 2      | 4      | 2      |
| 3      | 2      | 2      | 1      | 2      | 4      | 1      | 1      |
| 5      | 4      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 2      | 1      | 1      |
| 2      | 3      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 1      |
| 4      | 4      | 2      | 2      | 2      | 4      | 1      | 3      |
| 4      | 2      | 1      | 1      | 2      | 3      | 2      | 4      |
| 5      | 3      | 1      | 1      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 3      |
| 5      | 1      | 5      | 1      | 5      | 5      | 1      | 1      |
| 3      | 3      | 1      | 5      | 2      | 1      | 1      | 1      |
| 2      | 3      | 2      | 1      | 1      | 3      | 1      | 2      |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
|   | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 4 |   | 1 |   | 5 |   | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 |   |
| 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 |   | 3 |
| 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 |   | 3 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 |   | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

| Position | Sum1to8 | Sum9to40 |
|----------|---------|----------|
| 2        | 28      | 75       |
| 2        | 38      | 83       |
| 4        | 29      | 82       |
| 3        | 35      | 84       |
| 4        | 31      | 81       |
| 4        | 39      | 78       |
| 4        | 34      | 70       |
| 2        | 31      | 95       |
| 5        | 32      | 83       |
| 4        | 37      | 76       |
|          | 39      | 67       |
| 3        | 30      | 84       |
| 3        | 33      | 66       |
| 3        | 32      | 74       |
| 4        | 38      | 84       |

|   |    |     |
|---|----|-----|
| 3 | 35 | 84  |
| 4 | 40 | 68  |
| 3 | 38 | 56  |
| 3 | 34 | 80  |
| 4 | 35 | 66  |
| 4 | 39 | 73  |
| 3 | 22 | 99  |
| 3 | 34 | 61  |
| 3 | 34 | 67  |
| 4 | 38 | 65  |
| 3 | 35 | 82  |
| 4 | 36 | 76  |
|   | 37 | 76  |
| 4 | 39 | 82  |
| 4 | 38 | 84  |
| 4 | 37 | 69  |
| 4 | 40 | 60  |
| 3 | 38 | 56  |
| 4 | 39 | 57  |
| 4 | 37 | 56  |
| 3 | 38 | 76  |
| 4 | 37 | 65  |
| 4 | 40 | 60  |
| 3 | 40 | 59  |
|   | 40 | 83  |
| 4 | 35 | 70  |
| 1 | 35 | 79  |
| 4 | 37 | 84  |
| 4 | 40 | 78  |
| 4 | 38 | 76  |
| 3 | 38 | 61  |
| 1 | 39 | 69  |
| 4 | 39 | 69  |
| 2 | 33 | 79  |
| 2 | 28 | 99  |
| 3 | 33 | 76  |
| 4 | 39 | 67  |
| 5 | 37 | 70  |
| 1 | 28 | 103 |
|   | 32 | 82  |
| 3 | 23 | 81  |
| 1 | 35 | 82  |
| 1 | 32 | 106 |



|   |    |     |
|---|----|-----|
| 3 | 33 | 81  |
| 3 | 38 | 89  |
| 1 | 31 | 79  |
| 1 | 32 | 75  |
| 3 | 35 | 83  |
| 4 | 32 | 70  |
| 1 | 33 | 96  |
| 3 | 25 | 85  |
| 3 | 29 | 83  |
| 4 | 32 | 92  |
| 4 | 18 | 88  |
| 4 | 27 | 94  |
| 2 | 23 | 108 |
| 4 | 26 | 90  |
| 4 | 22 | 68  |
| 3 | 25 | 93  |
| 3 | 25 | 81  |
| 4 | 36 | 65  |
|   | 26 | 79  |
| 3 | 26 | 113 |
| 2 | 20 | 92  |
|   | 37 | 69  |
| 3 | 19 | 94  |
| 4 | 31 | 87  |
| 4 | 23 | 86  |
| 4 | 30 | 77  |
| 5 | 31 | 77  |
|   | 29 | 66  |
| 3 | 25 | 106 |
| 4 | 26 | 96  |
| 4 | 24 | 94  |
| 3 | 23 | 80  |
| 3 | 21 | 83  |
| 4 | 27 | 86  |
| 4 | 40 | 74  |
| 3 | 36 | 60  |
| 4 | 29 | 73  |
| 4 | 32 | 62  |
| 4 | 34 | 61  |
| 4 | 38 | 68  |
| 4 | 40 | 70  |
| 4 | 40 | 68  |
| 4 | 39 | 69  |

