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CHAPTER I: FOUNDATIONS

Introduction

The metanarrative of church methodologies within the modern North American church provides multiple strategic pathways for growing the Kingdom and replication within the context of local gatherings of believers. With a plethora of methodologies connected to leadership training, discipleship replication and gathering style, it is imperative that leaders be willing to learn and extract elements from other methodologies to become both more biblical and effective in the mission of leadership and disciple replication. Crossover methodologies from one expression of church gathering to another provide local gatherings of believers not only more effective ministry, but a connection to the broader community of believers as a singular body and family.

Statement of the Problem

The intention of this thesis project is to establish the fungibility, or the fluidity, of leadership and methodological elements of organic and missional community expressions of the local church as well as parachurch organizations into more established and traditional models of church gatherings. The challenge that many have found within traditional ministry models is that of how to mobilize members into an expression of the church in which each member sees themselves as a replicator of the mission and gospel of Christ. The purpose of this thesis project is to establish a methodology that allows for traditional institutional models and expressions of church gatherings to glean leadership philosophies and methodologies from organic church expressions, as well as parachurch organizations to develop a more outwardly and replicating gatherings of the local church in their given context.
Special Terminology

The following section defines and explains the use of specific terminology as it is contextually applied throughout this thesis:

Missional and missional living are terms used within this project to both express and explain a leadership and ministry methodology in which Christianity is lived out not only within the gathering of believers but through the everyday activities, rhythms and elements of each believer’s life within a particular ministry methodology. The terminology of missional living utilized within this work can be linked in a more traditionally way with the term and idea of incarnational living.

The terminology of holistic is used within this thesis to describe the totality of Christ’s impact on the life of a believer. The concept of holistic Christian living reaches into every space and element that is equated with a healthy, holy and incarnational life of a follower of Christ. While holistic and missional have overlap in regard to their definitions, holistic encompasses the totality of the believer’s life, physical, mental, spiritual and emotional, whereas missional is focused on the daily mission and incarnational living of believers in everyday activities of their lives.

Within this thesis the use of the term metanarrative is used to describe the overarching story of the life of a believer within the context of mission of both the local and universal expressions of the Body of Christ. Metanarrative is also used within this thesis as an understanding of the totality of the individual, local church, and universal church in regard to their perpetual mission to the world and the biblical mandate of a replicating processes of making disciples.
Organic is a term used within this thesis to explain the simple, localized mission and gathering of believers outside the constructs of traditional church models and methodologies. At times within this work organic church will be used interchangeably with house church, missional church or community and simple church.

Vision casting is used within this work as an expression of the teaching and equipping of individuals within local expressions of church for the replicating mandate of ministry within a given methodical philosophy.

DNA is used within the context of this work as an expression of the bonding elements and principles within a local church community of believers for the purpose of fluent and healthy replication of ministry.

Statement of Limitations

The primary intention that this thesis project looks to accomplish, is if the leadership methodologies and practices found within organic, missional communities, and parachurch organizations, as defined in the project, can be replicated within more traditional expressions of church gatherings, or if they can only be fully expressed within more organic models of Christian community. The first limitation of this thesis is that it is not designed to provide the reader with a blueprint on how to design or replicate an organic or simple church community. While elements of what organic church expressions are will be overviewed within the thesis, their total replication will not be a primary objective to the overarching narrative of this project.

The second limitation of this thesis is that of a total review of different expressions of organic church gatherings. While this thesis project will review the primary elements of simple church expressions, it will not evaluate and deconstruct all elements and expressions of non-traditional, organic church gathering models.
The third limitation of this thesis project, will be that of evaluating the entire methodological and leadership structure of the traditional church model. While elements of more traditional and historic models of church gatherings will be evaluated in relation to their ability to facilitate leadership and methodological elements of more organic expression of ministry, a defining of the institutional church both in a modern and historical context is neither necessary nor beneficial to the intention and focus of this thesis project.

The forth limitation of this thesis project will be connections of organic church models to the emergent church. While some elements found within the emergent church structure contributed to the development of organic church models, this paper will not evaluate nor explore this area of organic church model’s history.

The fifth element of limitation within this project will be its focus on missional communities over other forms of small group gatherings. While there will be a separation made between the missional community expressions of localized believers from small groups, cell groups, life groups and church community groups, the primary focus of this thesis is not to evaluate each of these expressions of small gatherings other that for clarification.

The final element of intentional limitation within this work is that of supporting one model or expression of church gathering over another. This paper is neither a support nor condemnation of either organic or traditional expressions of church gatherings. This project is intended to look at more nontraditional expressions of church and observe if leadership and methodological elements from those expressions can be extracted for beneficial use and integration into more traditional church gathering models.
Theoretical Basis

Introduction

Within the modern context of ministry there is currently a tension going on within the application of methodologies, leadership replication and systems. This tension is one that is taking place between traditional church models and the methodologies coming out of more organic church gatherings. The intention of this section is to not only explore the tension between methodologies but to provide a foundational understanding of the organic methodologies for potential application and crossover into the traditional church structure.

The theoretical basis of this paper will be looked at through three primary elements. The first of these elements is that of biblical data in regard to church gathering methodologies and leadership replication, followed by the theological impact of the organic community expression of church gathering, and concluding with an evaluation of the methodologies and leadership replication philosophies of Christian leaders through survey data. Each of these elements should be seen not as raw facts and figures, but rather as a pathway for the application and implementation of organic church leadership and mythologies into the modern church structure.

Biblical Data for Organic Structural Elements

Within this portion of the project, a look will be taken at scriptural references that directly impact the understanding of both what a missional ideal of simple church gathering and its leadership looks like, as well as its purpose. Information in this section will be taken from scripture and supplemented with ideals from different organic church models and Christian leadership organizations to develop a clear contextual understanding of elements that are found within each nontraditional model for their potential transference to the traditional church model.
Understanding what an organic community is requires looking at verses that support an understanding of what contextual organic gatherings and leadership looked like in the early church community as well as what values they held. The intention of this section is to recognize elements found within the early church model which are utilized in current organic gathering and leadership models within Christianity for their later potential for transference over to more traditional church gatherings. One of the primary verses that helps to understand the biblical grounds for organic gatherings is that of Romans 12:10-16.\(^1\) This verse points out that those in the body of Christ are to love each other like family and to involve each other in every area of each other’s lives. Along with this information, this passage shares that the saints are to take care of the needs of one another. While the primary objective is to be outwardly focused, it is also a group that operates like a family. This fact of the church body functioning like a family in all things is expressed by Mounce when he states, “God’s will is that his children become a family where the joys of one become the joys of all and the pain of one is gladly shared by all the others. The Christian experience is not one person against the world but one great family living out together the mandate to care for one another.”\(^2\) This understanding of Romans 12:10-16 is essential for understanding what the purpose of the organic community is to those within it.\(^3\)

While this idea of loving one another, and living in community is seen in the above-mentioned passages, it is more clearly seen and stated in Acts 2:44.\(^4\) In this passage the believers are told that the members of the church shared all things in common. This was done intentionally through living as a family and as a loving body that cared for one another. As the reader goes on

---

\(^1\) Study Bible, *ESV, English Standard Version Romans 12:10-16* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles), 2179.


\(^3\) Ibid., *Romans 12:10-26*, 2179.

\(^4\) Ibid., *Acts 2:44*, 2085.
they learn that these people did not withhold things from one another. This concept of sharing and doing life together is something that is truly being attempted by modern organic gatherings of believers. Whereas in more traditional models of church gathering, the structure and size can cause difficulties in regard to learning who your friends and neighbors are. The small and intimate nature of the organic communities have better facilitated the idea of caring for one another in a practical way that is both obedient to scripture and a true expression of family love for one another. The question then becomes, is there a way to transfer this element of organic church family life into more traditional church models?

One of the downsides of larger, traditional church structures is that they can unintentionally limit and minimize care for others to a simplistic offering of prayer. While all Christians need to pray for one another, this methodological structure of the traditional church can allow those within the body of Christ to either neglect or ignore the practical needs of those who are hurting within the church and local community. An organic church structure by design places the believer into a more intimate interaction with the lives of others. When a believer within the local organic community is hurting for money, or food, or a physical need of any kind, it is much easier for the community to rally together to come up with a solution for the problem at hand. Along with serving the needs of those within the community, this model allows the member to more easily serve and worship in practical, tangible ways. While the organic structure allows for more intimate expressions of service to those within the community, it is often a neglected element within traditional church structures that the act of service of others is an expression of worship by the one doing the serving. This intimate, family nature of organic church communities allows for this element of service to take place in more biblical and Christ-like expressions.
Along with the idea of family, organic communities are structured in a way that places a high importance on outwardly focused living and ministry. This idea of outwardly focused community can be seen in passages such as John 20:21. In this passage Christ explains to his followers that the sending that the father did of him is to be replicated through them as they are sent out throughout the earth. Carson explains this concept of them being sent to replicate in a complete and holistic way when he states, “the church’s mission must not be restricted to evangelism and church planting; it embraces everything that we rightly do in imitation of Christ. It is evident within the organic church methodology that the example set by Christ in his instructions to his followers to live an outwardly focused life that went out to the lost instead of expecting the lost to come to them is to be emulated. In Acts 1:8 the followers of Christ are told they will be witnesses for Christ all over the world. It is clear within the organic community model that the idea in this passage is that Christ was clarifying that he did not want his followers to be centrally located, rather to be scattered in the world among the lost and marginalized.

For this project, three elements found within scripture in regard to organic gatherings as well as leadership will be evaluated for their potential and healthy application into more traditional church gathering models. These elements are groups of believers doing life together, groups of believers existing with an outward focus within the secular community around them instead of segregated from it, and supporting a replicating model of Christianity in which all believers are expected to participate in the work of the ministry.

---

5 Ibid., John 20:21, 2071.


8 Ibid., Acts 1:8, 2081.
Theological Impact of The Missional Community

In this section, the theological impacts of organic church expressions will be evaluated for a better understanding into how they impact the reading of scripture by individuals, as well as how living out the Christian life within community and the context of North America occurs. This section, while providing a theological look at primary organic methodologies, will also provide a practical understanding and purpose for organic methodologies and leadership strategies implementation within the modern context of the North American church.

The first primary element of organic church methodological expressions in relation to theology that will be looked at within this section is that of being outwardly focused contrasted with an inwardly segregated model of gathering. This element will impact both the disciple making process and replication, as well as leadership strategies within specific church methodologies. A second element which will be observed within this section is the theological impact of the organic methodologies focus of the responsibility of every believer to participate in the mission of Christ both in service and accountability to one another. As will the first element of this section, this element impacts both replication and leadership empowerment within the model of the organic expression of the church. This section of the work will briefly evaluate if the traditional church structure and its methodologies possess the potential to segregate itself from the institutional structure which has developed church into a place to which individuals must come to rather than a place that sends believers out to the places where they, work, live and play for the purpose of fulfilling the great commission. This theological hurdle that is prevalent within many traditional church models of coming to church rather than the church sending its members out is a point in which the organic model can influence change both methodological
and in leadership structure for a more theologically and methodologically biblical expression within the institutional church model.

Matthew 18:20 explains that God is participating wherever believers gather. This number can be as small as two or as great as millions. When those who are looking to live a life on mission begin to understand this, they are able to see the work of the church and each individual Christian as something that is not inside the walls of a building but rather in the everyday spaces and places of their lives.

While often overlooked within the missional community model, Matthew 27:51 has a great theological impact on how church is done. It is revealing that after the veil of the temple was torn Christ neither established a way nor commanded others to develop or build a new gathering space for the new covenant to take place. Theologically, the church became universal at this point and existed wherever believers lived, worked and played. It is apparent that Christ did not mandate believers have central gathering locations; rather he wanted them to be spread in the wind to make disciples of all nations. This however does not dissolve the functionality of central gathering places such as church buildings for the use of believers, but rather must serve as a point of reflection for any institutional gathering as to the importance of the location and places they converge to worship in and at.

Accountability among believers is another element that is dynamically different within organic expressions of church gathering compared with that of more institutional models of church gathering. Within larger, more traditional church expressions, the structure and size can lead to the issue of people failing to share their needs and struggles. Because of the design and

---

9 Ibid., Matthew 18:20, 1859.
10 Ibid., Matthew 27:51, 1887.
structure of this model, members have the potential to leave their sin and troubles at home and come to church where nobody knows them or personally confronts or engages them. While these issues within organic expressions of the church can still occur, the smaller context and focus on doing life together in the organic model can create an environment in which this issue of accountability is not so easily avoided. In Galatians 6:1-2, Christians are told to restore those that sin with gentleness and to bear one another’s burdens.\(^\text{11}\) In a small missional community this restoration and bearing one another’s burdens are seen as a primary element of doing life together. This theological principal of accountability can be more simplistic in its implementation and function in the smaller context of the organic model. Not only does the organic model allow for personal accountability of those within the gathering, but it also sets a biblical example of love and restoration to be viewed by those outside the church. Within the traditional church model, accountability can often times be seen as one man standing on a stage, condemning sin and then it being the job of the individual to deal with the sin and the conviction that has been revealed by the man on the stage. In smaller organic gatherings, there is structure that is more capable of allowing individuals to hold each other accountable in both love and deed with Christ and scripture as the backdrop for restoration and forgiveness in and through gentleness.\(^\text{12}\)

While not an exclusive list of all elements of organic church methodology, a lack of central gathering places and the priesthood of every believer in service and accountability to one another are major theological and methodological elements that organic church gatherings places significant value on. These elements are a focus in how they are lived out in practical ways

\(^{11}\) Ibid., *Galatians 6:1-2*, 2255.

within the lives of those within the community who theological and methodological focus on living a life that is on mission. These elements become a point of reflection for both larger gatherings as well as more traditional expressions of church in regard to if their models can properly facilitate them within their community of believers.

**Organic View of The Historical Traditional Church**

Understanding potential crossover elements of organic models and expressions of church gatherings into more traditional and institutional expressions of church models requires an understanding of certain elements of the traditional church model and their historical context as viewed by the organic model of church. The intention of this section is to provide a historic look at primary elements of the traditional church model as seen by the organic model and its potential hurdles this may cause in the mission of the church as understood by the organic expression of gathering. The intention of this section is not just to provide historical facts as presented by the organic model and its leadership, but also to make biblical and historical arguments for the potential implementation and utilization of organic methodologies into that of traditional expressions of church gatherings where and if possible.

A primary argument made out of the organic model of church expression is that of the institutional church’s structure being a hurdle to the mission of the Body of Christ. Most arguing that this hurdle of structure is not a malicious one, but rather an unintended consequence of a model and a structure itself. When looking to understand the argument that the institutional model of church gathering is a hurdle to the mission of the church, Frank Viola along with Wolfgang Simson are two primary sources for information coming out of the organic church argumentation against the structure of the traditional model of church gathering. Each of these men have done research into the traditional church along with developing replacement
expressions of church structure based on what they see in scripture rather than history and tradition.

Frank Viola in his work *Pagan Christianity* states, “be prepared for a rude awakening as you find out how off-track our current religious practices are.”\(^{13}\) Viola’s intention in this work is to show the hurdles that some practice within the modern traditional church model unintentionally cause for a proper living out of the Gospel of Christ. It should be understood that the word “pagan” in this section is not always referring to an ungodly religious system, but rather to elements of the church structure and model that have been adapted from a secular culture.\(^{14}\)

While Viola establishes a historical grid for almost everything within the modern church structure, there is one element that he sees as the most damaging and dangerous to being biblical Christians – the church building. In this work, Viola expresses that, “nowhere in scripture do we find the terms church (ekkelsia), temple, or house of God used to refer to a building.”\(^{15}\) Viola then goes on to expound upon the idea of no church buildings and explains that, “when Christianity was born, it was the only religion on the planet that had no sacred objects, no sacred persons, and no sacred spaces. This work by Viola is a primary argumentation out of the organic church model, against buildings and the system that structured around them because of their perceived hindrance to the mission of the church.

The question in regard to the historical implementation and effect buildings have had on the structure and mission of the modern church according to the organic model might be, “so what?” For many within the modern expression of traditional church models, even understanding


\(^{14}\) Ibid., xxxi.

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 11.
the concern of the organic church that their buildings, gathering, and structure may be having a negative impact on their mission as the church is inconceivable. The issue and question becomes, if these structures and buildings of institutional models truly impact worship and the living out of a Christ-like life, should they be utilized and maintained at all? For individuals such as Viola, elements contained within these building and structure such as choirs, clothing and environment were all adopted from the reign of Constantine. For Viola, this issue is the entire structure that came out of the centralized gathering of believers in dedicated buildings shifted the focus of the church from worship to a system of performance and repetition. Along with this, Viola argues that as this structure was developed, the church was no longer going to the people but became a place the people must come to. Simply stated, the opinion of many within the organic church is that the traditional model became a segregated community instead of a missional community impacting the everyday lives of the lost around them.

This understanding of the historical impact of structure and methodology as seen by the organic church helps to develop a position of methodological and structural reflection by traditional and institutional expressions of church gatherings as to their effectiveness as a model, as well as any potential implementation and crossover of organic church gathering elements into their context and structure. While an organic expression of church gathering can help untangle the members from a methodology and structure that unintentionally segregates itself from the community it exists within, the question becomes does a traditional model have to sell its building and restructure its methodology to be as effective as the organic model’s effectiveness? This question will be evaluated through this project for the health and growth of traditional methodologies and leadership structures.

---

16 Ibid., 26.
Statement of Methodology

Introduction

Understanding how the writer developed his conclusions and assumptions is an important element in regard to the development and structure of this thesis project looking into the integration of organic church elements within traditional church models and structures. The following section is dedicated to providing an outline as to the contents of each chapter that will be included within this Doctorate of Ministry thesis project. This section provides for the reader an understanding of what the thesis project contains as well as how that information was gathered and gleaned for the work that was researched and provided to the reader.

