

The Barrett Model: A Framework for Understanding Culture, Not Defining It



BARRETT VALUES CENTRE

Culture is complex

A model offers a lens to understand and frame complex constructs. The Barrett Model® does something more: it gives us a consistent way to organise the values and needs we see in the data.

The Barrett Model is not the assessment, the strategy, or the answer. It is the architecture beneath our analytics. It helps us make sense of patterns, gaps, and tensions, and provides a structure that connects the organisation's context, leadership, and strategic priorities.

A framework, not a maturity ladder

The Barrett Model is sometimes read as a sequence in which an organisation progresses from lower levels to higher ones. That interpretation misses an important point. The model does not rank values from least to most desirable, nor does it suggest that foundational needs become irrelevant once an organisation develops a strong sense of purpose. It presents a connected spectrum of human and organisational needs, all of which remain important.

Healthy cultures and effective leaders move across this full spectrum as circumstances, strategy and context change. A period of rapid growth may require greater adaptability, autonomy and learning. A disruption may bring renewed attention to stability, relationships and performance. A strategic shift may call for stronger alignment, collaboration and contribution. These are not steps backwards or forwards; they are different organisational needs coming to the foreground.

The practical issue is therefore not how “high” a culture sits on the model, but whether the organisation can access the values and behaviours its situation requires. An inspiring purpose cannot compensate for weak accountability or unstable systems. Equally, strong controls and reliable execution may protect performance in the short term but restrict innovation if autonomy and learning are absent. Sustainable performance depends on the ability to integrate the foundations, evolution and purpose rather than optimise one area in isolation.

This is where the framework becomes useful: it helps leaders see which needs are being supported, which are underdeveloped and where competing demands may be creating tension. It groups that inquiry into three simple questions: Are the foundations secure enough to support performance? Can the organisation adapt, learn and grow as conditions change? Can people align around a shared purpose and contribute beyond their own role?



Psychological foundations, practical application

Developed by Richard Barrett in 1997, the model was inspired by Maslow's work on human needs and self-actualisation. Its conceptual grounding does not rest on Maslow alone. Several influential strands of psychological research converge around similar conditions for healthy motivation and human flourishing.

These theories do not 'prove' the Barrett Model, and the constructs are not interchangeable. What they provide is convergent conceptual support: different traditions point to strikingly similar human needs.

Three Convergent Models

Self-Determination Theory. Deci and Ryan identify relatedness, competence and autonomy as basic psychological needs that support motivation, growth and well-being. These closely echo the model's focus on relationships, effective performance and evolution.

Psychological well-being. Ryff's work highlights positive relationships, environmental mastery, autonomy, personal growth and purpose in life - themes that run across the full Barrett framework.

Flourishing and eudaimonia. Seligman's PERMA framework and the wider eudaimonic tradition emphasise engagement, relationships, accomplishment, meaning and contribution to something beyond the self.

The useful question changes

The aim is not to ask, "What level are we?" It is to understand where attention and energy are concentrated; which needs are well supported; where friction is absorbing capacity; and what the strategy requires next.

Almost 30 years of use

Since 1997, the model and the analytics it supports have been applied with thousands of organisations across more than 90 countries. Longevity is not proof on its own. It does mean the framework has been applied and refined across sectors, languages and operating contexts and has remained simple enough for leaders to use without reducing culture to a slogan.

The model grounds the analytics, it does not replace them

Data is the starting point. Our assessments surface the values people hold personally, experience in the current culture and want to see in the future. Where relevant, we also examine the culture and leadership the strategy requires.

- ▶ The data reveals the signal. Repeated values, demographic differences and areas of alignment show what is shared and where experience diverges.
- ▶ The model organises the pattern. It gives the findings a common language across foundational, adaptive and purpose-led needs, without forcing the organisation into one label.
- ▶ Cultural Entropy® identifies drag. It indicates how much energy may be absorbed by limiting patterns such as bureaucracy, blame, confusion or control.
- ▶ Context turns insight into action. Strategy, leadership dialogue and lived experience determine what matters most and what needs to change in behaviours, systems and decisions.

The model gives the map. The analytics show where you are. Strategy clarifies where you need to go. Leadership creates the movement.

The question is not: “Where are we on the model?”

It is: “What is our culture enabling and what is it quietly making harder?”

References:

Wiedemann, C. Theoretical Support for the Barrett Model. Barrett Values Centre.

Barrett, R. (1998). *Liberating the Corporate Soul*. Routledge.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). “Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being.” *American Psychologist*, 55, 68–78.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). “Happiness is everything, or is it?” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 1069–1081.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish*. Free Press.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2001). “On happiness and human potentials.” *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141–166.