|   |    |     |
|---|----|-----|
| 3 | 40 | 66  |
| 4 | 40 | 69  |
| 4 | 39 | 68  |
| 4 | 40 | 64  |
| 4 | 39 | 56  |
| 4 | 31 | 66  |
| 5 | 31 | 80  |
| 4 | 39 | 74  |
| 4 | 39 | 61  |
| 4 | 40 | 71  |
| 4 | 40 | 76  |
| 5 | 39 | 73  |
| 3 | 40 | 61  |
| 4 | 40 | 62  |
| 4 | 39 | 73  |
| 4 | 40 | 56  |
| 4 | 40 | 68  |
| 3 | 38 | 62  |
| 4 | 40 | 74  |
| 4 | 25 | 79  |
| 4 | 32 | 62  |
| 1 | 33 | 70  |
| 4 | 35 | 63  |
| 2 | 38 | 92  |
| 3 | 28 | 81  |
| 4 | 38 | 67  |
| 5 | 39 | 61  |
|   | 30 | 76  |
| 3 | 34 | 69  |
| 4 | 29 | 87  |
| 2 | 31 | 78  |
|   | 28 | 65  |
|   | 23 | 52  |
| 4 | 29 | 82  |
| 4 | 30 | 78  |
| 3 | 38 | 63  |
| 4 | 25 | 69  |
| 4 | 28 | 75  |
| 4 | 35 | 64  |
| 4 | 27 | 53  |
| 4 | 34 | 86  |
| 3 | 35 | 100 |
| 3 | 12 | 51  |

|   |    |     |
|---|----|-----|
|   | 38 | 80  |
| 3 | 22 | 82  |
| 3 | 36 | 80  |
| 3 | 36 | 71  |
| 3 | 25 | 79  |
| 3 | 26 | 93  |
| 3 | 28 | 101 |
|   | 19 | 110 |
| 3 | 33 | 94  |
|   | 35 | 83  |
| 1 | 29 | 89  |
| 3 | 33 | 83  |
| 3 | 38 | 90  |
| 3 | 25 | 101 |
| 3 | 38 | 89  |
| 3 | 34 | 79  |
| 3 | 36 | 92  |
| 3 | 35 | 81  |
| 3 | 36 | 78  |
| 2 | 36 | 71  |
| 3 | 30 | 67  |
| 2 | 29 | 86  |
| 2 | 29 | 78  |
| 3 | 29 | 77  |
| 3 | 29 | 77  |
| 3 | 29 | 80  |
| 4 | 24 | 125 |
| 3 | 29 | 77  |
| 4 | 31 | 85  |
| 5 | 34 | 96  |
| 4 | 29 | 75  |
| 4 | 28 | 78  |
| 5 | 36 | 90  |
| 5 | 40 | 67  |
| 4 | 33 | 84  |
| 5 | 34 | 99  |
| 3 | 36 | 83  |
| 4 | 33 | 80  |
| 4 | 29 | 80  |
|   | 31 | 84  |
| 4 | 36 | 76  |
| 3 | 30 | 68  |

# APPENDIX I: CORRELATIONS FROM DATA

|                     |                     | Plants | Church Health | Codependency | Attendance Change | Baptism Change |
|---------------------|---------------------|--------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Plants              | Pearson Correlation | 1      | .240          | .034         | .781*             | -.213          |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     |        | .534          | .930         | .013              | .612           |
|                     | N                   | 9      | 9             | 9            | 9                 | 8              |
| Church Health       | Pearson Correlation | .240   | 1             | -.729*       | .054              | .514           |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .534   |               | .026         | .889              | .193           |
|                     | N                   | 9      | 9             | 9            | 9                 | 8              |
| Codependency        | Pearson Correlation | .034   | -.729*        | 1            | .305              | -.639          |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .930   | .026          |              | .425              | .088           |
|                     | N                   | 9      | 9             | 9            | 9                 | 8              |
| Attendance Change   | Pearson Correlation | .781*  | -.054         | .305         | 1                 | -.540          |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .013   | .889          | .425         |                   | .167           |
|                     | N                   | 9      | 9             | 9            | 9                 | 8              |
| Baptism Change      | Pearson Correlation | -.213  | .514          | -.639        | -.540             | 1              |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .612   | .193          | .088         | .167              |                |
|                     | N                   | 8      | 8             | 8            | 8                 | 8              |
| Attendance Change % | Pearson Correlated  | .117   | -.069         | .201         | .600              | -.210          |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .763   | .859          | .604         | .087              | .617           |
|                     | N                   | 9      | 9             | 9            | 9                 | 8              |