Chapter One

Within this chapter of the project, the student will answer five questions as to what the thesis project will accomplish and develop. These five elements are a foundational understanding of where the project will go, and how it will be developed by the writer throughout the thesis project.

The first of these five elements will be that of stating the problem. Simply stated this section of chapter one will allow the reader to develop the understanding of what organic expressions of ministry look like and if there are any elements from this methodology that can be integrated within the current, traditional church models.

Following this, chapter one will provide the reader with five limitations of the paper. A primary element of this section will be the understanding that this project is not intended to provide an entire history of either organic or traditional church models of church gatherings. The primary intention of this section is to inform the reader that the intention of this project is not to make a determination if one model is more biblical over the other. The limitations described in
this section will be for the understanding that the thesis project will only look to provide the reader with an understanding of what organic expressions of ministry look like and if any of their elements of methodology and leadership can be utilized within a more traditional church model.

The third element that will be developed within this first chapter will be that of theoretical basis for the topic being addressed within the thesis project. This chapter will provide the reader with an understanding of the current elements of organic ministries. Along with an understanding of current expressions of organic ministries, this section of the project will provide the reader with biblical, and theological evidence for the foundation of organic expressions of church gatherings. A link will also be provided to show that more organic expressions of church community have existed throughout the history of the church even if they were expressed under a different label.

This chapter will also provide the reader a clear understanding of the primary literature that has been utilized in relation to the study for this project. Books and works on missional communities, house church and other forms of the organic church will be utilized for the development of the understanding of what a missional community is and does in regard to methodology and leadership replication within the traditional church model.

A statement of methodology will also be provided within this first chapter of the work. This section of the project will provide the reader with a brief summary of the contents of each chapter and how it ties into the larger narrative of the work itself.

The final element of this first chapter will be a review of the literature that is utilized within the project. A number of books and scripture will be briefly referenced so that the reader can have an overarching understanding of the material that has been utilized within the project.
Chapter Two

Chapter two of this paper will provide the reader with an introduction to the findings that have been developed during the research of the paper. In this chapter, the author will provide the reader with an overview of information that has been gathered from the survey conducted for the research of this project. This chapter will define the three major groups that were surveyed for this project as well as the intention for the choice of each surveyed group. Along with an explanation of the ministry groups and demographics utilized for this project, examples of survey questions from each section of the survey will be introduced. The intention of this chapter is to provide the reader with a foundational understanding of the project and survey for the intended purpose of developing core elements that will later in the work be more deeply evaluated for both understanding and crosspollination of ministry methodologies and leadership strategies.

Chapter Three

Chapter three of the project will be where much of the research will be evaluated that has been conducted in regard to the survey of leadership within different Christian methodologies for this project. Within this chapter, each section of the survey will be evaluated and broken down for an understanding of the positions of leaders from different methodological backgrounds and ministry models. While the graphs and surveys will be placed in full in the appendixes that are located within the end of this project, their information will be utilized within this section in conjunction with the material gathered from the primary experts within different ministry models. Also within this chapter an explanation of organic community methodologies and leadership elements along with their contextual implementation will be provided to the reader for contemplation. Along with these elements, this chapter will develop a foundational narrative for
the possible crossover of organic methodologies and leadership replication elements into the traditional church model and structure.

**Chapter Four**

Within this final chapter, elements of unutilized scripture, literature as well as information gathered from the conducted survey will summarize and developed for the crossover application of organic methodologies and leadership replication systems into traditional church structures. Within this chapter, leadership from more traditional church structures will be provided with elements gleaned from the organic system for implementation into their contextual church structure and methodologies. The intention of this concluding chapter is not to transcribe organic systems in an unnatural way to a foreign methodology, but rather provide elements that may provide a foundation for growth and overall church health to traditional church models and structures.

**Review of Literature**

The following is a review of primary sources used within the research of this thesis project. Along with their listing below, a concise understanding of each work and an explanation for its inclusion within this work will take place. The intention of this section is to provide a contextual understanding of the literary influences that impacted the development of the research within this thesis project as well as potential transference of organic leadership and structural methodologies into more institutional models of church gatherings. Along with primary resources used within this thesis project a number of scripture verses will be included in this section. These passages have been included based on their impact on the understanding of organic community elements as gleaned for scripture. This passage will also be briefly explained for understanding as to their theological, biblical and scriptural context of church expressions. It
should be understood that this is not an extensive evaluation of all material used for this project but rather an overview of primary resources utilized within this work.

Utilized Literature

*Pagan Christianity* by Frank Viola will be a primary work utilized for this thesis project. In the first chapter of his work, Viola asks the simple question, “Have we really been doing it by the book?”

Throughout this work Viola attempts to point the believer back to a model of Christianity that is founded in scripture and not in history and current contextual elements.

Tim Chester has developed a work called *A Meal with Jesus* that will be a primary work utilized within this thesis project. Chester states of his own work, “this is a book about meals. But the meals of Jesus are a window into his message of grace and the way it defines his community and its mission.” Chester’s book is about using the common things of life to reach the community around Christians and it is a foundational message for the understanding of missional communities and how they function and operate.

Craig Millward has been closely affiliated with Mike Breen and his 3DM team of missional leadership developers. In his work *Disciplemaker*, Millward states, “I have come to believe that there is much to learn from the Gospel of John as we approach it in faith that Jesus Christ is calling his church back to its core purpose: to make disciples and teach them to do all things he taught those who walked with him in the flesh to do.”

---


this work are that of making replicating disciples through a missional community model of doing everyday life with those that are lost and not of the Kingdom.

*Deliberate Simplicity* by Dave Browning is a work dedicated to the understanding that the church can accomplish more by doing less. Browning works to develop an understanding of church as a place where, “the main thing is the main thing. A church were people convene primarily in homes and secondarily in public spaces for worship services.” 20 The book builds a foundation that the gathering of the believers in a building is not unbiblical; rather it is secondary to their gathering in community with the lost in a missional mindset.

Jeff Vanderstelt is one of the pioneers into the missional community movement in North America. After years of doing missional communities and teaching on them, he wrote a book called *Saturate*, which helped define the heartbeat of missional communities in relation to discipleship. Vanderstelt develops the concept that church means gathering and that in scripture this meant gathering to Jesus where in modern culture it often just means believers gathering with one another. 21 This changes the focus of the church from one that is about one another to one that is primarily about Christ and those outside of the church.

*Simple Church* by Thom Rainer is about returning believers to a replicating model of making disciples, not just programs and structures. Rainer simplifies the mission of the church to clarity, movement alignment and focus. 22 The intention is to bring the church back from all the

---


noise that a stricter model has unintentionally caused, and refocus it on the simple missional life of making disciples.

J. D. Payne’s work *Missional House Churches* is dedicated to reaching the local communities and contexts of believers with the Gospel. Payne explains that when he uses the word missional he means, “churches that engage the culture with the gospel, make disciples, and plant churches from those house churches that do not.”^{23} Simply stated, this is a book that is about being on mission within the world and not segregated to safe Christian communities.

*Transformational Church* by Stetzer and Rainer is about reevaluating biblically the priorities of church models and what they are structured to accomplish. Stetzer states that, “rather than missionary disciples for Christ going into the world, we have a group of people content to go in circles.”^{24} This is a work that will be linked with the organic church community idea of being outwardly focused and not inwardly stagnate.

*Community: Taking Your Small Group Off Life Support* by Brad House addresses the issue of small groups within churches that have become dead, inwardly focused Bible studies without actions or results of their meeting and gathering. House points out that small groups are about vision over reaction and purpose over product.^{25} This builds the concept that when a group is developed based on a Holy Spirit vision and then grounded in a Great Commission purpose they must be outwardly focused and not stagnate and segregated from the lost within their community context.

---


*The House Church Book* by Simons will be another primary source for this thesis project. This, along with *Pagan Christianity*, will be utilized for a historic and biblical understanding of church gatherings. Simons states that, “church as we know it is preventing church as God wants it.” Simons develops the idea that missional, disciple replicating church is being strangled by institutional models that regulate ministry structurally over spiritually.

*Everyday Church* by Tim Chester is a simple look at missional communities that are Gospel-centered and focused on mission rather than methodology. Chester states that, “we can no longer assume the wider culture matches that of the church. We can no longer assume people share a similar worldview to ours.” Simply stated, the current structure of the church according to Chester must become one that is aggressively and outwardly on mission to the lost instead of expecting its institutional rhetoric to impact them.

The focus of any healthy church methodology or leadership structure is one of making replicating disciples. *Real-Life Discipleship* by Jim Putman is dedicated to this end. While many books about models of missional communities and discipleship are dedicated to reaching the leaders, Putman makes it clear that for real replicating discipleship to take place it must be accomplished through the activity of every church member. This breaks with the traditional model and forces every believer to develop a missional mindset outside of their Christian community context.

---

26 Wolfgang Simson, *The House Church Book: Rediscover the Dynamic, Organic, Relational, Viral Community Jesus Started* (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House, 2009), xiii.


Neil Cole’s work *Church 3.0* is a foundational work in moving the church away from an institutional model to one that is both on mission and outwardly focused. Cole believes that “replacing the old ways of thinking about God’s church with new ones can release the health, growth, and reproduction meant to be characteristic of the church.”²⁹ This will be utilized in the paper to separate the institutional elements of the church from the mission and biblical intention of the church.

*Leading Missional Communities* by Mike Breen will be utilized within this project as a practical application book. Breen states that, “Missional communities are not a silver bullet that will solve all of the church’s missional problems.”³⁰ Breen believes that missional communities help to solve some of the institutional hurdles that are placed on the mission of Christians and move them closer to a biblical model of Christ.

Also by Mike Breen, *Leading Kingdom Movements* will be utilized in this work for its focus on equipping each believer to be an active participant in the missional work of the kingdom in a way that changes the dynamic and focus of the church through a household mindset.³¹

**Utilized Scripture**

1 Peter 5:5-6³² will be utilized within this paper to develop the concept that God gives grace to the humble, and that humility has often been developed more within organic structures.

---


³² Study Bible, *ESV, English Standard Version: 1 Peter 5:5-6* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles), 2413.
in a more simplistic way in relation to serving over than in traditional church models.  

Romans 1:17 will be developed within this paper as an understanding that often times a large protective institutional church can develop comfort and faith in the members and the system for the security of the institution, much in the same way the Jews did, over the faith and security that is required more often in an outwardly focused community. The idea of living by faith according to this verse provides a promise and security from and in Christ, and will have “steadfast loyalty” to those who live in and through faith in him.  

Philippians 1:21 has the missional idea of living as Christ as being gain. This is a living that must be done outwardly and in community with the lost and society around the believer.

John 21:17 contains the idea of feeding the sheep as an outward expression of one’s love for Christ. This concept will be developed within the project of serving in an outwardly focused capacity to those in a given community.

---


34 Ibid., *Romans 1:17*, 2158.


37 Ibid., *Philippians 1:21*, 2281.


In Hebrews 5:12-14\textsuperscript{41} the believers had not grown up yet. This passage will be used to compare and contrast the context of those in local organic church community with the spiritual statues of those within more traditional model of church.

John 13:34-35\textsuperscript{42} will be utilized to shine light on if a model of church such as traditional or organic communities can better facilitate and develop disciples that have love for one another.

Matthew 25:31-46\textsuperscript{43} will help the reader understand how an organic community allows the participants to serve others more effectively and thereby serve Christ.

Organic communities are often focused on serving and engaging each other and the lost in the communities surrounding them. Serving the lost is as much a part of worship as singing a song in a worship service. This idea is developed within the words of Romans 12:1\textsuperscript{44}

John 20:21\textsuperscript{45} captures the heartbeat of the organic community ideal that every believer is being sent as Christ was sent and that this is not just something that is for those in positions of leadership.

Matthew 11:19\textsuperscript{46} is the idea of Jesus as the friend of sinners because of his time eating meals with them. Organic communities use this idea to develop a narrative of doing life and being in relationship with lost sinners.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., Hebrews 5:12-14, 2368.

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., John 13:24-35, 2052.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., Matthew 25:31-46, 1877.

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., Romans 12:1, 2178.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., John 20:21, 2070.

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., Matthew 19:11, 1861.
1 Peter 2:9\textsuperscript{47} builds the message of being a light in the darkness. Organic models of church gatherings develop the idea that a light is not affective in a lit area but rather in the dark and must be taken to the dark places of our world.

James 1:21-27\textsuperscript{48} shows that God questions faith that lacks experience. An inwardly focused mindset or methodology will be used in this project to show the hurdles that an institutional system can have to the spiritual experience of the believers within the community.

In Matthew 28:20\textsuperscript{49} the believers were taught to observe all this. This is not a passive observation but rather a call for imitation. This project will develop the idea that organic models of church gathering allow for believers to better observe all this in regard to Christ.

The word congregation as to its application to the Jerusalem church in Acts 4:32\textsuperscript{50} will be observed to see if this is the overarching intention of a church gathering or just an example of one gathering.

The words of Matthew 28:16-20\textsuperscript{51} will be essential to the development of this project. The Great Commission is the concept of sending, replicating and going which is foundational to the purpose and understanding of a purpose of all gatherings of believers.

The books and scriptures that have been reviewed above will be foundational in both the development and understanding of organic communities, their purpose, and how to live them out both individually and within the context of a larger or more institutional model of church gathering.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 1 Peter 2:9, 2408.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., James1:21-27, 2393.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., Matthew 28:20, 1888.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., Acts 4:32, 2089.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., Matthew 28:16-20, 1888.
CHAPTER II: INTRODUCTION TO APPLIED RESEARCH

Introduction

Within this chapter, information from the primary survey will be introduced to the reader with the intention of developing an understanding of the results of the surveys as well as primary responses of the participants in the survey. Linked with the information gathered from the survey that was conducted for this thesis, information will also be presented from modern leaders and organizations within the fields of church methodology and leadership structures. The intention of this chapter is to provide a foundational understanding of the groups surveyed as well as the intention of the questions and categories utilized within the survey.

Research Methodology

Outside of current material on the subjects of traditional and organic church methodologies and their leadership structures, the primary element of research utilized for this thesis was a survey directed at leaders and professionals within different elements and expressions of Christian leadership and methodologies. One of the primary intentions of the survey utilized for this project was to have the specific objectives of evaluating professionals in each expression of church gathering and leadership structures to develop a better understand of their methodologies as well as potential areas of crossover of methodological and leadership elements from one expression of church gathering to another.¹

Following the specific objectives of the questions, the next primary element of the survey utilized for this thesis project was that of having straightforward questions.² While the intention

² Ibid., 6.
of the questions is not clearly revealed to the participants of the survey, each is worded in such a way to make them simple and clear to those taking the survey. By eliminating ambiguity within the survey questions, participants were able to answer simply without much thought. This simplicity was done by design to eliminate over thinking by the participants and provide the researcher with clear information to evaluate.

The third element of the survey used for the research of this thesis project was that of choosing a sound population or sample. Each participate was carefully chosen for their professional connection to specific ministry expressions as well as leadership styles and structures. Individuals for the survey were chosen from traditional ministries, organic ministries, parachurch organizations and professional Christian leadership training organizations. Many of the leaders who were requested to participate in the survey are top examples of leadership and representatives within their given category both professionally and academically.

The fourth primary element used within the survey for this thesis project was that of accurate reporting of the survey results. While this paper has the purpose and intention of looking into crossover elements from organic expressions of ministry and leadership structures into more traditional models, it is the intention of this research to present the material gathered from the survey in a clear and unbiased way. While the survey used within this project has been utilized for a specific purpose and intention, the graphs, tables and percentages used within the thesis are preserved in their original forms for their continued use within further research.

---

3 Ibid., 6.
4 Ibid., 6.
Sampling Type

The survey or sampling method that was utilized for the gathering of information for the thesis, was that of nonprobability sampling. The individuals engaged within the survey that was utilized for the development of this thesis project were chosen based on their characteristics in relation to ministry and leadership as well and the needs of the survey. While nonprobability sampling has the innate vulnerability to selection bias, within this project much of this risk is eliminated. With the nature of the project being the utilization of elements from certain models of ministry and Christian leadership into other expressions of church gathering expressions as well as leadership structures, and not the promotion of one model over another, selection biases did not impact the survey or research project.

Sample Size

Those surveyed for the research within this project were specifically engaged for their experience, leadership and time spent within their given fields. Because the nature of this survey was to gain information from leadership within very specific cohorts, the sample size for this survey was relatively concentrated. With a sample size of just over fifty participates, the sample size of the survey utilized within this project could be considered small, and accused of running the possible risk of not having enough participants for precise and reliable findings. For the purpose and intention of this project a smaller sample size was intentional in regard to the chosen participants as well as for the benefit of the researcher. If the sample size for this research project

---

5 Ibid, 37.
6 Ibid, 37.
7 Ibid, 49.
had been increased it would have had the effect of diverting the comparison of top representatives within the chosen fields.\textsuperscript{9} With a limited number of experts from the organic, traditional and leadership methodologies and structures of church expressions utilized within this survey, other sample groups were intentionally limited to minimize a lopsided sampling of one participant group over another.

**Primary Survey Introduction**

The following sections of the thesis was developed with the intention of providing the reader with an overview of the survey that was utilized in the development in the project. This overview should be understood in the context of being a limited overview of the survey and information gained from the survey. This section of this thesis is not intended to present the readers with a totality and development of every statistic and piece of information that was gathered from the survey, rather a comprehensive overview of the categories, survey participants and primary elements of the survey.