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

## SOURCES CONSULTED

### **Biblical Theological Review**

- “Abstinence.” The General Council of the Assemblies of God. Accessed June 18, 2013.  
[http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position\\_Papers/pp\\_downloads/pp\\_4187\\_abstinence.pdf](http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position_Papers/pp_downloads/pp_4187_abstinence.pdf).
- Anderson Ray T. *The Shape of Practical Theology: Empowering Ministry with Theological Praxis*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2001.
- Arnold, Clinton E. *Power and Magic: The Concept of Power in Ephesians*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1989.
- Banks, Robert J. *Paul’s Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in Their Cultural Setting*. 2nd ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Bartel, LeRoy. *Prison Epistles: Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, and Philippians: An Independent Study Textbook*. 3rd ed. Springfield, MO: Global University, 2010.
- Bauer, Johannes B. “Wine.” In *Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology: The Complete Sacramentum Verbi*, 966-968. New York: Crossroad, 1981.
- Barth, Karl. “Selections from Church Dogmatics (1932-1967).” In *Karl Barth: Theologian of Freedom*, edited by Clifford Green, 171-264. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Barth, Markus. *The Broken Wall: A Study of the Epistle to the Ephesians*. Vancouver: Regent College, 2002.
- . *Ephesian 4-6: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1974.
- Best, Ernest. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*. The International Critical Commentary. Edited by J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield and G. N. Stanton. Edinburgh: T and T, 1998.
- Bramer, Stephen J. “Drink.” In *Baker Theological Dictionary of the Bible*, 186-188. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.
- Carr, Amy and Daniel Buchanan. “A Theological Analysis of Codependency Theories.” *The Journal of Pastoral Care* 51, no. 3 (Fall 1997): 303-314.
- Chan, Simon. *Pentecostal Theology and Christian Tradition*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2000.

- Childs, Brevard. *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- Clowney, Edmund P. *The Unfolding Mystery: Discovering Christ in the Old Testament*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P and R, 1988.
- Collins, C. John. "Ephesians 5:18: What Does *πληροῦσθ ἐν πνεύματι* Mean?" *Presbyterian: Covenant Seminary Review* 33, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 12-30.
- deSilva, David A. *Honor, Patronage, Kinship, and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2000.
- Dijkstra, Meindert. "He Pours the Sweet Wine off, only the Dregs Are for the Wicked: An Epigraphic Note on *mizzæh* in Psalm 75, 9." Translated by Walter de Gruyter. *Mitteilungen* 107 (1995): 296-300.
- Duffield, Guy P., and Nathaniel Van Cleave. *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology*. Los Angeles: Foursquare, 1983.
- Dumbrell, William J. *Covenant and Creation: A Theology of Old Testament Covenants*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2009.
- Dyrness, William A. *Invitation to Cross-Cultural Theology: Case Studies in Vernacular Theologies*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992.
- Ellis, E. Earl. *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1997.
- Fee, Gordon. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Foulkes, Francis. *The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians: An Introduction and Commentary*. 2nd ed.. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Edited by Leon Morris. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Fowl, Stephen E. *Ephesians: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2012.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. *The Moral Teaching of Paul*. 3rd ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 2009.
- . *Theology and Ethics in Paul*. 2nd ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009.
- Goldsworthy, Graeme. *Preaching the Whole Bible as Christian Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Gombis, Timothy G. "Being the Fullness of God in Christ by the Spirit: Ephesians 5:18 in its Epistolary Setting." In *Tyndale Bulletin* 53, no. 2. (2002): 259-271.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Translated by C. Bertelsmann Verlag. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Gosnell, Peter W. "Ephesians 5:18-20 and Mealtime Propriety." In *Tyndale Bulletin* 44, no. 2 (1993): 363-371.