**Elements of the Survey**

**Definitions**

The survey that was utilized for research within this thesis project was divided up into five categories. The first of the utilized categories of the survey was based on providing the participates an understanding and definition of organic and traditional church models. These definitions were provided to the reader so as to help provide a self-categorization as well as personal understanding of each methodology to the participants before they began the survey. While some of the participates could fit into both categories, the survey was designed so as to

provide a foundational definition of each category so that participants were less likely to interpret
their own definitions onto the questions within the survey.

Table 1: Ministry Methodology Definitions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Church:</td>
<td>Within this survey, “traditional church” refers to any church model that owns or rents property for meetings and services on a regular basis. Within this survey, “traditional church” also refers to any church gathering with a paid staff or clergy. For the purpose of this survey “traditional church” refers to local churches that identify with denominations or titles such as Baptist, non-denominational, Presbyterian, Pentecostal, Episcopalian, Assembly of God, etc. (Traditional church does not mean old-fashioned, liturgical or fundamentalist.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Church:</td>
<td>For the purpose of this survey, “organic church” refers to local church gatherings that do not own property nor have a desire to own property. Within this survey, “organic church” is a local gathering of believers that does not have a paid staff and has no plans to hire a professional staff. For the purpose of this survey, “organic church” does not have formal leadership, rather it participates in a form of leadership that relies on the responsibilities of each believer based on the idea of the priesthood of all believers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section One: Personal Background

Following the definition section of the survey, participants engaged with four sections of questions. Each of these sections was utilized to gather information on the views, ministry and leadership background of each participant. The first of the four was that of questions pertaining to personal background information of the participants of the survey. Within this section of the survey there were five questions, three of which were essential to the understanding the participants in relation to the thesis focus. The three most important questions from this section

---

dealt with length of time each participant had been a Christian, what type of ministry they have been affiliated with, and finally they were asked to rank each church methodology for effectiveness. The first two questions in this section were in relation to personal information that will help to divide up answers within the survey. The third important question from this section allows for an understanding of any personal or professional bias to be recognized.

**Table 2: Length of Time as a Christian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ Years</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the results of this question, the majority of participants have been Christians for significant periods of time. While the answers from participants who have been Christians for a shorter time period and thereby in ministry for a shorter time period will be evaluated in the theses, those with a longer Christian experience provide an understanding of how time and tradition interact with the church methodology and leadership structures of each participant.

---

The above results are those gathered from another primary question for the second section of the survey and are a result of the participants being asked about their personal interaction with each ministry methodology. While it is clear from the results above that the majority of participants have had a majority of their ministry experience with the traditional model of church expressions, the result of that interaction it not as clear later in the survey once individuals are directly asked about elements of ministry. It should also be understood that within the methodology of ministry there are large crossover elements from the organic and hybrid models. This crossover will be taken into consideration during the evaluation and development of the project. What this crossover of elements between these two expressions does is take their results from a clear 26% and 22% into a not so clear 48%. While the crossover of elements from the hybrid into the organic will be considered within the research of this project, it should also be stated that many elements of the hybrid model have transference and crossover into the traditional model and expression of church.

---

12 Lewis, Appendix B, Survey Graphs, 121.

13 Lewis, Appendix B, Survey Graphs, 121.
The third primary question from the second section of the survey was engaging the participants in relation to their opinions on the effectiveness of church structures and methodologies. While it is clear from the results above, that the largest percentage of participants believed that the traditional church was most effective, this number must become compared with the 70% of participants who stated their primary ministry methodology exposure and interaction was with the traditional church model. This information is one of the first telling statistical sings gathered from the survey that crossover elements from one ministry methodology to another have the potential to take place.

Section Two: Church Ministry and Practices

The second section of questions within the survey utilized for this project was a set of fifteen questions that were presented to the participants in such a way as to gain an understanding of their personal views on elements of both ministry methodologies and leadership within church organizations. Throughout this section of the survey there was an intentional removal of any clear theological elements of church methodology. While there were elements of theological implication that are involved with some of the questions presented to the participants, much of the theological overtones were removed to help gather specifically a methodological understanding of each participant in regard to their views on healthy church methodology as well as leadership expressions and structures. While this section covered both methodological and leadership views of the participants, the structure and development of the questions for this

---

14 Lewis, Appendix B, Survey Graphs, 121.
section were done in such a way as to gain an understanding into leadership structures as well as replication methodologies from the perspective of each participant. Below will be reviewed a few of the primary questions that were utilized within this section as to building a foundation of the leadership and replication philosophies of the participants in the survey.

Question eight within this section of the survey dealt with the opinions of the participants in relation to the ownership of buildings and property by churches. This question is foundational for understanding the centralized structure and philosophy for given church expressions and gatherings. The responses to this question also provide a foundational understanding into the leadership structures found within church.

Table 5: The Helpfulness of Property Ownership by Churches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Ownership Helps</th>
<th>78%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Ownership Hurts</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the overall results of this question, the majority of participants felt that property ownership by a ministry helps the ministry function more effectively. Closely linked to this question was the follow-up question on the survey in which participants were asked if paid staff helps or hurts the local church.

Table 6: Paid Vs. Unpaid Church Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paid Staff</th>
<th>84%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Staff</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While both property ownership and paid staff had a large statistically favorability among the participants, the six-percentage increase in favorability for paid staff over property ownership is an important element from the results of these two questions. This percentage increases

---

15 Lewis, Appendix B, Survey Graphs, 121.
16 Lewis, Appendix B, Survey Graphs, 121.
between these two questions will be evaluated in greater detail within chapter three as an important element for understanding the leadership structure and values of the different church models.

Building on the questions related to the participants views on property ownership and paid staff, this section then directed the participants towards their views and understanding of how leadership within the church functions, is utilized and effects ministry. The questions in this section of the survey were developed in such a way as to gather information on the views of each participant in relation to the replication of leadership within the church. These questions and their answers will help to provide an understanding of both the limitations and methodologies of the participants in regard to leadership expressions within their contextual contexts.

Within this section, questions fourteen and fifteen start the processes of understanding the views of leadership from each participant. Question fourteen of the survey dealt directly with the issue of who is and is not allowed to participate in the teaching at church gatherings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Laypeople Vs. Professional Staff Teaching(^\text{17})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laypeople Teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Is Professional Trained Leadership More Effective(^\text{18})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Effective with Professional Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It Is Not More Effective with Professional Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through the information gathered it becomes clear that while most leaders within these contextual structures are split on which individuals within the church should be allowed to teach they are not split on their beliefs that individuals within leadership are more effected when

\(^\text{17}\) Lewis, Appendix B, Survey Graphs, 122.

\(^\text{18}\) Lewis, Appendix B, Survey Graphs, 122.
professionally trained. This information will be analyzed in chapter three for a greater understanding with the percentage discrepancy as well as its impact on both the methodology and leadership philosophies of the ministry models.

Following questions fourteen and fifteen in this section, questions sixteen and seventeen were utilized to gather more information on the beliefs of leaders in regard to how teaching is utilized and replicated within a church context as well as the qualifications of who should be allowed to teach and lead in a church.

Table 9: Is the Sunday Morning Service/Gathering Better Served by A Pastor Preaching Alone or Through Community Discussion\textsuperscript{19}

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor Lead</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Discussion</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the percentages above, the majority of those survey believed that there should be a lead pastor who is over the Sunday morning service and gathering of believers. While these numbers will be broken down in chapter three for a better understanding of the demographics and beliefs of leaders within each methodological style, it should still be understood that the primary belief of most Christian leaders is that service should be lead by one main pastor.

What is interesting about this question and the results are that there is some apparent conflict between them and question fourteen in this section which was reviewed above. In question fourteen of this section, participants were asked if laypeople within the church should be involved with teaching and preaching for main services or just those in official leadership

\textsuperscript{19} Lewis, Appendix B, Survey Graphs, 122.
capacities.\textsuperscript{20} While 56\% of participants believed in this question that teaching should still be up to a main pastor, 44\% believed that laypeople should have a voice in the teaching and preparation for services.\textsuperscript{21} This discrepancy will be evaluated in greater detail in chapter three.

Concluding the foundational questions from section three of the survey, question seventeen was designed with the intention of developing an understanding of what the participants of the survey believed about the professional qualifications for leadership within the church.

Table 10: Should Church Leaders Be Ordained\textsuperscript{22}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should Be Ordained</th>
<th>52%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They Don’t Need to Be Ordained</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the numbers above, the participants within the survey were very close in their beliefs on whether or not a leader within the church should be ordained. This question was presented to those participating in the survey to gather an understanding as to how individuals within each methodology see leadership qualifications of pastors. The intention of the utilization of this question was for the purpose of developing a broader understanding as to how leadership is replicated within specific church models. These numbers, as well as a methodological demographic breakdown of participants in regard to this question will be undertaken in chapter three.


\textsuperscript{22} Lewis, Appendix B, Survey Questions, 122.
Section Three: Early Church Views

Within this section of the survey and research, the participants are confronted with questions that are targeted at the beliefs and understanding of the early expression of church community, as observed in the New Testament. An understanding of how each participant views and implements their understanding of the gathering model of the early church well be helpful to developing potential strategies later in this work for methodological crossover elements within ministry models.

The first question that is foundational within this section of the survey is that of the participants understanding of the descriptions of the early church that are located within scripture as being either prescriptive or descriptive. The intention behind this question was not only to gain an understanding into the views of the participants in regard to the early church but to establish a baseline for how the participants transfer information about the early church in regard to application within their modern ministry and leadership reproduction contexts and methodologies.

**Table 11: Early Church Model: Descriptive or Prescriptive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the numbers appear to show that the majority of participants believe that the gathering models as expressed within the context of the early church in Acts are only descriptive and not necessary for replication within the modern church context, the information will be developed further in the next chapter as to which groups and participants believed which way. It should be noted that participants mostly aligned with their current church methodology in regard to the descriptive or prescriptive nature of the church in Acts for modern day applications. While
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this may seem insignificant, it has implications into other areas of church methodology in relation to what is seen in scripture compared to what is practiced within a modern methodological context.

The next significant question that is addressed within this section of the survey is if the early church had a hierarchical leadership structure. It should be understood that every participant within this survey self identifies as an evangelical Christian and protestant. This question was utilized for the understanding of how participants see historic leadership structures within the church as well as the implications that has on the mission, leadership and participation of those that fall outside of the established leadership structure.

**Table 12: Did the Early Church Have a Hierarchical Leadership Structure?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the results above the vast majority of participants believed that the early church did involve some sort of hierarchical leadership structure. This will be important for understanding the methodological structures of the different gatherings as well as their leadership replication style. These elements will be evaluated further in chapter three, along with a deconstruction of the numbers from each participant and group in relation to this specific element of church history and the survey.

This survey question and its answers of the hierarchical leadership structure of the early church will also be evaluated in chapter three in comparison with the previously mentioned question about if the Bible is prescriptive or descriptive on the topic of church models. The evaluation between these two questions will be that of where individual participants chose to see the New Testament as more historical and where they view it as more mandated for replication.
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Following the previous two questions, the third foundational question that was presented in this survey was question twenty-three and dealt with what factors can influence church methodology in modern contexts.

**Table 13: Can Modern Church Methodology Be Influence by Contemporary Culture or Only by New Testament Examples**

| Methodology Can Be Influenced by Culture | 90% |
| Methodology Should Only Be Influenced by Scripture | 10% |

In one of the most lopsided statistical question results of the survey it was clear that the majority of participates felt that contemporary culture can be allowed to influence the methodology on the modern church. This will be one of the more interesting stats that will be evaluated in chapter three. The results of this statistic will be compared to the results from questions such as the descriptive and prescriptive nature of the New Testament in regard to implementation within modern ministry models and contexts. The results of this question will also play a primary role in the development and argument for crossover methodological practices and leadership replication systems within modern church models.

The final two questions within this section of the survey were designed to get a pulse, not so much for the beliefs of the participants in relation to how ministry works but a more personal perspective of their views on the effectiveness of their specific models and how that relates to the historic church. The first of the two questions dealt with which element of ministry each leader felt the early church model was more effective at than modern church expressions. The follow up question to this was to ask the participants if they believed the New Testament church would recognize the expression of church in the modern North American context.
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Table 14: Which Elements Was the Early Church More Effective At

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evangelism/Outreach</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Less Than 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship</td>
<td>Less Than 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information above reveals some very interesting views of leadership within the modern church. One of the most interesting statistics from this question was that the majority of participants felt that teaching and worship are the areas in which the modern church is most like the early church. Understanding the areas in which modern leaders see their ministry models as closely replicating the early church, or even at times being more effective, will allow for a development from one methodology to another for crossover elements of ministry and practices.

Table 15: Would the Early Church Recognize North American Church Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, They Would Recognize It</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, They Would Not Recognize It</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final foundational question from this section of the survey, as represented above in table fifteen shows another nearly evenly split percentage of the participants. With a majority of 54% of participants believing the early church would not recognize the modern church in a North American western context, this question and its answers are extremely revealing. In the following chapters this question and the responses that individuals provided to it will be explored for a multitude of reasons. The first element of this question and its results that will be explored is that of which methodologies and leaders ended up answering in which way. The second primary element that will be extracted from the results of this question, is if the 54% of participants who feel the modern church would be unrecognizable to the early church, provides
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an opportunity for restructuring and crossover elements from one church methodology to another.

**Section Four: Terminology**

The concluding section of the survey that was utilized for this thesis project was dedicated to developing an understanding of the methodological knowledge of simple church models by the individuals participating in the survey. This section was composed of five questions, broken up into two primary parts. The first part of the last section was made up of four questions dedicated to learning what engagement each participant had with the terminology of simple church models. This simplistic approach was utilized intentionally to provide a foundational understanding of where each participant was in regard to knowledge on simple church practices. It was the belief of the project that for crossover elements to be developed from simple church models into more traditional church models then it was important to know if leadership within traditional church models were engaged with or even aware of the simple church models and methodologies.

**Table 16: Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of “missional communities”?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This first question of the section was utilized for the purpose of developing an understanding of the participants relation with the term “missional community.” This term was intentionally used for a comparison between it and other defining terms from more organic church models and methodologies. In the modern church, the term of missional has large crossover from one church methodology to another. While there is broad crossover amongst
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methodologies of this term, it often means something quite different from one methodology to another. Of the four questions, this one was understood by the survivor to possess some of the largest affirmative answers by the participants. One stat from this question that will be evaluated at length in the following chapter is that of the 28% of participants who had never engaged this terminology. These participants will be evaluated for their ministry positions as well as their other answers to gain a better understanding of how they are separated from this terminology.

**Table 17: Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of “organic churches”?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above question in this section provided one of the most surprising results of the survey. In a church and North American context that is often saturated with the terminology of “organic,” 42% of participants have never even heard of the term “organic church.” This number will be evaluated in the following chapter and compared with the other responses of these participants to see if this is consistent with their understanding of other simple church model terminology and concluding with an evaluation of if they must have an understanding of this expression of church gathering to integrate elements into their current ministry context.

**Table 18: Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of “house churches”?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With a much more affirmative response, the question above shows that the concept of “house church” is more widely known than any of the other simple church model names in
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regard to terminology. One key element that will be evaluated from this section later in the project is the 20% difference between those that have never heard of nor engaged the concept of “house church” with those that have never heard of nor engaged the terminology of “organic church.” This discrepancy will be evaluated to provide an understanding of if the participants see these methodologies and terminology as completely different concepts of church methodological expression or if it is a more simplistic answer of them seeing each term as the same expression of church gathering model.

Table 19: Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of “simple church”?\textsuperscript{31}

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the question related to the terminology of “organic church” the above question about exposure to the terminology of “simple church” is another area in which there was a large percentage of participants who answered that they had never even heard of the terminology of “simple church.” As with the other questions in this portion of the final section of the survey, the answers from this will be evaluated against the responses of the participants in relation to their understanding or lack of understating of other organic church model phrases and terminology. This low number of understanding will be evaluated against the church methodology of those that answered no to this question. This information will then be evaluated in the later chapters of this work to determine if the lack of understanding of the concepts and terminology of “simple church” needs to be clarified with those who don’t understand it, or if elements from the model can be extracted and implemented into other models with a clear understanding of the holistic model of the simple church.

\textsuperscript{31} Lewis, Appendix B, Survey Graphs, 123.
The concluding question of both this section of the survey as well as being the concluding question of the entire survey was specifically chosen and developed to be utilized at the end of participation of those being surveyed. After providing the participants will definitions of different church methodologies as well as a multitude of questions related to organic forms of church expressions and leadership strategies, participants were presented a question to determine their overarching perspective of organic church models within the North American context.

**Table 20: Do you believe different organic church models and gatherings as mentioned in the previous questions have a more positive or negative understanding by those who gather at traditional churches?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the above question where without a doubt the most surprising of the entire survey. When asked if the organic church model had a more positive or negative understanding by those who gather in traditional churches, a staggering 70% of the participants answered that the model was viewed in a negative way by those within more traditional church models. This will be one of the most important answers for engagement going forward in this thesis project. This answer will later be evaluated for an understanding of which participants answered to the negative on this question. This question will also be engaged as a major reference point for developing both an understating of if elements from the organic model can crossover into the traditional model, or if the perceived negative outlook of the traditional church on the organic model will prove too large of a hurdle for the mythological elements and leadership structures to traverse.
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Introduction to Research Conclusion

Moving forward in this thesis, each of these sections from the survey, especially the questions engaged with in this chapter, will be evaluated more in-depth for statistical understanding of the participants that answered each question. This information will be developed in the following chapter in such a way as to provide a statistical foundation for evaluation in the concluding chapters of how and if methodological elements of organic church models and leadership replication styles can be emulated and replicated into more traditional church models without deconstruction and reconstruction of the entire traditional church methodology.
CHAPTER III: APPLIED RESEARCH ANALYSIS

Introduction

With the last chapter of this project functioning as an introduction to the survey and research utilized for this project, this chapter will evaluate the information from the survey in a more holistic manner with the intention of providing the reader a transition of understanding of the purpose of the survey into areas of practical application and ministry recommendations which will follow this chapter. With a focus on extracting specific elements from the survey, this chapter will provide the reader with a more in-depth perspective on the information gleaned from the utilized survey. As in the previous chapter of this work, this chapter will be broken down into sections based on the utilized sections of the survey. The intention of this structure is to provide the reader with a clear and focused look at the answers and results that were introduced in a limited way in the previous chapter.

Survey Elements

Intention of Church Model Definitions

While not primary data extracted from the survey, it is essential to understand the definitions that were foundational to the survey itself. The below definitions are those that were utilized for this project and the research survey that was utilized for the development of this project. The two primary definitions that were addressed in this section of the survey were focused on the two primary models of church gathering evaluated for this project, which were traditional models of church gathering and organic models of church gathering.

Before evaluating the results of the survey, it is important to clarify the wording of the two definitions mentioned above. As well as clarifying the definitions above, it should be understood that these model definitions are limited in their scope based on the intention and...
focus of this project. It should be fully understood that neither of these definitions should be
taken as a complete and total expressions of the methodologies of church gathering that were
evaluated for this project.

Table 21: Ministry Methodology Definitions

| Traditional Church: | Within this survey, “traditional church” refers to any church model that owns or rents property for meetings and services on a regular basis. Within this survey, “traditional church” also refers to any church gathering with a paid staff or clergy. For the purpose of this survey “traditional church” refers to local churches that identify with denominations or titles such as Baptist, non-denominational, Presbyterian, Pentecostal, Episcopalian, Assembly of God, etc. (Traditional church does not mean old-fashioned, liturgical or fundamentalist.) |
| Organic Church: | For the purpose of this survey, “organic church” refers to local church gatherings that do not own property nor have a desire to own property. Within this survey, “organic church” is a local gathering of believers that does not have a paid staff and has no plans to hire a professional staff. For the purpose of this survey, “organic church” does not have formal leadership, rather it participates in a form of leadership that relies on the responsibilities of each believer based on the idea of the priesthood of all believers. |

In the graph above, the traditional church for the purpose of the utilized survey, is defined as, “any church model that owns or rents property for meetings and services on a regular basis. “Within this survey, ‘traditional church’ also refers to any church gathering with a paid staff or clergy. For the purpose of this survey ‘traditional church’ refers to local churches that identify with denominations or titles such as Baptist, non-denominational, Presbyterian, Pentecostal, Episcopalian, Assembly of God, etc. (Traditional church does not mean old-fashioned, liturgical

---

or fundamentalist.)”² Before moving forward in this work, this definition needs to be broken down for the intentionality of its elements as well as impact on the project itself.

In the first line of the definition, traditional church is defined as any church model that owns or rents property for meetings and service. The intention of this element being included within this definition is not only for a structural understanding, but as a distinction between the theological and methodological differences between the organic gathering and this traditional gathering. Within the traditional church, and denominational expressions of the North American church, a large central gathering point is foundational to the local expression of the church and as Neil Cole points out, “We are so accustomed to having a larger gathering for worship and teaching that it is hard for us to imagine church without it.”³ This central gathering point is almost always a building, either rented or owned, by the local gathering of believers. This building is often referred to as the “church.” Individuals within these gatherings will often use phrases such as going to, or attended church, in reference to their gathering at the building. Other expressions such as, it’s time for church, is not intentionally a reference to church not taking place in the daily lives of the believers, rather is an indicating phrase to express the determined time for the gathering of all believers together at that specific and centralized location known as the church building.

Also mentioned in the above definition is the concept of the traditional church being one with a paid staff or clergy. While it should be understood that this project fully understands that traditional church gatherings are full of members and volunteers who are neither professionally


trained in ministry nor paid for their service, the majority of senior leadership positions at these churches are filled and occupied by individuals who are either (or both) trained in ministry through a seminary, school of divinity or school of religion and are paid for their service.  

Within the above definitions of traditional churches there is the statement that traditional churches are affiliated with denominations. While it should be understood that there are expressions of local gathering of believers which could be defined as traditional churches in regard to their model and structure of church gathering who are denominationally unaffiliated, the vast majority of church gatherings within the North American context, which would be defined as traditional church models, fall under a denominational title either officially or through affiliation. For the purpose of this work, traditional churches and their affiliation with a denomination will focus on the leadership structure and methodologies found within the denominational examples. With this leadership focused understanding of the traditional model of church gathering, non-denominational, interdenominational and post-denominational churches, can be included with the denominational understanding of leadership structures because they often have a centralized hierarchical leadership structure similar to denominational churches.  

The concluding element of the above definition of the traditional church model for the purpose of this project states, “Traditional church does not mean old-fashioned, liturgical or fundamentalist.” While it should be understood that many churches within the traditional church model can be defined as old-fashioned, liturgical or fundamentalist, these elements or
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expressions are not all inclusive to all expressions of traditional church gatherings. Within the traditional church model expression of gatherings, individuals can find very modern, progressive, liberal and contemporary examples of worship and teaching.

As with the above reviewed definition of the traditional model of church which was produced for the utilization within the survey for this project, it is likewise important to evaluate the definition of the organic church used for the survey. Within the survey, the organic church model was defined as, “For the purpose of this survey, ‘organic church’ refers to local church gatherings that do not own property nor have a desire to own property. Within this survey, ‘organic church’ is a local gathering of believers that does not have a paid staff and has no plans to hire a professional staff. For the purpose of this survey, ‘organic church’ does not have formal leadership, rather it participates in a form of leadership that relies on the responsibilities of each believer based on the idea of the priesthood of all believers.”

Contained within the first line of the survey definitions of organic church, it is stated that, “for the purpose of this survey, ‘organic church’ refers to gatherings that do not own or rent buildings.” As well as not owning or renting property, the definition goes on to explain that the organic model, as defined within this project, have no desire to acquire buildings or property. This is a major defining element between the defined traditional church model and organic model within the survey and this project. There are two primary reasons for the purpose of this project that the organic church does not own, rent or pursue property. The first of these two reasons is that of how the organic church model interprets the early church within the New Testament. The organic church sees the early church meeting in homes as an example that we are
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to repeat. They see the larger church gatherings as events that are not an adequate representation of the mandated or example of church gatherings as seen in the New Testament. The second of the two primary reasons for the organic model not utilizing owned or rent property is one of more theological significance. These gatherings feel that the church is neither a centralized gathering place nor is it wise of the church to spend money on buildings. Wolfgang Simson explains of the problem with centralized gathering places that they are a “cathegogue system” which was developed after Constantine and adopted a religious system based on the temple of the Old testament and a worship pattern styled after the Jewish synagogue. Wolfgang goes on to explain, that the linking of the synagogue and modern centralized gatherings through the “cathegogue,” which was based according to him, in Greek pagan philosophy, was both unbiblical and a primary reason the modern church structure must be untangled. These two elements of the organic church help to define and dictate much of their theology in relation to being both outwardly focused on mission and decentralized in their gathering methodology.

Another element of the organic church as defined for this projected and the utilized survey for this project is that of not having paid staff. This concept of not having a paid staff has some crossover elements that relate to why the organic church does not own nor rent buildings but also has some major distinctions of its own. One of the primary reasons that the organic church model, as defined for this project, does not support nor have paid staff is that they believe
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the church is made of every believer doing and participating the work of the ministry.\textsuperscript{12} Those within organic methodologies of local church expressions often see the creation of a professional class of ministers as a hindrance to the mission and gospel of Christ. This organic philosophy and methodological ideal of a professional class of ministers being a hindrance to the mission of the church can be seen in Lance Fords work \textit{Un-Leader} when he states, “Most pastors can develop leaders individually, but lack the skill to implement a process of leadership development. When a pastor can’t build systems and structures that support ministry, the only people who are cared for or empowered to lead are those who are “near” the pastor or those very close to the pastor. This limits the size of the church to the size of the pastor.”\textsuperscript{13} It is clear that through the organic philosophy that when an organization starts with a paid staff it can hinder the growth of ministry in all aspects by limiting the ministry to an individual’s personality and talents who has been placed in the lead of the local gathering of believers.

Leadership is another key area that is defined for the organic church for the purpose of this project. From the definition, it is established that the organic church, for the purpose of this work, does not support or believe in “formal leadership.”\textsuperscript{14} This is not to say that there are not leaders within the organic church structure and methodology. The rejection of formal leadership within the methodology of the organic church is based on their interpretation of the priesthood of


\textsuperscript{13} Lance Ford. \textit{Un Leader: Reimagining Leadership... and Why We Must} (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 2012), 38.

all believers as well as their understanding of each believer’s responsibility to function as an active member of a holistic family which is the church that functions as a living organism.\textsuperscript{15}

**Conclusion to Survey Definitions**

These two definitions were provided to those participating in the survey and then utilized for this project for two specific reasons. While it should be remembered that neither definition was holistic of each model, they were intentionally developed for the benefit of both the participants of the survey and the trajectory of project itself. In regard to the participants of the survey, the definitions were crafted with the purpose of unity of understanding on each of the church methodological expressions. While there are many more defining characteristics of each of these models, the elements contained within the survey definitions were intentionally placed for clarity for the participants. While it should be understood that many individuals may have alternative definitions for each of these models of church gathering, the definition was utilized for clarity of specific elements of each gathering model in a simplistic and clear presentation.

In conclusion, by providing the participants of the survey with well-defined elements of each church model, a baseline was developed for understanding their reactions and answers to each of the following questions within the survey. These definitions not only were intentionally developed for the clarity of the participants but also for the utilization of the information gathered in the following sections and questions of the survey. As the survey and its answers are evaluated and presented, it is essential to know that individuals who participated with the survey had an understanding contextually of each church model. This understanding of the church methodology definitions by the participants was designed with the intended purpose of

\textsuperscript{15} Wolfgang Simson and George Barna. *The House Church Book: Rediscover the Dynamic, Organic, Relational, Viral Community Jesus Started* (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 2009), xviii.
evaluating the participants answers to each question in light of their understanding of the foundational definitions utilized within the survey.

**Review of Section One Responses: Personal Background Evaluation**

Following the introduction section of the survey which was designed to primarily provide the participants with an understanding of the definitions of organic and traditional church models, this section of background and ministry experience was developed to better understand each participant and how their individual backgrounds influences their perspective or ministry models and applications of contextual ministry. The personal background section of the survey was composed of five questions which will be in part evaluated below for a better understanding of the intention of each question, as well as possible implications and effects those results have on each participant’s ministry and leadership philosophies as well as their individual methodological preferences.

The first question that was addressed in this section of survey was how long each participant had been a Christian.

**Table 22: Length of Time as a Christian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ Years</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen above 88% of the participants in the survey had been Christians over 10 years at the time of their interaction with the survey. While an assumption of many individuals
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is that younger people or those new to ministry are more open to more simple and organic expressions for church gathering models, the results of the survey revealed that age had little effect on which model and expression of church gathering people would gravitate towards. Because of the professional nature of those surveyed, the majority of the participants have been in their given fields, as well as Christians, for many years. With the majority of the participants being saved for longer periods of time at the time of their participation with the survey, it should not be seen as an invalidation of the data because of a lack of younger Christians, but rather as an intentionally directed element of research in which those who have been in ministry and saved longer were specifically chosen. This intentionality was directed at this group so as to help develop the possibility of crossover elements from one methodology to another when dealing with those that could be unshakably committed to their specific methodological preference and experience.

Following up on the question of how long each participant had been saved, the survey engaged each individual to establish an understanding of what kind of ministry that they were most closely affiliated with at the time of the survey.¹⁸ The survey revealed that 44% of the participants self-identified as affiliated with a singular ministry.¹⁹ Of this the largest majority of individuals were affiliated with the traditional church model. Of the 56% of participants who did not identify with only one methodology in relation to their current work and ministry experience,
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their ministry and work experience was eclectic and fluid in relation to how they self-identified in regard to their current ministry model and work.\textsuperscript{20}

The next important question for evaluation from this section of the survey was that of those taking the survey ranking the organic, traditional and hybrid church models from most effective to least effect.\textsuperscript{21} Of those that participated in the survey, 58\% were able to identify one model over the others as most effective in their opinion.\textsuperscript{22} Of this 58\%, 12 individuals saw the traditional church model as most effective in ministry, 8 individuals ranked the organic church as most effective and 9 individuals chose the hybrid church as most effective.\textsuperscript{23} The remaining 42\% of participants did not clearly identify one methodology as more effective over the others.\textsuperscript{24} These participants were clear in all other answer within the survey indicating an individual choice to not develop a narrative of one methodology being more universally effective over the others.

The collected data from this section of the survey will be utilized within the conclusion of this project for the understanding and development of strategies and potential crossover elements from the organic church model methodology and structure into the traditional church model methodology and structure. Primary statistical elements that will be carried over from this evaluation section of the project into the application section of the project will be the above-

\textsuperscript{20} Lewis, Appendix D, Survey Data, 128.
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mentioned data in regard to the personal ministry experience of each participant, as well as their rankings and views of the most effective methodology for ministry.

**Review of Section Two Responses: Church Ministry and Practices**

Following the above reviewed section of the survey over the personal and ministry background of those surveyed, the survey then questioned the participants on their personal views of church ministry and church practices. This section builds upon the definition section, as it asks directed questions of the participants over their views of elements that were contained within the definitions of the survey. Along with questions related to the definitions, this section of the survey looked to understand a range of issues and elements related to traditional and organic church methodologies and practices.

The first primary question within this section of the survey deals with which elements of church life each individual viewed their current church models as being the healthiest at.\(^{25}\) Individuals were asked between evangelism/outreach, teaching, community, prayer and worship, which was their church was the most effective at.\(^{26}\) The results of the survey were that 8% of the individuals surveyed believe their church was most effective at evangelism and outreach.\(^{27}\) The survey results for those identifying their current ministry as most effective at teaching or community was 41% for each.\(^{28}\) These elements of teaching and community were by far identified as most effective by those taking the survey. Along with the above information,


\(^{26}\) Lewis, Appendix A, Survey Questions, 117.


\(^{28}\) Lewis, “Appendix D, Survey Data, 128.
worship was seen by 8% of the participants as the most effective element of their current church model. Concluding the information gathered from this section of the survey, no participant indicated that prayer was the most effective element of their current church model.\textsuperscript{29}

The follow-up question within this section to the above question was that of which elements of church life did the participants see their current church model as least effective at.\textsuperscript{30} Of those surveyed, 39% believed their current church was least effective at evangelism and outreach.\textsuperscript{31} Following evangelism and outreach, prayer resulted in 32% of those surveyed as the least effective element of their current church expression.\textsuperscript{32} Following prayer, teaching, community and worship came in fairly evenly as the least effective elements of current church models of those surveyed at 12%, 10% and 8% respectively.\textsuperscript{33}

Following the two introduction questions to this section of the survey, individuals were presented with questions that directly related to the definitions of church models that were developed for this project. The first of the questions that interacted with information for the definitions was if those being surveyed believed owning or renting buildings and property helps or hurts the local church.\textsuperscript{34} Of those who were surveyed, 78% believed that owning or renting
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property helps the local church. Only 40% of those surveyed who identified with the organic church as the most effective methodology of church believed the building ownership helps the mission of the local church. Of the 22% individuals who were surveyed who believe the ownership of property hurts the local church, none identify as supporting the traditional model as most effective. This lack of those that endorse the traditional church as the most effective model stands in contract with the 60% of participating individuals who see the organic church as the most effective model which see the ownership or renting of property as hurting the local church.

The next definition related question within this section of the survey was over whether paid staff helps or hurts the local church gathering. The results of this question had 84% of participants believing paid staff helps the local church with 16% believing it hurts the local church. Some interesting findings from within this question are that 40% of those that endorsed the organic model as the most effective believed that paid staff hurts the local church while only one individual who believed the traditional church model is the most effective model of church believed paid staff hurts the local church.

---
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Following the questions within the survey that dealt with specific elements of the survey definitions of church models, individuals were presented with a question dealing with gender and age specific ministries. Those surveyed were asked if they personally felt if age or gender specific ministries were a positive or negative elements of church methodology. Of those that responded to the question, 76% indicated that age and gender specific ministries and programs were positive and 24% believed them to be negative. While the results were mixed as to the current ministry participation and preferences in relation to this question, more individuals from an organic church affiliation answered this question as these elements having a negative effect on methodology.

The eleventh question that was included in the survey dealt with uncovering if the individuals surveyed believed both the organic and traditional models of church gathering were healthy biblical expressions of church gathering. Of those surveyed, 78% believed that both models were expressions of church gathering. This information will be used within the concluding sections of this work to answer the question of if elements of the organic church can
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be appropriated into the traditional model of church gathering. Along with the 78% of individuals who believed both models were healthy expressions of church gathering, 22% of participants believed that both models were not healthy biblical expression of church gatherings.\footnote{Lewis, Appendix D, Survey Data, 128.} Within those that did not believe both models were healthy expression of church gathering none of those who answered no to this question were only supportive of the organic church model.\footnote{Lewis, Appendix D, Survey Data, 128.} Of the eleven percent who answered no to this questions two were specifically affiliated with the traditional model of church gathering.\footnote{Lewis, Appendix D, Survey Data, 128.} Of the remaining individuals who answered no to this specific question, nine individuals had ministry experience and exposure to more than one church gathering model.\footnote{Lewis, Appendix D, Survey Data, 128.} Important to the stats gathered from this question was also the fact that of the eleven that said no to the question, three of the individuals ranked the traditional model as the most effective expression of church gathering and of those three individuals, two individuals only had experience with the traditional model of church gathering within in the North American context.\footnote{Lewis, Appendix D, Survey Data, 128.} This question and its results will be an essential element in answering the overarching questions and potential applications in the following sections of this work.