- Grenz, Stanley J. *Theology for the Community of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Guder, Darrell L. *The Continuing Conversion of the Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Heil, John Paul. "Ephesians 5:18b: 'But Be Filled in the Spirit.'" In *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 69 (2007): 506-516.
- Hendriksen, William. *Exposition of Ephesians*. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1967.
- Hengel, M. *Between Jesus and Paul*. London: SCM, 1983.
- Hoehner, Harold W. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002.
- Houlden, J. L. *Paul's Letters from Prison: Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1970.
- Keener, Craig S. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1993.
- Kidner, Derek. *Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary*. Leicester, England: Tyndale, 1967.
- Kittredge, Cynthia Briggs. *Community and Authority: the Rhetoric of Obedience in the Pauline Tradition*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1998.
- Laaser, Mark R., George Ohlschlager, and Tim Clinton. "Addictions." In *Caring for People God's Way: Personal and Emotional Issues, Addictions, Grief, and Trauma*. Nashville: Nelson, 2005.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary 42. Edited by David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Macchia, Frank D. *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006.
- . "Baptized in the Spirit: A Reflection on the Future of Pentecostal Theology." In *The Future of Pentecostalism in the United States*, edited by Eric Patterson and Edmund Rybarczyk, 15-25. Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2007.
- . *The Trinity: Practically Speaking*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2010.
- Malina, Bruce J. "Understanding New Testament Persons." In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard L. Rohrbaugh, 41-61. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996.
- McCullough, Donald. *The Trivialization of God: The Dangerous Illusion of a Manageable Deity*. Colorado Springs: NavPress, 1995.

- Mead, James K. *Biblical Theology: Issues, Methods, and Themes*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007.
- Meaders, Gary T. "Abstain, Abstinence." In *Baker Theological Dictionary of the Bible*, 8-9. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996.
- Mitton, C. Leslie. *New Century Bible Commentary: Ephesians*. Edited by Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black. London: Oliphant's, 1976.
- Moxnes, Halvor. "Honor and Shame." In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard L. Rohrbaugh, 19-40. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996.
- Muddiman, John. *The Epistle to the Ephesians*. Black's NT Commentaries. London: Continuum, 2001.
- O'Brien, Peter T. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. Pillar NT Commentary. Edited by D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- "On Alcohol Use in America." The Southern Baptist Convention. Accessed June 18, 2013. [www.sbc.net/resolutions/amresolutions.asp?ID=1156](http://www.sbc.net/resolutions/amresolutions.asp?ID=1156).
- Oss, Douglas A. "Biblical Theology in Ministry." Class notes for Core 2 Course at Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, Springfield, MO, February 25, 2013.
- Rabb, John L. "Guidelines for the Use of Alcoholic Beverages at Church Functions or on Church Property within the Diocese of Maryland." Anglican Diocese of Maryland. Accessed June 18, 2013. [www.ang-md.org/alcohol-service-guidelines.pdf](http://www.ang-md.org/alcohol-service-guidelines.pdf).
- Rohrbaugh, Richard L. "Introduction." In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard L. Rohrbaugh, 1-15. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996.
- . *The New Testament in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2007.
- Ryken, Leland. "Cup." In *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Edited by James C. Wilhoit and Tremper Longman, 186. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1998.
- . "Drunkard, Drunkenness." In *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Edited by James C. Wilhoit and Tremper Longman, 220-221. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1998.
- . "Wine." In *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Edited by James C. Wilhoit and Tremper Longman, 953-954. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1998.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *Ephesians: A Commentary*. Translated by Helen Heron. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1991.
- Stott, John R. W. *The Message of Ephesians: God's New Society*. The Bible Speaks Today. Edited by J. A. Motyer and John R. W. Stott. Leicester, England: IVP, 1986.



- Stronstad, Roger. *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984.
- . *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology*. Cleveland, TN: CPT, 2010.
- Tillich, Paul. *Paul Tillich: Theologian of the Boundaries*. Edited by Mark Kline Taylor. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Wilson, Walter L. *A Dictionary of Bible Types*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Wood, A. Skevington. *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Ephesians through Philemon*. Edited by Frank A. Gæbelein. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1981.
- Zodhiates, Spiros, ed. *The Complete Word Study: New Testament*. Chattanooga: AMG, 1991.