Individuals were next asked within the survey what they believed a healthy maximum number for a Sunday church service was.\footnote{Aaron Lewis, “Appendix A, Survey Questions: “The Cultural Appropriations of Organic Church Leadership, Rhythms, and Methodologies into the Traditional Church Model” (Doctorate of Ministry thesis., Liberty University, 2018), 118.} Of the leaders who answered this question 26%
believed the maximum number for a Sunday gathering should be between 10 and 100 people.\(^5^4\) Of this 26%, 3 individuals believed gatherings should only be between 10-30 and another 3 believed the size should be between 31-50 individuals in a Sunday morning gathering.\(^5^5\) None of the individuals who believed church gatherings should be under 100 people were from a traditional only model of ministry and the majority had a preference for the organic only or organic model as the most effective model of church gathering.\(^5^6\) Another interesting fact that was gathered from the results of this question was that the majority of individuals who identified as working in either parachurch organizations and professional leadership training, were of the belief that the most healthy maximum number for a Sunday morning church gathering service was 500 or more.\(^5^7\)

One of the most significant questions that was presented in the survey which will be utilized in the concluding sections of this work was the question dealing with the participants understanding and definition of cell groups, body-life groups, small groups, community groups and missional communities.\(^5^8\) While the numbers for this question were almost statistically equal with 48% of participants saying there is a difference between these groups and 52% saying there was really no difference between these groups, the important statement for this work is gathered
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from the 52% who say the models of groups are basically the same.\footnote{Aaron Lewis, “Appendix D, Survey Data: “The Cultural Appropriations of Organic Church Leadership, Rhythms, and Methodologies into the Traditional Church Model” (Doctorate of Ministry thesis., Liberty University, 2018), 128.} This statistic will play an important role in the concluding sections of this work in regards to establishing if elements of the organic church model can crossover into the traditional model of church gathering.

Another element of church gathering methodology that the survey addressed was that of who within a church gathering should be involved with teaching and preparing teachings for main services and gatherings.\footnote{Aaron Lewis, “Appendix A, Survey Questions: “The Cultural Appropriations of Organic Church Leadership, Rhythms, and Methodologies into the Traditional Church Model” (Doctorate of Ministry thesis., Liberty University, 2018), 118.} Of those surveyed 56\% of individuals believed that teaching and preparing teachings should primarily be done by official leadership with 44\% believing anyone within the church should be allowed to participate in teaching and preparation of teaching for main services and gathering times.\footnote{Aaron Lewis, “Appendix D, Survey Data: “The Cultural Appropriations of Organic Church Leadership, Rhythms, and Methodologies into the Traditional Church Model” (Doctorate of Ministry thesis., Liberty University, 2018), 128.} Of those that believed teaching and preparation should be done only by official leadership only two individuals were organic only in their preferences to church methodology.\footnote{Lewis, Appendix D, Survey Data, 128.}

While the previous section surveyed to understand the position of the participants on who should be allowed to teach in main church gatherings, it also served as a segway into the following three questions of the survey. Participants in the survey were next asked if leadership is more effective when it has professional and academic training.\footnote{Aaron Lewis, “Appendix A, Survey Questions: “The Cultural Appropriations of Organic Church Leadership, Rhythms, and Methodologies into the Traditional Church Model” (Doctorate of Ministry thesis., Liberty University, 2018), 118.} In one of the most statistically

overwhelming results of the survey 82% of participants believed leadership is more effective when professionally and academically training. Of the 18% who believed leadership was not more effective with professional and academic training only 2 were from the organic only position of ministry preference. While not completely obvious, the follow up question to this one was closely related as it looked to establish the views of those surveyed as to if the Sunday morning service is better served by an individual such as a pastor preaching or by community discussion. As with the previous question, an overwhelming 80% of those surveyed believed the Sunday morning service is better served by an individual teaching. Of the 20% who believed community discussion was better 37% of those believed the organic model was the most effective model of ministry. The third question in this grouping of questions asked those surveyed if they believed church leaders should be ordained. With the first two questions about leadership within this group of questions resulting in very similar answers, and a large percentage of those surveyed answering to the affirmative over singular teaching, leadership and professional training, when questioned about the issue of ordination, participants had a very different response. When asked if church leaders should be ordained 52% of those surveyed

---
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believed leadership within the church should be ordained, while 48% believed ordination was unnecessary.\(^7\) One of the most interesting results from the gathered information through this question was that answers were not leaning towards a preference towards one model over another. Individuals from each model and mix-model preferences fell into both answers for this question.

The eighteenth question of the survey deals with understanding what the participants believe about the effectiveness of different church models in regard to discipleship. The participants are asked if the organic or traditional model of church gathering is more effective at making disciples.\(^7\) Of those that were questioned for the survey, 60% believed that the organic church model is better at making disciples with 40% believing the traditional model of church gathering is more effective at making disciples.\(^7\) Of those that believed the organic model is better at making disciples, 90% of those that believe that community based discussion is a better teaching model than pastor lead supported the organic model over the traditional model for effectiveness of discipleship making.\(^7\) Along with the information about it was another important element: that only one of the individuals that supported the organic church model as the most effective model believed that the traditional church was better at making disciples.\(^7\)
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Departing from the previous question focused on discipleship, the concluding two questions of this section of the survey focused on gathering information on the participants views on leadership within different expressions of church gathering methodology. The first of the concluding questions in this section of the survey asked participants if leadership is more effectively developed through intentional leadership training and discipleship or through personal experience. Of those surveyed, 58% believed that leadership is most effectively developed through intentional leadership training and discipleship and 42% believed the most effective way to develop leadership was through personal experience. While the majority of individuals within ministry were divided between these two options for leadership training, the majority of those that identified their current work as only or predominately leadership training believed that intentional leadership training and discipleship was the best form of leadership training and replication.

Concluding this section of the survey, the participants were asked if they believed leadership could more effectively be developed through traditional or organic church expressions of church gatherings. The responses for this question were equally divided between those that
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believed the organic church is the most effective at developing leadership and those that believe the traditional model of church is most effective at developing and replicating leadership.  

**Review of Section Three Responses: Early Church Views**

The next section of the survey was designed not only to interact with those participating in the survey in regard to their personal views and interpretations of the early church, but also to understand how these views influence their contextual application of church methodology into a modern context. Within this section of the project the answers of the participants’ views of the early church’s methodologies and leadership replication structures will be reviewed for a better understanding of where participants from different backgrounds fall in relation to interpretation and application of certain church practices.

One of the most important questions for understanding the participants of the survey is the first question located within this section of the survey. Participants in this question were asked if they believed the way the early church was portrayed in the New Testament was more descriptive or prescriptive. The question then goes on to explain to participants that it is looking to understand if the participants believe early elements of the first church such as meeting in homes, sharing meals and having all things in common was a directive for all following generations of church gathering models, or was it more just recording how church looked in the cultural context of the early church gatherings. Of those that participated in the

---


survey, 70% believed that scripture was descriptive and 30% believed scripture was prescriptive in regard to understanding elements of the early church gatherings.\textsuperscript{82} While the minority of participants believed the biblical record of methodological elements of the early church were prescriptive, there is a very interesting bit of information to be gathered from those that believed the biblical recorded of the early church was prescriptive. Of the 30% of participants who believed the biblical recorded of the early church was prescriptive a larger number of participants were from those individuals who identified with only one church model.\textsuperscript{83} Of this 30% of participants who believed the early account of how the church gathered was prescriptive, 50% were from only one specific modern church gathering model and methodology.\textsuperscript{84} For this 50% of the 30% that answered the biblical account of the early church was prescriptive in regards to model and practices, there was an even division between those that identified as only affiliated with the organic, traditional and hybrid model of church gathering.\textsuperscript{85} This is possibly one of the most telling elements within the responses within the survey due to the fact that it shows an entrenchment by some of those that identify with only one model of church gathering as biblical.

Following the above question within this section, participants were asked if the early church had a hierarchical leadership structure.\textsuperscript{86} Within this question, individuals were not provided with a definition of what a biblical hierarchical leadership structure was. This was done
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intentionally so that participants brought their personal understanding of hierarchical leadership to their interaction with the question. Within this question, 78% of those surveyed believed there was a hierarchical leadership structure within the context of the early church model within scripture. Of the 22% of individuals who did not believe the early church had any form of hierarchical leadership structure, there was little to no consistency in regard to their church methodological backgrounds.

The next question within this survey was one of the most lopsided in regard to answers from the participants. Individuals in this question were asked if modern culture can help define effective church methodology or if methodology should only be defined by the examples found within scripture. Of those surveyed an overwhelming 90% believe that modern church methodology can be influenced by contemporary culture. This overwhelming percentage stands in direct contrast with the above question dealing with whether or not the biblical account of the early church is either prescriptive or descriptive. Of the 10% of those that answered that methodology cannot be influenced by modern culture, 40% were those that were of a background or believe that only one model of church methodology is biblical. While a small number of participants believe the methodology of a modern church should only be influenced

---
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by the early church, within that small percentage, the majority of those who believe the church should only be influenced by the early church come from singular church methodological backgrounds in which they believe is a direct representation of what is seen in the early New Testament church gathering model.\footnote{Lewis, Appendix D, Survey Data, 128.}

The third question of this section asked participants which of five elements the early church was better at than modern church gatherings.\footnote{Aaron Lewis, “Appendix A, Survey Questions: "The Cultural Appropriations of Organic Church Leadership, Rhythms, and Methodologies into the Traditional Church Model" (Doctorate of Ministry thesis., Liberty University, 2018), 119.} Of these five elements, 48% of participants believed that the early church was better at evangelism and outreach and 38% of participants believed the early church was more effective at community than modern church expressions.\footnote{Aaron Lewis, “Appendix D, Survey Data: "The Cultural Appropriations of Organic Church Leadership, Rhythms, and Methodologies into the Traditional Church Model" (Doctorate of Ministry thesis., Liberty University, 2018), 128.} While these numbers are not surprising, what was revealing within the answers to this question was that less than 10% of participants believed the early church was more effective at teaching, prayer and worship.\footnote{Lewis, Appendix D, Survey Data, 128.} While it is good that modern leaders feel their churches are effective in these areas, it is a point of pause to wonder why leaders believe their church is more or equally effective in certain areas as the early church was.

The concluding question of this section presented participants with a choice between if the early Christians in the New Testament would or would not recognize current church models in North America.\footnote{Aaron Lewis, “Appendix A, Survey Questions: "The Cultural Appropriations of Organic Church Leadership, Rhythms, and Methodologies into the Traditional Church Model" (Doctorate of Ministry thesis., Liberty University, 2018), 120.} Of those that answered this question the responses were evenly divided with
46% of participants stating the early church would recognize the modern church and 54% stating the early church would not recognize the modern church. With many of the questions within this survey that had answers that were evenly divided between participants, there was an element of encouragement that should have been taken away from the responses. Within this answer however it should be a point of pause for readers to understand that over 54% of leaders who were surveyed for this project did not believe the early church would even recognize their modern brothers and sisters.

**Review of Section Four Responses: Terminology**

The fourth and final section of the survey that needs to be reviewed in detail for understanding of the participants and methodological predispositions they brought with them to the survey, is the terminology section of the survey questions. This section of the survey was made up of five simple questions that were directed at understanding the participants views of missional communities, house church gatherings, organic church gatherings, the simple church model and concluding with an opinion question directed at determining the participants thoughts on the overarching elements and methodologies of organic church expressions.

Starting off the concluding section of the survey, individuals were asked if they had ever encountered or participated in the concept of missional communities. Of those surveyed 72%
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answered that they had either heard of or participated in missional communities at some point in their personal or professional ministry life and experience.\textsuperscript{101}

The follow-up question to the introduction question of this section of the survey asked the participants if they had ever encountered or participated with the concept of organic church gatherings.\textsuperscript{102} Of those surveyed 58\% said they had either participated with or heard of organic church models, while 42\% answered that they had never participated in or heard of organic church models and methodologies.\textsuperscript{103} The results of this question are important when evaluated in relation to the results of the question above about missional communities. While most concepts of missional communities come out of more organic models of church gatherings, it is interesting that more participants have encountered the concept of missional community over that of organic church. This issue will be addressed in the concluding chapter of this work.

The third question that was presented to participants within this section dealt with their understanding of the term house church.\textsuperscript{104} Individuals participating in the survey were asked if they had ever heard of, encountered or participated in the concept of “house church.”\textsuperscript{105} Of those surveyed 78\% said they had encountered in some way the house church movement with 22\%
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stating that they had no concept of the house church at all.\textsuperscript{106} While the 22\% of individuals that answered this question with a no is a small percentage, it is an important percentage.\textsuperscript{107} It was a surprise of the conducted survey that a significant percentage of those in professional ministry whether church, parachurch or Christian leadership training had not heard of the concept of the house church movement.

The follow up question in this section to understating the participants’ connection to and with the house church was the question dealing with the term “simple church.”\textsuperscript{108} In this question participants were asked if they had ever heard of, encountered or participated in the concept of “simple church.”\textsuperscript{109} For this question 58\% of those who were surveyed answered that they had engaged the simple church model in some way and 42\% answered that they had never encountered this terminology.\textsuperscript{110} While the amount of participants who answered no to this question was almost double that of those who had not engaged the term house church, it is not surprising being that this terminology is often a subcategory of organic and house church models.

The concluding question of this section and of the survey itself was intentionally placed at the end to give participants time throughout the survey to understand what the survey was
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dealing with as well as the terminology and concepts of different church models. In this concluding question, participants were asked if they believed organic church models and gatherings are mentioned in the previous questions have a more positive or negative understanding by those who gather at traditional churches. Of those surveyed, 70 percent believed that the majority of those gathering in traditional churches have a negative understanding of those that gather in organic church models. While throughout the survey there were many areas that opinions were leaning more heavily towards one side of an issue. Where this question and its results are different than the other questions in the survey is that participants are directly asked about how people under their care feel about the organic church.

This question was designed to gather information from leaders in such a way that they would get an honest answer. While this question in regard to its results may be surprising in its percentage of those that have a negative opinion of the organic church, what should not be missed by both the leaders who were surveyed and those reading this project is the fact that these people must have developed their negative views of the organic church model and that often times, negative opinions by those within a church or an organization, come from how the leadership of that organization interact with other methodologies.

Survey Review Conclusion

Within this chapter each of the sections located within the utilized survey for this project were reviewed. Each question within each section of the survey was reviewed for a better understanding of the statistical results of the survey. Each question was designed to gather


information to help develop an understanding of the beliefs, understanding, and views of the participants in regard to different ministry models. The stats that were unpackaged and revealed in this chapter were done so to help with the development of the final chapter of this project. In the opening chapter of this project a statement of the problem and a statement of the purpose of this project was presented to the reader as, “The intention of this thesis project is to establish the fungibility of leadership and methodological elements of organic and missional community expressions of the local church as well as parachurch organizations into more established and traditional models of church gatherings.” The answers and the statistics from this chapter will be utilized in the concluding chapter to establish both if and which leadership elements and ministry methodologies from organic and localized parachurch organizations can be implemented into the methodological systems contained within more traditional church models.

The primary questions and elements from this research review section that must be focused on for the development of solutions to the problem and question of if elements and methodologies from organic models of church can be implemented into more traditional models of church gatherings, starts with a primary question from section one of the survey. The fourth question of the survey asked participants to rank traditional, organic and hybrid church models from most to least effective.¹¹³ This was one of the most interesting questions in the survey and the results were encouraging in relation to the question of if elements of the traditional church would be able to utilize elements from the organic church models. Participants were divided fairly evenly in relation to those that believed without conflict that one model was more effective than others. While this division may appear to be discouraging for the crossover of elements and

methodologies from one model to another it is encouraging because it shows that there is not a foundational biased on a significant level towards the traditional church as the most effective. This is not to say that a preference to the traditional church model’s effectiveness is a wrong preference, it just shows that the majority of leaders surveyed did not have an overwhelming belief that the traditional church model is the only way to do ministry. This is very encouraging in developing an understanding of if elements of the organic model can be moved to the traditional church models.

The next primary question from the survey that must be reflected upon in the development of the final chapter of this paper is found in section two of the survey. In question six located in section two of the survey, participants were asked which element of church life they believed their current church was most effective at. There were two primary results of this questions that will be utilized in the final chapter of the survey. The first result from this question that must be reflected on is that none of the pastors or leaders said prayer was the most effective element of the current church model. This was one of the most disturbing results of the entire survey. While this information does not directly relate to the development of one methodology over another, it is something that must be essential to the health and biblical development of any church leadership or methodological model of church gathering.

The second element of question six that is important for development of crossover elements from the organic model of church gathering to more traditional models is that only eight percent of participants believed evangelism and outreach was the most effective element of
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ministry within their current model of church gathering.\textsuperscript{116} While the organic model is often seen as a more small and nimble model, this survey result shows that both models need to have a more outwardly and service minded model of ministry. This will be an area of the organic church model of community that can be addressed within the more traditional model of church gathering with the avoidance of arrogance for the simple reason that neither model is exceling in this principle area.

Question eleven in the survey will be the next question that is evaluated in the final section of this work for its relation to the potential crossover elements from the organic to traditional model of church gathering. In this question survey participants were asked if both models of church gathering were healthy models.\textsuperscript{117} The results of this question are extremely encouraging for the potential of cross over elements from one model to another. 78\% of the participants believed that both models are healthy biblical expressions of church gathering.\textsuperscript{118} Of those that answered no to the question, only two were specifically affiliated with only the traditional model of church gathering.\textsuperscript{119} This result is extremely encouraging for answering the question of if elements can be transferred from one model to another.

For the fourteenth question in the survey participants were asked if laypeople within the church should be involved with teaching and preparing teaching for main church services and
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gatherings or just those in official leadership positions.120 While the majority of those affiliated with only the traditional model felt that only official leadership should be preparing teaching, there was 44% of participants who believed that laypeople should participate in the process of message preparation.121 This does show that there is a good percentage of leadership within church models that believe that teaching is not owned by official leadership and shows promise for the mobilization of all members for the work of ministry even in the area of teaching and the preparation of teaching.

In question eighteen of the survey participants were asked if they believed the organic or traditional model of church gathering was better at making disciples.122 With 60% of participants believing the organic model of church is better at making disciples, an encouraging tone can be set from these results for the question of if the traditional church can implement elements of organic church expressions.123 With the majority of participants being from more traditional models of church gathering, the results of this question show that leaders are willing to see and acknowledge that other models can be better than their current models is in certain areas.

Concluding the second section of the survey, participants were asked if they believed leadership can most effectively be developed through traditional church models and education or


through organic church models.\textsuperscript{124} With an even split of 50% for each of the answers to this question, it is encouraging for the transfer of elements from the organic to traditional when 50% of participants believe that the organic model is more effective at training and replicating leadership.\textsuperscript{125}

Within the third section of the survey there were two questions that are essential to answering the question of if elements of the organic church can be implemented within more traditional church gatherings. In question twenty-one of the survey, those surveyed were asked if the early church of the New Testament was portrayed in scripture in a way that was more descriptive or prescriptive.\textsuperscript{126} Of those surveyed, 70% believed that the account of the methodology located within scripture in regard to the gathering practices of the early church were descriptive.\textsuperscript{127} These results are encouraging to the discussion of if elements from the organic model can be transferred to the traditional model by revealing that the majority of participants are not dogmatically dedicated to their methodological expression of church gathering based on a biblical methodological mandate.

Closely related to results of question twenty-one in relation to answering the question of if elements of the organic can be transferred to the traditional model of church gathering are the


results of question twenty-three in the survey. In question twenty-three, those surveyed were asked if modern culture can help define effective church methodology or should church methodology only be defined by the examples found within the New Testament. With one of the most lopsided results of the survey, 90% of those surveyed believed that church methodology can be influenced by modern culture. When answering the question of if elements from the organic model can be utilized within the traditional model of church gathering it is encouraging when individuals are not entrenched in a methodology of the New Testament’s cultural elements dedicated to modern expressions of church gatherings models. While there are still those who are dedicated to their specifically model of church expression, it makes the discussion on the transfer of elements from one model to another much easier when people are not basing their methodological model on misplaced scripture utilization.

The final question from the survey that will be utilized in the final chapter for both answering the question of if organic church methodologically elements can be utilized in traditional models as well as how to methodologically accomplish this, can be found in question thirty of the survey. In question thirty of the survey, those surveyed were asked if the organic models of church gathering had a more positive or negative understanding by those who gather in traditional church models. The results of this question, with 70% of participants believing the organic church has a negative understanding by those within more traditional models of
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church expression, can be seen as discouraging to the question of if elements of the organic model can be utilized more traditional models of church expression. What will be reviewed in the final chapter of this project is that while there is a belief that the majority of those within the traditional model of church gathering have a negative opinion of the organic model, this is just an opinion and that there appears to be more of a misunderstanding than a dogmatic, negative view of the organic church gathering model.

The above information and data has been reviewed from the results of the utilized survey and two primary conclusions can be drawn from the information gathered. The first element of information gathered from this question was that the majority of participants did not fall into neat categories based on their methodological affiliation. The second primary element for focus resulting from the survey was that stereotypes of methodologies do not stand firm enough to justify their distinctions between methodologies. With focus on these primary elements of discovery from the survey, this paper can enter its concluding chapter answering the question of if methodological elements of the organic church can be utilized within the traditional church model with a positive tone and affirmative answer.
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CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSION

Recapping and Making It Work

As this project concludes it is essential to remind the reader that contained within the initial chapter of this work, in the section titled “Statement of the Problem,” it was stated that, “The intention of this thesis project is to establish the fungibility of leadership and methodological elements of organic and missional community expressions of the local church as well as parachurch organizations into more established and traditional models of church gatherings.” Along with this statement from the “Statement of the Problem” section of the project, within the abstract of the project, it was stated that, “The metanarrative of leadership replication strategies and methodological elements which are foundational to the bio-communities contained within the context of simple and organic church expressions will be evaluated for their replication within the traditional church context.” These two statements, and the implied question of, if and what elements from organic expressions of church gatherings in relation to leadership and replication can be utilized within more conventional church methodological expressions were evaluated in this section. Within this concluding chapter, this question will be answered in the affirmative along with provide elements and examples for transference from organic expressions of church gathering into conventional church gathering models.

Before this chapter answers the above question and provides solutions for conventional churches in regard to utilizing organic church elements into their methodological expression, it will provide a brief review of each previous chapter and section of the paper for context for answering the question of what elements from organic church expressions and methodology can be utilized in conventional church expressions as well as how to utilize these elements. This
review will not only provide the reader with a reminder of what elements were contained in each chapter, but will extract and highlight key elements for providing solutions for potential crossover elements from the organic model into more conventional and traditional expressions of church gathering.

**Chapter One Recap**

Chapter one of this project served as an introduction for the entire project. Chapter one of the project was designed as a space where the primary issue and question of if elements of the organic church methodology in regard to leadership and replication could be utilized in a healthy way within more traditional and conventional church expressions was introduced to the reader as well as setting other parameters and explanations for the purpose of the project.

Special terminology that would be used within the project was also outlined within chapter one. While many of the words and terms that were defined in the special terminology section of the work are common to English, their contextual definitions in relation to their utilization within organic church expressions was essential for the establishment of the project as well as clarification for their intended purpose and utilization within the project itself. The majority of these special terminology definitions were provided so as to allow the reader to have a foundational understanding of how these definitions are applied within the context and methodologies of the organic church parameters.

Following the special definition section of the project, a section establishing the limitations of the project was presented to the reader. While the limitations of the project are far more numerous than was outlined in the limitations section, the elements that were chosen to be defined in the limitations section were done intentionally for the focus and development of the project. Opening with the statement, “The primary intention that this thesis project looks to
accomplish, is if the leadership methodologies and practices found within organic, missional communities and parachurch organizations, as defined in the project, can be replicated within more traditional expressions of church gatherings, or if they can only be fully expressed within more organic models of Christian community,” the statement of limitations section of chapter one was designed to focus readers on this intention of the work, while avoiding other elements of the discussion of organic versus traditional church methodologies that would not have propelled the project forward in its intention.

The next section of chapter one was designed to establish the theoretical basis of the project itself. The theoretical basis section of the paper looked at three primary elements which were biblical data in regard to church gathering methodologies and leadership replication, the theological impact of the organic community expressions of church gatherings, and an evaluation of the methodologies and leadership replication philosophies of Christian leaders through survey data. Each of these elements of the theoretical basis section of the project were developed so as to establish a foundation for if and how elements from the organic church methodologies for leadership and replication can be utilized in modern, conventional expressions of church gathering.

Chapter one followed up its theoretical basis section of the project with a “Statement of Methodology” section. This section of chapter one was designed to provide the reader with an outline of the flow of each chapter of the project, as well as setting up foundational elements and understanding for each of the chapters and sections of the project.

Concluding chapter one were multiple sections addressing utilized scripture and literature for the project. This section was developed to provide the reader with an understanding of primary works and elements both from literature and scripture for the foundation and
development of the project. By defining each work and passage briefly, this section was designed to provide the reader with a foundational look at the background elements for this work, as well as establish a common understanding for the reader of organic methodological elements and community mindsets of these church gathering expressions.

Chapter Two Recap

Chapter two of the project was an introduction of the research, individuals, and groups that were utilized and evaluated for the development of the project. As stated in the introduction of chapter two, “The intention of this chapter is to provide a foundational understanding of the groups surveyed as well as the intention of the questions and categories utilized within the survey.”

Within chapter two, before aspects of the survey were developed and explained, the chapter defined the research methodology used for the project to the reader. In this section, elements such as literature and the utilized survey were introduced to the reader for a greater understanding of the intention of the project and its development. Along with this introduction to the elements of the survey, this section of chapter two also defined the academic and professional aspects of the survey and research that was done for this work. Primarily in this section, how the sample type of people, as well as the sample size of the survey, and how each impacted the research was presented to the reader. This section explained both the positives and negatives of the survey and research types utilized for this work, as well as limitations that this type of research may possibly have had on the project’s overall development and effectiveness.

The third and concluding primary element of chapter two of this project was an outline of the survey and its primary sections and elements. The intention of this section of the work was to provide the reader with a foundational understanding of the sections of the survey as well as their
purposes. Each section of the survey was developed in this portion of chapter two so as to provide an overview of both primary results, as well as the intentions of the questions and purposes of the elements of the survey. While some of the primary results of the survey were included in this section of chapter two, the intention of this portion of the project was designed as an introduction to the survey which would introduce the reader to a preliminary understanding of the survey before the survey was fully evaluated within chapter three of the project.

**Chapter Three Recap**

Chapter three is possibly the most important chapter of this project. While chapter one functions as an overview of the project and chapter two functions as an introduction to the research of the project, chapter three contains an evaluation of each primary question from the survey, as well as the results and implications of those results to the overall purpose of the survey. As well as the primary presentation and evaluation of the survey, its results and possible implication of these results, chapter three serves, along with the appendixes on the survey and its results, as a tool for research and ministry coordination for the readers and others looking to evaluated elements, attitudes, and realities of leadership from different expressions of church gathering methodologies. While the questions contained within the survey were specifically tailored for the purpose and development of this project, the results of the survey can be utilized for evaluation into the understanding of modern church methodologies and mindsets outside of the limitations of this project alone.

While chapter three reviewed each question from the survey, as well as presenting important results from the data collected from each question, seven of the survey questions are essential for understanding in this concluding chapter for the development of what, if any, elements from more organic church expressions can be utilized within traditional church models,
as well as how this process of methodological crossover in regard to elements may be implemented. These questions help to show that there is a potential and willingness on the part of leadership within more conventional expressions of church gathering to utilize healthy elements of the organic church methodology within their own context.

**Willingness for Change**

The first question to look at for understanding if there is the potential for the utilization of organic elements of church gathering into more conventional church gathering models is question four from the survey. In this question, participants were asked to rank traditional, organic, and hybrid church gathering models from the most effective to the least effective.¹ What was important to look at was the raw numbers of those that did not have conflict in their answer. What is meant by “no conflict” for this question, is that the participant had to rank all three differently. While the traditional model of church was ranked as the most effective, only 24% of participants who had no conflict in their belief of model effectiveness ranked the traditional model as the most effective.² This information is encouraging to the question of if organic methodologies can be utilized within more conventional and traditional expressions of church methodology by showing the majority of participants are not dogmatically or ideologically dedicated to their personal church expression. While this does not mean they will be willing to implement these elements from the organic model into their local church gathering context, it does provide the opening for conversations and the potential of crossover of elements.
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Question eleven of the survey is another area of data that reveals there is the potential for elements of the organic model to be utilized within the traditional model of church gathering. In question eleven of the survey, participants were asked if they believe that the organic and traditional models of church gathering methodologies were both healthy and biblical expressions of church gatherings. The results to this question were that 78% of participants believed that both models of church gathering were healthy expressions of church methodology. While this stat does not show if participants of different models and methodologies would be willing to utilize elements from different expressions of church gathering models, it does show that the majority of participants saw different models as healthy parts and expressions of the kingdom work on earth. This question reveals the potential for the conversation to take place over the utilization of elements from one healthy model into another.

**Reflection on the Early Church and Modern Culture**

Question twenty-one of the survey interacts with the survey participants in a manner as to determine how they see the example of the early church in scripture with the intention of utilizing this information for determining if whether or not organic church methodological elements have the potential to crossover into more conventional church gathering expressions. As mentioned previously in this work, in question twenty-one of the survey, those surveyed were asked if the early church of the New Testament was portrayed in scripture in a way that was
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The results of this question showed that, 70% of leaders who participated in the survey believed that the account of the methodology located within scripture in regard to the gathering practices of the early church were descriptive. The results of this question are again encouraging to answering the question of if organic methodology can be utilized within more conventional models and expressions of church gathering. With the majority of pastors and leaders utilized for the purpose of the survey being from non-organic backgrounds, the results of this question show that a majority of participants do not hold a dogmatic methodological attachment between their current models and methodology and that of the early church as expressed in the New Testament. The encouragement that can be extracted from this statistic for the crossover utilization of elements from the organic model of church gathering into more traditional and conventional expressions of church gathering is that if leaders do not believe the methodological expression of church gathering example as seen in the New Testament was prescriptive, then their current model and methodology must be flexible to change based on the fact that it is not a biblically mandated methodological model of church gathering expression. Simply stated, this opens the possibility for discussions to take place for the potential crossover of methodological elements from the organic models and expressions of church gathering into more traditional and conventional expressions of church gathering.

As with question twenty-one above, question twenty-three again results in an understanding that leaders who participated in the survey could be open to the possibility of elements from more organic models and expressions of church gathering to crossover and be
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utilized in more conventional expressions of church gathering models. In question twenty-three, participants were asked if modern culture can help define effective church methodology, or should church methodology only be defined by the examples found within the New Testament. This question resulted in one of the most lopsided results in the survey with 90% of participants answering that church methodology can be influenced by modern culture. As with question twenty-one, the results of question twenty-three show that the majority of leaders are not dogmatically dedicated to their methodology as a biblical mandate. While these results do not mean that a conversation with leaders in regard to utilizing methodologies from other church gathering models will be easy, it does show that there is methodological wiggle room from many leaders which at the very least opens the possibility to conversations about methodological effectiveness and change.

**Organic Reflection**

While the above two sections of question reflections were utilized to show room for the potential of the transference of organic methodological elements into more conventional church gathering models, this section of survey question reflections more directly focuses on the survey participants feelings and understanding of organic methodologies and results in regard to certain areas of ministry.

Within question fourteen of the survey, participants were asked if laypeople within the church should be involved with teaching and the preparing of teaching material for main church
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services and gatherings, or just those in official leadership positions. While the majority of participants felt that only those within official leadership positions within the church should be involved with teaching and preparing teaching for main church gatherings and services, 44% of leaders surveyed believed that laypeople within the church should be involved in the process of preparing and teaching at main gatherings. While 44% is not a majority of the leaders surveyed it is a significant enough number to highlight that there is the potential for the crossover of the more organic methodological practice of members and laypeople participating in the preparation of teaching into more conventional expressions of church gathering. While the majority of leaders from more conventional and traditional expressions of church gathering fell within the 56% of leaders that felt teaching and its preparation should only be done by staff, there was a significant enough element of conventional and traditional church leader participants contained within the 44% to signal room for crossover of this more organic church practice into the conventional church model expression.

In question eighteen, participants were presented with a question that was directly intended to discover their beliefs in regard to one of the primary elements of church life and ministry. Within question eighteen, participants were asked if they believed the organic or traditional model of church gathering was better at making disciples. With many of the questions allowing for the questions to be somewhat ambiguous on intention, this question
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directly confronted participants with a key ministry requirement of all Christians and local church gatherings. With a result that showed both honesty and humbleness on the part of participants, 60% of participants believing the organic model of church is better at making disciples. With the majority of participants not coming from organic models of church gathering, the results of this question show two primary things that are important to the development of this project. A main point of reflection on the results of this question is that many leaders within all models of church gathering expressions are willing to reflect on what they are good and bad at. While this may not be universally true, in the case of the utilized survey for this project, participants showed great humbleness in their willingness to look at another model of church gathering and express that they believed that model was better than their current expression of church gathering at doing something as important as discipleship. It should also be understood that the intention of this question and this project was not to establish if one model was in actuality better at elements of church, but rather to establish if there was the potential for the crossover of elements from one expression of gathering to another. In seeing that many leaders saw another model other than their current church gathering model as better at something as important as discipleship, shows that there is the potential for conversations and utilization of methodology and elements from one model and expression of church gathering into another.

Located within question twenty of the survey utilized for this project, leaders were presented with a question that got to the heart of this project. In question twenty participants were asked if they believed leadership can most effectively be developed through traditional
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church models and education or through organic church models.\textsuperscript{13} As mentioned earlier in this work, with a split of 50\% for each of the answers to this question, encouragement for the transfer of elements from organic expressions of church gathering into more traditional and conventional expressions for church gatherings is found.\textsuperscript{14} While not all conventional and traditional leaders believed the organic model was better at creating leaders, a significant enough number of conventional church leaders believed the organic model was better at replicating leadership so as to highlight the fact. While the results of this question do not prove which model is truly better at the replication process, what the results do show is that leadership across methodological models is willing to recognize significant areas of the church’s responsibility and be willing to reflect on if their current model is the best or if other models can be gleaned from for greater training and effectiveness.

As a reflection on the above-mentioned survey questions and their results, along with other information gathered through the entire survey, it becomes evident that there is room within traditional and conventional expressions of church gathering models for the implementation of elements from more organic and expressions of church gathering. While not all of those surveyed who were aligned with more conventional and traditional models of church gathering models were willing to acknowledge that there are areas of the organic model and methodology they can learn from or adopt, many were willing to entertain and interact with the possibility that there are elements of the organic model that they are either lacking in or could improve on.