### General Literature Review

- Adedoyin, Christon, Jesse Beacham, and Mary S. Jackson. "Support Systems Provided by Faith-Based Organizations to Families of Clients Undergoing Substance Use Disorder Treatment." *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 24, no. 5 (2014).
- Adult Children of Alcoholics World Service Organization. *Adult Children of Alcoholics: Alcoholic/ Dysfunctional Families*. Rev. ed. Torrance, CA: Adult Children of Alcoholics World Service Organization, 2006.
- . *Twelve Steps of Adult Children: Steps Workbook*. Torrance, CA: Adult Children of Alcoholics World Service Organization, 2007.
- Al-Anon Family Group Headquarters. *The Dilemma of the Alcoholic Marriage*. New York: Al-Anon Family Group Headquarters, 1971.
- Anderson, Ray S. *The Soul of Ministry: Forming Leaders for God's People*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Argyris, Chris. *Overcoming Organizational Defenses: Facilitating Organizational Learning*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1990.
- Beattie, Melody. *Codependent No More: How to Stop Controlling Others and Start Caring for Yourself*. 2nd ed. Center City, MN: Hazelden, 1992.
- . *Codependents' Guide to the Twelve Steps: How to Find the Right Program for You and Apply Each of the Twelve Steps to Your Own Issues*. New York: Fireside, 1990.

- Biscarra, María Ayelén, Romina Antolela Brandariz, Aldana Lichtenberger, Raquel Peltzer, and Mariana Cremonte. "Construcción de una Escala de Codependencia." *Revista Argentina de Ciencias del Comportamiento* 5 (2013): 42-51.
- Booth, Leo. *The Happy Heretic: Seven Spiritual Insights for Healing Religious Codependency*. N.p.: HCI, 2012.
- Bossidy, Larry, and Ram Charan. *Execution: The Discipline of Getting Things Done*. Rev. ed. New York: Crown, 2002.
- Boyd, Willie E. *Improving Leadership Effectiveness in the Nonprofit Sector: A Quantitative Study on the Impact of Clarification of Values and Expression of Beliefs on Codependency in Religious Organizations*. N.p.: ProQuest, 2007.
- Brent, John S. "An Outline for an Existential Approach to the Treatment of Codependency." *Journal of Pastoral Care* 47, no. 2 (1993): 157-166.
- Calderwood, Kimberly A., and Anne Rajesparam. "A Critique of the Codependency Concept Considering the Best Interests of the Child." *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Sciences* 93, no. 3 (2014): 171-178.
- Calhoun, David. "Recovering Recovery: Toward a New Missional Understanding in the Local Church." D.Min. project. Asbury Seminary, 2006.
- Cameron, Kim S., and Robert E. Quinn. *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture Based on the Competing Values Framework*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011.
- Carr, Amy, and Daniel Buchanan. "A Theological Analysis of Codependency Theories." *The Journal of Pastoral Care* 51, no. 3 (Fall 1997).
- Chang, Shih-Hua. "A Cultural Perspective on Codependency Treatment." *Asia Pacific Journal of Counseling and Psychotherapy* 3, no. 1 (2012): 50-60.
- Clark, Jerry, and Virginia C. Stoffel. "Assessment of Codependency Behavior in Two Health Student Groups," *American Journal of Occupational Therapy* 46, (September 1990): 821-828.
- Cook, Mary Crocker. *Awakening Hope: A Developmental, Behavioral, Biological Approach to Codependency Treatment*. Rev. ed. Los Gatos, CA: Robertson, 2011.
- Crawford, Robin. "Trouble in the Family of God: The Effects of Household Chaos on Relations with God." *Church and Society* (May/June 1992): 25-34.
- Cullen, James, and Alan Carr. "Codependency: An Empirical Study from a Systemic Perspective." *Contemporary Family Therapy* 21, no. 4 (1999): 505-526.

- Daire, Andrew P., Lameria Jacobson, and Ryan G. Carlson. "Emotional Stocks and Bonds: A Metaphorical Model for Conceptualizing and Treating Codependency and Other Forms of Emotional Overinvesting." *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 66, no. 3 (2012): 259-278.
- Dear, Greg E. "The Holyoake Codependency Index: Further Evidence of Factorial Validity." *Drug and Alcohol Review* 21, issue 1 (2002): 47-52.
- Dear, Greg E., and Clare M. Roberts. "Validation of the Holyoake Codependency Index." *The Journal of Psychology* 139, no. 4 (2005): 293-313.
- Fischer, J. L., L. Spann, and D. Crawford. "Measuring Codependency." *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly* 8 (1991): 87-100.
- Fitzgerald, Paul D. "Hope for Recovery: Correlations among Codependency, Internalized Shame, and Spiritual Well-Being." D.Min. project, Asbury Seminary, 1994.
- Fuller, Julie A., and Rebecca M. Warner. "Family Stressors as Predictors of Codependency." *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs* 126, no. 1 (2000): 5-22.
- Funston, C. Eric. "Ministry to the Legal Profession: A Suggested Codependency Model." *Journal of Pastoral Care* 45, no. 2 (1991): 181-195.
- George, Jennifer M. "Emotions and Leadership: The Role of Emotional Intelligence." In *Leaders and the Leadership Process: Readings, Self-Assessments, and Applications*. 3rd ed., edited by Jon L. Pierce and John W. Newstrom, 82-96. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003.
- Gilbert, Marvin G. "Systems Theory." In *The Holy Spirit and Counseling: Theology and Theory*. Vol. 1, edited by Marvin G. Gilbert and Raymond T. Brock. 221-234. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1985.
- Goldsmith, Marshall with Mark Reiter. *What Got You Here Won't Get You There: How Successful People Become Even More Successful*. New York: Hachette Books, 2007.
- Greenleaf, Robert K. *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. 25th anniversary ed. New York: Paulist, 2002.
- Griffin, Dan, and Rick Dauer. "Rethinking Men and Codependence: Men's Treatment Must Focus on Developing Relational Skills." *Addiction Professional* 10, no. 4 (July-August, 2012): 24-30.
- Groom, Nancy. *From Bondage to Bonding*. Colorado Springs: NavPress, 1991.
- Hagberg, Janet O. *Real Power: Stages of Personal Power in Organizations*. Rev. ed. Salem, WI: Sheffield, 1994.

- Halstead, Kenneth A. *From Stuck to Unstuck: Overcoming Congregational Impasse*. Herndon, VA: Alban, 1998.
- Hawkins, Catherine A., and Raymond C. Hawkins. "Codependence, Contradependence, Gender-Stereotyped Traits, Personality Dimensions, and Problem Drinking." *Universal Journal of Psychology* 2 (2014): 5-15.
- Hannegan, Eileen R. *When Money is Not Enough: Resolving Co-dependency in the Workplace*. Lake Grove, OR: Northwest Pacifica, 1991.
- Hemfelt, Robert, Frank Minirth, and Paul Meier. *Love is a Choice: The Definitive Book on Letting Go of Unhealthy Relationships*. Nashville: Nelson, 1989.
- Herrington, Jim, Mike Bonem, and James H. Furr. *Leading Congregational Change: A Practical Guide for the Transformational Journey*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.
- Hogg, James Andrew, and Mary Lou Frank. "Toward an Interpersonal Model of Codependence and Contradependence." *Journal of Counseling and Development* 70, no. 3 (1992): 371-375.
- Hoffman, Virginia Curran. *The Codependent Church*. New York: Crossroad, 1991.
- Hollander, E. P. "Emergent Leadership and Social Influence." In *Leaders and the Leadership Process: Readings, Self-Assessments, and Applications*. 3rd ed., edited by Jon L. Pierce and John W. Newstrom, 65-67. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003.
- Hunt, June. *Codependency: Balancing an Unbalanced Relationship*. Torrance, CA: Rose, 2013.
- Jackson, Walter C. "Codependence and the Christian Faith: An Introduction to Compassion Addiction." *Review and Expositor* 91 (1994): 31-41.
- Klunzinger, Marlene K. and Michael S. Moore. "Codependency and Pastoral Care: A Report from the Trenches." *Restoration Quarterly* 38, no. 3 (1998): 159-174.
- Laaser, M. R. *Healing the Wounds of Sexual Addiction*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004.
- Laaser, Mark. R., and Kenneth M. Adams. "Pastors and Sexual Addiction." In *Clinical Management of Sex Addiction*, edited by Patrick J. Carnes and Kenneth M. Adams, 285-298. New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2002.
- Lancer, Darlene. *Conquering Shame and Codependency: 8 Steps to Freeing the True You*. Center City, MN: Hazelden, 2014.