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
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Making the Changes

For conventional church models to be able to take steps in adopting elements from more organic expressions of church gathering models, two primary things must take place. Leadership within more conventional expressions of church gatherings must first look into the ideology, structure, and ministry methodological elements within their current model. Only through genuine reflection can change take place if and where change needs to occur. The second thing that must take place in conventional churches to adopt elements from more organic expressions of church gatherings is to have some elements of organic methodology and practice that can be implemented for ministry, training and replication. These practices and elements will help to instill a DNA of organic methodology and more organic ministry into the lives of those within more conventional expressions of church gathering models.

Below are listed some of the primary areas of focus both biblically and theologically that will help to facilitate the transition of more conventional expressions of church gathering into a more missional and organic approach for ministry implementation. While not exhaustive, this section will provide a foundation for leaders to reflect on in regard to primary transition ramps in the process of moving from one methodological expression to another. This list does not provide a blueprint for a holistic transition from conventional and traditional church models into organic models, but rather provides simple suggestions that will help to utilize and implement organic methodology and ideology into conventional church models in which the changes can help and impact in a positive way the Kingdom mission in their local contexts.

Before any transition can be made within any methodology, prayer needs to be central in the life and ministry of those looking to make changes to the mythological trajectory of their local ministry context. While prayer may sound like a forgone conclusion in the organizational
life of any ministry mythological strategy, in reality, the research reflects something very different. When participants were asked which element of church life they believed their current church model was most effective at, prayer came in with zero percentage of leaders saying it was their most effective element. This was the lowest ranking of any element by any of the leaders surveyed. While God has multiple avenues of communicating with his people, his people only have one way to communicate with him: prayer. When prayer is non-existent in a ministry there can be no expectations for change, growth or healthy biblical mission. With that said, prayer for the sake of prayer is not healthy either. Prayer by leadership must be biblical and intentional in its direction and purpose. Francis Chan suggests that before praying, individuals should stop praying and take a long hard look at God and who he is before they speak another word. Leadership, must know who God is in his character, person and mission so as to know how to pray in relation to where their ministry and its mission progresses. Chan also expresses the idea that our lack of intimacy with God is often a result of our refusal and inability to unplug and shut off communications from all others so we can be alone with him. This ability to learn who God is, so individuals know how to pray, as well as doing and teaching the practice of unplugging from distractions to be alone with God, is foundational to any ministry but specifically for local ministry contexts that are looking to make changes to have a more holistic biblical family and mission. Leaders within any church methodological expression who are looking to make changes will do nothing biblically if there is not a foundational practice on their part and on the part of


those they lead in relation to knowing God, being alone with God, and speaking with God. For any church expression looking to make a transition into more organic and missional expressions of church gathering, prayer is not just needed but an unshakable requirement.

Closely related to prayer in regard to making any transitions from conventional and traditional church models into more missional and organic ministry models is the practice and discipline of humility on the part of leadership and those the leadership is being replicated within. Leadership that is not humble will struggle to see doing things in a different way than they have always done things. These same leaders will have hurdles such as pride that get in the way of their ability to make changes. One reason that self and pride get in the way as a hurdle for change is that many leaders fail to understand that, death of elements within their methodological model must take place as a prelude for resurrection and change to occur within the mission and ministry. For leaders looking to move from more conventional expressions of church gathering into the realm of more organic church practices, must have the ability to say, the way we have been doing it, the way I have been doing it, has either been wrong or not as effective as it could be, which takes a massive amount of self-awareness, submission to Christ, love of people and finally, humility. Humility in leadership of putting others and mission first as well as being willing to change course in regard to where an organization has been going are extremely powerful elements in the life of leaders looking to mobilize others in a new direction. John Dickson states that, “humility has the potential to enrich a leader.” He goes on to explain that humility enhances persuasiveness, partly because it is a compelling character trait in leadership.
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When attempting to mobilize an organization from something that it has always done and been into something that is new, uncomfortable and possible scary to those within the church or organization, humility accompanied by biblical leadership and the depths of confidence and convictions can go a long way to bring the rest of the organization along with any methodological changes being made.\textsuperscript{21}

A third element that is essential for any organization looking to change its methodology is an openness to observe what others have done and are doing in their methodological models. Dave Browning states that, “when we are no longer manic about the parts we like, we can see the reality of other parts of the picture. If we have enjoyed belonging to a large ministry, we will still be able to appreciate a smaller one. If we feel at home in an unstructured setting we will still be able to appreciate the value of structure.”\textsuperscript{22} This willingness to be open to others’ methodological ideas is essential if a conventional or institutional church model is looking to attempt to utilize elements from more organic expressions of church gathering models into their own model for the health and growth of the Body of Christ in their given context. This concept of openness is not done in a vacuum, but rather it is done through humility, prayer and reflection on scripture. It must be remembered that personal comfort and methodological elements are not the goal but rather the kingdom work of serving others and laying up treasure in heaven.\textsuperscript{23} When leaders in the church begin to lay up their treasures in heaven, their mission becomes that of treasuring of Christ’s perfection and mission which takes the focus off what is wanted by a specific
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methodology and becomes a desire to do more holistic and healthy mission in the local context.\textsuperscript{24} While ministries can have the most creative, qualified, and intelligent people working with and for them, it is always important to observe what others who are on mission are doing with a willingness to learn from them. A benefit above and beyond the health of a local ministry, this willingness allows for a local gathering of believers to understand in a greater way their connection to the greater Kingdom body outside of their own local context and gathering. While openness is an important mindset and element for change for any organization, openness does not mean that what is observed is right biblically or even contextually right for a specific ministry. Through the observation of ministry models, learning may in the end be the most important thing to take place over change itself. While the transference of organic elements into more traditional expressions of church gathering must take place through engagement and observation, this same observation and engagement will allow for leaders to observe what has not worked for other ministries and avoid those possible negative decisions and elements taking place in their own ministries.

The next key element that traditional church models and methodologies must engage in if they are looking at utilizing more organic methodologies and ministry elements into their own context, is that of empowering the body for the work of ministry. For empowerment of each believer to take place, local church gatherings must first fully understand that the mission of the local gathering of believers “is to make the invisible kingdom visible through faithful Christian living and witness-bearing.”\textsuperscript{25} Trevin Wax builds on the purpose of the local church gathering

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 188.

when he states, “The local church is the place where we put into action all that we believe.” If the local gathering of believers has the purposes of faithful Christian living and witness-bearing, along with being a place where Christians put into action all that they believe, then the local gathering of believers must be designed in such a way to support this process through the discipleship and empowerment of those within the gathering model. The organic church has a methodology that is dedicated to making each participant an active member of the mission of the local church. Often times more conventional expressions of church gatherings have an established structure in each element of their local ministry which at times can hurt the freeing and empowerment of each believer for the work of the ministry. What is meant by the empowerment of each believer in the body is that of discipleship for the purpose of replication within the Kingdom. Atkerson states that, “the growth of the believers and the multiplication of leaders through the process of discipleship, are the healthy signs of a biblical church.” Atkerson goes on to explain that, “in our modern-day system, discipleship is not a significant and necessary task of the church, and Christianity without discipleship is always Christianity without Christ.” To empower believers is at its core the concept of removing individuals from a plug-n-play ministry methodology where individuals are utilized to fulfill tasks of “ministry” within the local church, and places them into a model and structure of replication discipleship which at its core is about making more about Jesus and less about the model or structure of a local ministry. This empowerment of each believer has the effect of making the local gathering stronger, more effective, and makes each member an actual participant in all elements of kingdom work, and not
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just tasks that are needed to maintain the institutional workings of a conventional church gathering model.

A final element that must be implemented by local conventional church models if there is a desire to implement more organic elements into their methodology, is that of replication. It should first be understood that replication and growth are very different things. While a Church can grow in size and numbers it does not mean that they are replicating disciples that participate in ministry and the process of replicating disciples themselves. When biblical replication is the focus over raw growth, the end result will always be numerical growth but it will be done through a discipleship process that understands a sustainable model of replication over that of growth for the sake of growth. While many organic models of church gathering utilize “multiplication” in their rhetoric and concept of replication and growth, their dedication to remaining small often times runs in contrast to kingdom mission and explosive replication. This is an area where more conventional models of church gathering can implement an element of organic ideology and possibly do it better. If larger and more conventional church gatherings become dedicated to the idea of discipleship and empowerment of each believer for the work of ministry, they must start with saying “no” to the unhealthy practice of a few individuals at the top doing all or most of the ministry.30 When a larger church starts to say “no” to doing everything from a position of leadership, and begins to move and focus on an organic methodology of empowering each believer for the work of ministry, they will see explosive growth that is organic in nature as it is done through each individual while simultaneously growing the larger gathering through many individuals doing the work of ministry in their daily

lives in a much more simple process which is healthy and repeatable.\textsuperscript{31} Neil Cole builds on this concept when he states, “Today, many who are called pastor never equip the saints to shepherd others; instead, they try to do all the shepherding themselves. We’re not suggesting that the tile of pastor be taken away from these people who are caring for a flock, but this does not fulfill the intent of Ephesians 4:11. We do, however, strongly encourage pastor to expand their sense of service and personal identity to include equipping other saints to do what they alone have been doing for so long.”\textsuperscript{32} Simply stated, the empowerment of every believer for the work of the ministry will grow the kingdom, make it healthier, and relieve pressure from those currently in leadership who are expected to be spiritual superheroes.

**Suggestions for Practical Transitions**

For conventional models of church gathering expressions looking to implement elements into their current methodology from more organic expressions of church gathering, the first thing that must be understood is that elements from organic models of church gatherings are best utilized and implemented through small numbers of believers gathering together. While conventional churches by their nature are often larger than the gatherings found within the organic community of the church, this does not mean there are not ways that organic elements can be implemented into the conventional model. The most effective place within conventional expressions of church gathering models for the crossover of organic elements to be utilized within traditional church models is the small group setting. Small groups within a larger, more conventional church models, are positioned to function in some ways the same as an organic church expression is if the small groups are equipped, freed and empowered to resemble more
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organic expressions of church gathering. For the conventional church model to truly utilize organic elements within its model, there must be a dynamic – almost revolutionary – shift in focus from the centralized gathering of the church being the primary focus, into a methodology where the local church gathering is outwardly focused through the mission of the Kingdom through the small, missional, and community groups. Alan Hirsch quotes Machiavelli on this idea when he writes, “There is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more difficult to handle, than to initiate a new order of things. For the reformer has enemies in all those who would profit by the old order, and only lukewarm defenders in all those who would profit by the new.”

This idea of struggle for change is something that has caused the organic model to often times see themselves as needing to segregate from more conventional models and expressions of church gathering. Many times, the leaders within the organic movement do not believe that true missional living can be completed through more institutional models. The leaders within the organic church will often reference the power and institutional elements of conventional church models as evidences and support for their arguments that conventional churches cannot be missional or organic in methodology or practice. While there seems to be an antithetical attitude from those within the organic model toward the ability of the conventional church structure to be organic and missional, there are still open doors for this change to take place.

Hirsch and Frost go on to express that they do not advocate a one-size-fits-all approach, which allows for churches in different ideological and methodological contexts.

---


34 Ibid., 19.
to reflect on the elements of the missional organic church model through humility, prayer and openness for the potential for crossover of elements.\(^\text{35}\)

Understanding small groups within more conventional expressions of church gathering models, as having the potential to function as missional communities and to serve as a more outwardly focused expression of the living system that is the Body of Christ, will assist in the transition of conventional churches to more organic methodological styles with outwardly focused ministry purposes.\(^\text{36}\) Hirsch explains that, “all living things seem to have innate intelligence. Living systems, whether organic in form or systemic organizations, seem to have a life of their own and possess a built-in intelligence that involves an aptitude for survival, adaptation, and reproduction.”\(^\text{37}\) These small groups is where the mission and life of the church can be lived out in the life of each believer within the church. The small group allows for the members of more conventional expressions of church gatherings to move from being observing consumers of a Sunday morning service, into active participants in the mission of Christ and his Church. Each member of a local gathering of believers must see themselves as a missionary in their daily lives and part of living system that is the Body of Christ.\(^\text{38}\) Lance Ford expresses that for too long, members of local church gatherings believe they are to do evangelism at home and missions in some faraway place.\(^\text{39}\) While the issue is that most in the church do neither evangelism nor missions in their local context, small groups, just as organic churches can be a
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place to shift this dynamic for the health of the church. Ford and Hirsch go on to express that, “Christians who earn a living as teachers, accountants, store clerks, mechanics, plumbers, doctors, whatever – you are a missionary!”\textsuperscript{40} The idea of every believer as a functioning missionary helps to move the conventional model of church gathering towards that of the organic model and this is best done through the small groups that see themselves and function as active, living systems, that are on mission for the Kingdom. There is no way for any expression of conventional and traditional models of church gathering to move to more missional and organic elements of church gathering outside of the small and missional group structure.

The next question that must be asked is, how can the small groups within more traditional and conventional models of church gathering support the implementation of organic elements into their larger church context and model. One of the key ways that the small groups within a church can facilitate a more organic methodology is through leadership development and training. For many conventional church expressions leadership is left to those with professional training. Outside those in positions of official leadership, many members, if they get involved at all, are utilized in a ‘plug-n-play’ ministry system. What this means is that often times the spiritual gifts and talents of individuals are not cultivated for the benefit of the kingdom, rather individuals are used to fulfill needs the church already has. While this is not always a negative element within conventional expressions of church gatherings, it can have the unintended consequence of making people feel used and ultimately not be engaged outside of being an observing consumer of church services. Small groups are a place within the conventional church expression where small group members can emerge as leaders and be brought into deeper
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connection with the Body of Christ and the mission of the larger church. While McConnell is speaking about multisite churches when he expresses the potential for leadership and connection, the principal transfers over to small groups by their nature of being small and more nimble like a new church plant or campus site. In these small groups the priesthood of every believer can be worked out both in community and mission in a more intimate and healthy way.

Small groups for leadership replication and a missionary mindset of members is key to the utilization of organic elements into the traditional church model. Conventional church models have very specific leadership structures which at times can stifle the development of each individual as a leader within the localized context. Within small groups, that have an organic mindset, it becomes much more simplistic to discuss leadership development in three key areas. These three areas are: replication, spiritual gifts, and the mindset that each individual is a leader or influencer in their given context which works its way out in deeds, mission, and works.

Replication is the biblical idea and concept of making disciples. The making of disciples is not the adding of ‘Christians’ to the pews on Sunday morning in a church service, but rather making disciples that are on mission to replicate the process in the lives of others. This process starts with a foundation that is based on being in community with those who are not saved with the intention of evangelism. David Wheeler explains that ‘hanging out with a purpose’ is a primary foundation for being in community with unsaved individuals with evangelism as the intention and foundation of hanging out with them. In the majority of churches, at best Christians will invite others to church with them, and at worst will attended service within no
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spiritual interaction outside the walls of a ‘church’ building. The organic methodology is highly focused on being in relationship with lost people within the local proximity of the local gathering of believers. This model of being in community with lost individuals, as seen in the organic church, can be utilized in the small groups of a conventional church model as a point for relationship building, with the desire of evangelism, conversion, and then replication of the process. Through the small groups, individuals can rise up and see themselves as replicators in the body of Christ. This model empowers each believer while providing them with ownership of their responsibility in the work of the Kingdom. Small groups take place in the common places and spaces of the lives of Christians. These small groups, just like the organic church, can allow for the replication of the model that was set by Christ in John 2:1-10, where he is seen in the most common places of fellowship in his community as was provided the opportunity to show himself to others for the replication of followers.\textsuperscript{44} Small groups, just as organic churches, can help to decentralize members outside the walls of a building into their communities with the intention of outreach, evangelism, service, and relationship building for the ultimate purpose of the growth of the Kingdom through the replication and growth of the followers of Christ.

The second two areas that small groups allow the church to function in a more organic methodology are in the areas of spiritual gifts and leadership replication. While these two may seem like very different issues, their relationship in the organic model is inseparable and can be utilized and expressed in the same way within the small groups of more conventional church models and expressions. Dealing first with spiritual gifts, it is no big secret that conventional church models do not help individuals recognize, develop, and utilize their spiritual gifts in biblically healthy ways. If an individual within a conventional church model has the spiritual gift

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 206.
of service, often times, the church will find a need in the church and plug the individual in and work them till they burn out. In the organic church model, each of the spiritual gifts has a much greater capacity to function within the needs of the family because of the small nature of the group. Within a conventional church model, there is a safety net to pick up the slack where individuals are not utilizing their spiritual gifts. In an organic church, however, the spiritual gifts must work together to make the environment healthy and biblically successful. The small groups within a conventional model, when decentralized from the larger gathering, allow for the same model of spiritual gifts to be utilized as within the organic model of church gathering expressions. Within this model, the body can help individuals to recognize their spiritual gifts and then utilize them for ministry on a much deeper level than just a plug-n-play utilization of those gifts.

The small setting of the organic church also has the potential to change the dynamic of leadership development within the context of small groups within the conventional church model. Within the organic church gatherings, it is expected for everyone to participate in the teaching time of the gathering. This does not mean that there is not a director of the lessons and conversation, but what it does mean is that the organic methodology creates an environment where participants are expected to contribute to the conversation and teaching. In this environment, those who have the gift of teaching and leadership can express these gifts in a way that a larger church gathering may not allow. Through the development of these individuals organically in the process of teaching and leading in the small group, leaders can be developed to leave the group, develop a new group, and multiply the process over and over again. This process of leadership development and replication can be transferred from the organic model into that of the conventional church small group methodology. The small group model of the
conventional church must learn to develop muscles that are often neglected within the context of the conventional model of church gathering. By the small group leader training and developing more leaders, and then sending them out to replicate the process, progress is made in the spiritual dimension which allows not only for the spiritual growth and health of the individual, but the replication of the process which leads to the growth of the Body of Christ. This process looks very similar to how the organic and house church models replicate leadership and growth and can be repeated in the conventional church model when done properly through the small group model.