- Langford, Daniel L. *The Pastor's Family: The Challenges of Family Life and Pastoral Responsibilities*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth, 1998.
- Lencioni, Patrick. *The Advantage: Why Organizational Health Trumps Everything Else in Business*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2012.
- Lewis, Robert, and Wayne Cordeiro. *Culture Shift: Transforming Your Church from the Inside Out*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Lindley, Natasha R., Peter J. Giordano, and Elliott D. Hammer. "Codependency: Predictors and Psychometric Issues." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 55 (1999): 59-64.
- Malphurs, Aubrey. *Planting Growing Churches for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998.
- Marks, Anthony D. G., Rebecca L. Blore, Donald W. Hine, and Greg E. Dear. "Development and validation of a revised measure of codependency." *Australian Journal of Psychology* 64, Issue 2 (2012): 119-127.
- Marquardt, Michael J. *Building the Learning Organization: Achieving Strategic Advantage through a Commitment to Learning*. Rev. ed. Boston: Nicholas Brealey, 2011.
- McIntosh, Gary L., and Samuel D. Rima, Sr. *Overcoming the Dark Side of Leadership: The Paradox of Personal Dysfunction*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1997.
- McMillan, Jill J. "Organizational Codependency: The Creation and Maintenance of Closed Systems." *Management Communications Quarterly* 9, no. 1 (August 1995): 6-45.
- Mellody, Pia. *Facing Codependence: What It Is, Where It Comes From, How It Sabotages Our Lives*. Rev. ed. New York: Harper, 2003.
- Menzies, William W. "The Holy Spirit as the Paraclete: Model for Counselors." In *The Holy Spirit and Counseling: Theology and Theory*. Vol. 1. Edited by Marvin G. Gilbert and Raymond T. Brock. 25-38. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1985.
- Miller, William R., Alyssa A. Forcehimes, and Allen Zweben. *Treating Addiction: A Guide for Professionals*. New York: Guilford, 2011.
- Ming, J. Melvyn, Martha Ming, and Steven R. Mills. *LDR Church Development Process Workbook*. 7th ed. Snoqualmie, WA: Leadership Development Resources, 2010.
- Mitchell, Christina E. "Review and Revision of Behavioral Guidelines Used by Religious Codependent Enablers." *Family Therapy* 18, no. 3 (1991): 255-263.

- Omeland, Omar K. *The Third Mile: A Biblical View of Codependency*. N.p.: F and FP, 1992.
- Pierce, Jon L., and John W. Newstrom. "The Leader-follower Relationship: Fairness, Trust, and Ethical Behavior." In *Leaders and the Leadership Process: Readings, Self-Assessments, and Applications*. 3rd ed., edited by Jon L. Pierce and John W. Newstrom, 29-36. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003.
- Platt, Nancy Van Dyke, and Chilton R. Knudsen. *So You Think You Don't Know One? Addiction and Recovery in Clergy and Congregations*. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse, 2010.
- Potter, James V., and Paula M. Potter. *Conquering Codependence: Restoring Your Self-Identity*. N.p.: AFS, 2011.
- Quinn, Robert E. *Building the Bridge as You Walk on It*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.
- . *Deep Change: Discovering the Leader Within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.
- Richardson, Ronald W. *Creating a Healthier Church: Family Systems Theory, Leadership and Congregational Life*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1996.
- . *Polarization and the Healthier Church: Applying Bowen Family Systems Theory to Conflict and Change in Society and Congregational Life*. Toronto: CreateSpace, 2012.
- Riordan, Richard J., and Diane Simone. "Codependent Christians: Some Issues for Church-Based Recovery Groups." *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 21 (1993): 158-164.
- Ryan, D. S. "Ministry Solutions for Substance Abuse." In *The Church Leader's Counseling Resource Book: A Guide to Mental Health and Social Problems*, edited by C. Franklin & R. Fong, 27-39. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Rusknáková, Markéta. "Codependency of the Members of a Family of an Alcohol Addict," *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences* 132 (May 2014): 647-653.
- Salancik, Gerald R., and Jeffrey Pfeffer. "Who Gets Power—and How They Hold On to It: A Strategic-contingency Model of Power." In *Leaders and the Leadership Process: Readings, Self-Assessments, and Applications*. 3rd ed., edited by Jon L. Pierce and John W. Newstrom, 128-132. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003.
- Scaturro, Douglas J. "Family Therapy: Dilemmas of Codependency and Family Homeostasis." In *Clinical Dilemmas in Psychotherapy: A Transtheoretical*

- Approach to Psychotherapy Integration*, 99-110. Washington DC: American Psychological Association, 2005.
- Schaeff, Anne Wilson. "Is the Church an Addictive Organization?" *Christian Century* (1990): 18-21. Religion Online. Accessed August 22, 2014. <http://www.religion-online.org/showarticle.asp?title=751>.
- Schaeff, Anne Wilson, and Diane Fassel. *The Addictive Organization: Why We Overwork, Cover Up, Pick Up the Pieces, Please the Boss, and Perpetuate Sick Organizations*. New York: HarperCollins, 2013. Kindle.
- Schein, Edgar H. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.
- Senge, Peter M. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday, 2006.
- Serbin, R. A. "What I Hate I Do: How Addictions Hijack the Development of the Mind of Christ—A Pastoral Response." *Enrichment* 15, no. 4 (Fall 2010): 96-103. Enrichment Journal. Accessed August 22, 2014. [http://enrichmentjournal.ag.org/201004/201004\\_096\\_What\\_I%20\\_Hate.cfm](http://enrichmentjournal.ag.org/201004/201004_096_What_I%20_Hate.cfm)
- Shockley, Gary Allen. "Overcoming the Obstacles of Codependency: An Interdisciplinary Task." *Journal of Spiritual Formation* 15, no. 1 (February 1994): 103-108.
- Silvious, Jan. *Please Don't Say You Need Me: Biblical Answers for Codependency*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1989.
- Sowle, Jennifer. *The Everything Guide to Codependency: Learn to Recognize and Change Codependent Behavior*. Avon, MA: Adams, 2014.
- Spann, Lynda Anne. "Developing a Scale to Measure Codependency." Master of Science thesis. Texas Tech University. 1989.
- Steinke, Peter L. *Healthy Congregations: A Systems Approach*. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: The Alban Institute, 2006.
- . *How Your Church Family Works: Understanding Congregations as Emotional Systems*. Washington, DC: The Alban Institute, 2006.
- St. Romain, Phillip. *Freedom from Codependency: A Christian Response*. Wichita, KS: Contemplative Ministries, 2010.
- Struthers, W. M. *Wired for Intimacy: How Pornography Hijacks the Male Brain*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2009.

- Subby, Robert. "Inside the Chemically Dependent Marriage: Denial and Manipulation." In *Co-Dependency, An Emerging Issue*, Edited by Sharon Wegscheider-Cruse, 34-44. Hollywood, FL: HCI, 1984.
- . *Lost in the Shuffle: The Co-dependent Reality*. Deerfield Beach, FL: HCI, 1987.
- Tarr, Del. "The Role of the Holy Spirit in Interpersonal Relations." In *The Holy Spirit and Counseling: Theology and Theory*. Vol. 1. Edited by Marvin G. Gilbert and Raymond T. Brock, 6-24. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1985.
- VanVonderen, Jeff. *Good News for the Chemically Dependent and Those Who Love Them*. Minneapolis: Bethany, 1995.
- Wegscheider-Cruse, Sharon, and Joseph Cruse. *Understanding Codependency: The Science Behind It and How to Break the Cycle*. Rev. ed. Deerfield Beach, FL: HCI, 2012.
- Weinhold, Barry K., and Janae B. Weinhold. *Breaking Free of the Co-dependency Trap*. Rev. ed. Novato, CA: New World Library, 2008.
- Welch, Edward T. *When People are Big and God is Small: Overcoming Peer Pressure, Codependency, and the Fear of Man*. N.p.: P and R, 1997.
- White, William L. *Pathways from the Culture of Addiction to the Culture of Recovery*. 2nd ed. Center City, MN: Hazelden, 1996.
- Wood, Gene. *Leading Turnaround Churches*. St. Charles, IL: ChurchSmart, 2001.
- Yarhouse, M. A. *Homosexuality and the Christian: A Guide for Parents, Pastors, and Friends*. Bloomington, MN: Bethany House, 2010.

### **Description of Field Project**

- Karpman, Stephen B. "Fairy Tales and Script Drama Analysis." *Transactional Analysis Bulletin* 7, no. 26 (1968): 39-43. Karpman Drama Triangle. Accessed May 29, 2015, [http://www.karpmamdramatriangle.com/dt\\_article\\_only.html](http://www.karpmamdramatriangle.com/dt_article_only.html).
- Marks, Anthony D. G., Rebecca L. Blore, Donald W. Hine, and Greg E. Dear. "Development and Validation of a Revised Measure of Codependency." *Australian Journal of Psychology* 64, issue 2 (2012): 119-127.