Practically speaking, there are hundreds of ways small groups within a conventional church model expression can be more organic, but as examples a few suggestions will be provided to help in the understanding of the process of moving small groups from inwardly focused biblical studies into outwardly focused, missional groups.

Organic church models allow for a high level of accountability in the works of ministry. Along with this accountability, the organic model allows for encouragement and engagement of each member in the work of the ministry. In a larger church setting individuals can become lost and unengaged, which hurts both the spiritual growth of themselves and the larger church body. By utilizing elements and methodologies of organic methodology into small groups this potential hurdle of conventional church models can be averted.

Another area within the small group setting that can resemble the organic church model is that it is much simpler to have conversations with participants about issues such as: when was the last time they shared the gospel, and if they have invited others to the small group. The small
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group, if done in a healthy way, does not become a place of condemnation for not doing these things, but rather a place for growth and development in these areas. When these elements are developed in a healthy way through the small group, the individual grows, the groups grow, and Christians are multiplied in a way that is repeatable and sustainable.

Small groups, when empowered, can much more easily serve and meet their needs in an organic way that the larger conventional church gathering struggles with. Small groups know the needs of their neighbors and community, and can plan to serve and reach these individuals through meeting their needs and loving them on a personal level. Engaging and serving at community events, as well as holding events for the small group in which the community is invited, are simple ways for small groups to function in a capacity much more similarly to the organic church model. When individuals within the small group are encouraged, empowered, and supported to be creative in ways to serve and reach the community, the small group can become a micro church within the context of the larger conventional church gathering.

**Areas for Further Research**

While this project has done due diligence to keep focused on the intention and purpose of the foundation of the project itself, there are elements that are related to the topic that are of value for further research to develop this study even further. Within the intentional limitations of this project, many relevant topics have been limited in their inclusion into this project but in further research will support the development of the discussion of, if, how, and what elements of the organic church model and methodology can be utilized within more conventional and traditional expressions of church gatherings. Below are a few areas for further research and development of this conversation and topic in relation to the utilization of organic elements into the conventional expression of church gathering. While the below topics are still limited in their
scope and impact on the discussion of crossover elements from one ministry model and methodology to another, they each possess significance for impact on the overall discussion.

A primary area of research that would be a benefit to the metanarrative of if organic church gathering practices can be utilized within more conventional church gathering expressions of the local church, would be to evaluate and study elements of conventional church models for their biblical versus traditional origins. By having an open and honest discussion about which elements of church life may possibly be based out of tradition rather than biblical mandate, discussion and opportunities become possible for leadership within the conventional church model structure to reevaluate their methodologies while becoming more open to the possibility that other methodologies such as the organic church may have value in their elements that can contribute to the overall health and mission of the conventional church model.

Another area that came to light during the process of the research for this project for further research would be a comprehensive study on the understanding of the terminology of conventional versus traditional church models. As this project progressed, it became apparent that while the project and its survey at times used the word traditional to label institutional models of church gathering, this brought confusion to the overall discussion. For many individuals, the terminology of traditional does not mean the institutional church models and methodologies, but rather invokes thoughts of fundamentalism, traditional worship styles and more of a North American, old-time church understanding. By clearly developing an understanding of how leaders within both the organic and conventional church models understand and define the terms of conventional and traditional, it will help to propel and develop the discussion of the utilization of organic church elements into the conventional church
model through a more clear and better understanding of each model and how to present the
discussion to leaders in each model more effectively.

A third element for further research into the topic of crossover church methodological
elements will be to engage the leaders and participants of organic church models and ministries
in surveys and discussion based research with the intention of developing a comprehensive
understanding on how they became involved and introduced to organic church models and
methodologies. This line of research will help to develop an understanding of what percentage of
participants in this methodological model came from more conventional church backgrounds and
which participants had this as their first and primary encounter with the Kingdom. Through this
research a narrative will be developed in regard to those who came from more conventional
church backgrounds into the organic model and how they first engaged the organic model of
church gathering. Understanding reasons such as a belief in the model’s ministry effectiveness,
disenfranchisement with current models, ministry opportunities, biblical model understanding
and interpretation, as well as personal relationships for making the transition from more
conventional church gathering models into more organic expressions of church gathering will be
key to developing an understanding of the function and mindset of those within the organic
church methodological structure. This understanding can then be utilized to further develop the
conversation of if elements from the organic model of gathering structures are transferable into
more conventional expressions of church gathering models.

A final area for research into the development of the intention and ideas found within this
project will be research into ministry statistics found within the organic church model.
Understanding the rates of conversion, baptism, replication, and giving as it takes place within
the organic church structure will better develop the conversation of where and if the model
contributes to more healthy church community in these areas. This information should be then utilized to develop further research into understanding how the organic model either contributes or hinders the functioning of ministry in each of these elements of church ministry.

**Final Thoughts**

The intention of this work has not been to promote the organic or house church gathering model as a more biblical model over that of conventional and traditional expression of church gatherings, but rather to open the door to leadership and individuals within the conventional and traditional models of church gathering for the observation and the consideration of the possibility of the utilization and implementation of organic elements into their local ministry contextual structures and expressions. Through research and interaction with those involved within different ministry methodologies, it was the intention of this work to develop an understanding of what leaders from ministry model backgrounds believed on different methodological topics, and then analyze that information to see if it provide for the fungibility of leadership and mythological elements of the organic and missional community expressions of the local church to be integrated into more conventional expressions of local church gatherings.

It is the belief of the researcher and this project that through the information presented in this paper that there are possibilities and the willingness of many within conventional church models to at least have the conversation about adopting elements from the organic church model and at best an openness to implementing and learning from this methodological expression of the universal kingdom of Christ. For many within the conventional church model it is not so much that they are appositionally against elements of the organic church methodological structure, but rather are unaware of the model and how it could influence and impact their contextual ministry in positive and Kingdom building ways.
When the mission of Christ, people, and the replication of kingdom gatherings is placed as the foundation of conversations and ministries, leaders show that they are willing to observe, learn, and try new things for the health of the family and the expansion of the Body of Christ on earth.
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Survey Questions

Title of Project:

The Cultural Appropriations of Organic Church Leadership, Rhythms, and Methodologies into the Traditional Church Model

For the purpose of this survey definitions:

Traditional Church:

Within this survey, “traditional church” refers to any church model that owns or rents property for meetings and services on a regular basis. Within this survey, “traditional church” also refers to any church gathering with a paid staff or clergy. For the purpose of this survey “traditional church” refers to local churches that identify with denominations or titles such as Baptist, non-denominational, Presbyterian, Pentecostal, Episcopalian, Assembly of God, etc. (Traditional church does not mean old-fashioned, liturgical or fundamentalist.)

Organic Church:

For the purpose of this survey, “organic church” refers to local church gatherings that do not own property nor have a desire to own property. Within this survey, “organic church” is a local gathering of believers that does not have a paid staff and has no plans to hire a professional staff. For the purpose of this survey, “organic church” does not have formal leadership, rather it participates in a form of leadership that relies on the responsibilities of each believer based on the idea of the priesthood of all believers.

Section One: Personal Background

1. How long have you been a Christian? (Choose one)
   A. 1-5 years
   B. 6-10 years
   C. 11-15 years
   D. 16-20 years
   E. 21+ years

2. Which type of ministry most closely describes your personal ministry work experience? (Choose all that apply):
   A. Traditional church
   B. Organic church
   C. Hybrid church
   D. Parachurch organization
   E. Professional leadership training
3. If you have only worked in one form of the above-mentioned ministries, have you ever been exposed to any of the others? If so, which ones? (Choose all that apply):
   A. Traditional church
   B. Organic church
   C. Hybrid church
   D. Parachurch organization
   E. Professional leadership training

4. Please rank these three church gathering experiences from most effective, to least effective, in your opinion, with 1 being most effective, and 3 being least effective:
   _____ Traditional church
   _____ Organic church
   _____ Hybrid church

5. Please indicate how long you have participated in each of these church models:
   _____ (years) Traditional church
   _____ (years) Organic church
   _____ (years) Hybrid church

Section Two: Church Ministry and Practices

6. Which of these elements of church life do you believe your current church model is most effective at: (Choose one)
   A. Evangelism/Outreach
   B. Teaching
   C. Community
   D. Prayer
   E. Worship

7. Which of these elements of church life do you believe your current church model is most ineffective at: (Choose one)
   A. Evangelism/Outreach
   B. Teaching
   C. Community
   D. Prayer
   E. Worship

8. Do you believe owning or renting buildings and property helps or hurts the local church? (Choose one)
   A. Helps
   B. Hurts

9. Do you think paid church staff helps or hurts local church gatherings? (Choose one)
   A. Helps
   B. Hurts
10. Do you think age and gender specific ministries and programs are a positive or negative church methodology style? (Choose one)
   A. Positive
   B. Negative

11. Do you believe that the organic and traditional church models are both healthy biblical expressions of church gathering? (Choose one)
   A. Yes
   B. No

12. What do you believe is a healthy maximum number for a Sunday morning church service or gathering? (Choose one)
   A. 10-30
   B. 31-50
   C. 51-100
   D. 101-500
   E. 501 +

13. Do you believe there is a difference between cell groups, body-life groups, small groups, community groups, and missional communities? (Choose one)
   A. There is a difference
   B. They are basically the same

14. Do you believe that laypeople within the church should be involved with teaching and preparing teachings for main church services and gatherings, or just those in official leadership positions? (Choose one)
   A. Primarily official leadership
   B. Anyone within the church

15. Is leadership more effective when it has professional and academic training? (Choose one)
   A. Yes
   B. No

16. Do you believe that the primary Sunday morning service/gathering is better served by an individual preaching (i.e. pastor), or by community discussion? (Choose one)
   A. Pastor lead
   B. Community discussion

17. Do you believe church leaders should be ordained? (Choose one)
   A. They should be ordained
   B. It doesn’t matter if they are ordained
18. Do you believe the traditional or organic church model is better at making disciples and replicating leadership? (Choose one)
   A. The organic church model is better at making disciples and replicating leadership
   B. The traditional church model is better at making disciples and replicating leadership

19. Do you believe leadership is more effectively developed by intentional leadership training and discipleship or through personal experience? (Choose one)
   A. Through intentional leadership training
   B. Through personal experience

20. Do you believe leadership can most effectively be developed through traditional church models and education or through organic church models? (Choose one)
   A. Through traditional church models and education
   B. Through organic church models

Section Three: Early Church Views

21. Do you believe the way the early church was portrayed in the New Testament is MORE descriptive, or prescriptive? Meaning, do you believe the gathering of believers in homes, sharing meals, and having all things in common, was more cultural, or an exact pattern the modern church should try to emulate. (Choose one)
   A. Descriptive
   B. Prescriptive

22. Do you believe the early church had an organized hierarchical leadership structure? (Choose one)
   A. Yes
   B. No

23. Can modern culture help define effective church methodology, or should church methodology only be defined by the examples found within the New Testament? (Choose one)
   A. Methodology can be influenced by culture
   B. Methodology should only be influenced by scripture

24. Which of these elements do you believe the early church structure was more effective at than current church structures and methodologies: (Choose one)
   A. Evangelism/Outreach
   B. Teaching
   C. Community
   D. Prayer
   E. Worship
25. Do you believe the early Christians of the New Testament would recognize current church models in North America? (Choose one)
   A. Yes
   B. No

Section Four: Terminology

26. Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of “missionsal communities”? (Choose one)
   A. Yes
   B. No

27. Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of “organic churches”? (Choose one)
   A. Yes
   B. No

28. Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of “house churches”? (Choose one)
   A. Yes
   B. No

29. Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of “simple church”? (Choose one)
   A. Yes
   B. No

30. Do you believe different organic church models and gatherings as mentioned in the previous questions have a more positive or negative understanding by those who gather at traditional churches? (Choose one)
   A. Positive
   B. Negative
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Survey Graphs

1. How long have you been a Christian? (Choose one)

- 1.5 years: 51%
- 6-10 years: 18%
- 11-20 years: 16%
- 21+ years: 6%

2. Which type of ministry most closely describes your personal ministry work experience? (Choose all that apply):

- Traditional: 26 (50%)
- Hybrid: 13 (25%)
- Organic: 16 (30%)
- Pan-church org: 9 (18%)
- Professional: 9 (18%)

3. If you have only worked in one form of the above-mentioned ministries, have you ever been exposed to any of the others? If so, which one? (Choose all that apply):

4. Please rank these three church gathering experiences as most effective, in your opinion.

- Traditional: 29%
- Hybrid: 43%
- Organic: 28%

5. Please indicate how long you have participated in each of these church models:

6. Which of these elements of church life do you believe your current church model is most effective at? (Choose one)

7. Which of these elements of church life do you believe your current church model is most ineffective at? (Choose one)

8. Do you believe owning or renting buildings and property helps or hurts the local church? (Choose one)

9. Do you think paid church staff helps or hurts local church gatherings? (Choose one)

10. Do you think age- and gender-specific ministries and programs are a positive or negative church methodology style? (Choose one)
21. Do you believe the way the early church was portrayed in the New Testament is MORE descriptive or prescriptive? Meaning, do you believe the gathering of believers in homes, sharing meals, and having all things in common was more cultural or an exact pattern the modern church should try to emulate? (Choose one)

![Chart]

22. Do you believe the early church had an organized hierarchical leadership structure? (Choose one)

![Chart]

23. Can modern culture help define effective church methodology, or should church methodology only be defined by the examples found within the New Testament? (Choose one)

![Chart]

24. Which of these elements do you believe the early church structure was more effective at than current church structures and methodologies? (Choose one)

![Chart]

25. Do you believe the early Christians of the New Testament would recognize current church models in North America? (Choose one)

![Chart]

26. Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of "missional communities"? (Choose one)

![Chart]

27. Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of "organic churches"? (Choose one)

![Chart]

28. Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of "house churches"? (Choose one)

![Chart]

29. Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of "simple church"? (Choose one)

![Chart]

30. Do you believe different organic church models and gatherings as mentioned in the previous questions have a more positive or negative understanding by those who gather at traditional churches? (Choose one)

![Chart]
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Tables

Table 1: Ministry Methodology Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Church:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within this survey, “traditional church” refers to any church model that owns or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rents property for meetings and services on a regular basis. Within this survey,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“traditional church” also refers to any church gathering with a paid staff or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clergy. For the purpose of this survey “traditional church” refers to local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>churches that identify with denominations or titles such as Baptist, non-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denominational, Presbyterian, Pentecostal, Episcopalian, Assembly of God, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Traditional church does not mean old-fashioned, liturgical or fundamentalist.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organic Church:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the purpose of this survey, “organic church” refers to local church gatherings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that do not own property nor have a desire to own property. Within this survey,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“organic church” is a local gathering of believers that does not have a paid staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and has no plans to hire a professional staff. For the purpose of this survey,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“organic church” does not have formal leadership, rather it participates in a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form of leadership that relies on the responsibilities of each believer based on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the idea of the priesthood of all believers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Length of Time as a Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ Years</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Ministry Model Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry Model</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Church</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Church</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Church</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parachurch Organization</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Leadership Training</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Effectiveness of Ministry Methodologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Church</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Church</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Church</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: The Helpfulness of Property Ownership by Churches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership Type</th>
<th>Helpfulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Ownership Helps</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Ownership Hurts</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Paid Vs. Unpaid Church Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Staff</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Laypeople Vs. Professional Staff Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff Teaching</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laypeople Teaching</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Is Professional Trained Leadership More Effective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Type</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Effective with Professional Training</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It Is Not More Effective with Professional Training</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Is the Sunday Morning Service/Gathering Better Served by A Pastor Preaching Alone Or Through Community Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor Lead</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Discussion</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Should Church Leaders Be Ordained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordination Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should Be Ordained</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They Don’t Need to Be Ordained</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Early Church Model: Descriptive or Prescriptive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Did the Early Church Have a Hierarchical Leadership Structure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Structure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Can Modern Church Methodology Be Influenced by Contemporary Culture or Only by New Testament Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology Influence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influenced by Culture</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenced by Scripture</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Which Elements Was the Early Church More Effective At

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evangelism/Outreach</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Less Than 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship</td>
<td>Less Than 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Would the Early Church Recognize North American Church Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, They Would</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, They Would Not</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of “missional communities”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of “organic churches”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18: Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of “house churches”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>78%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Outside of Christian academic studies, have you ever heard of, encountered, or participated in the concept of “simple church”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>58%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Do you believe different organic church models and gatherings as mentioned in the previous questions have a more positive or negative understanding by those who gather at traditional churches?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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April 10, 2017

Aaron Lewis
IRB Exemption 2822.041017: The Cultural Appropriations of Organic Church Leadership, Rhythms, and Methodologies into the Traditional Church Model

Dear Aaron Lewis,

The Liberty University Institutional Review Board has reviewed your application in accordance with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations and finds your study to be exempt from further IRB review. This means you may begin your research with the data safeguarding methods mentioned in your approved application, and no further IRB oversight is required.

Your study falls under exemption category 46.101(b)(2), which identifies specific situations in which human participants research is exempt from the policy set forth in 45 CFR 46:101(b):

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:

(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Please note that this exemption only applies to your current research application, and any changes to your protocol must be reported to the Liberty IRB for verification of continued exemption status. You may report these changes by submitting a change in protocol form or a new application to the IRB and referencing the above IRB Exemption number.

If you have any questions about this exemption or need assistance in determining whether possible changes to your protocol would change your exemption status, please email us at irb@liberty.edu.

Sincerely,

G. Michele Baker, MA, CIP
Administrative Chair of Institutional Research
The Graduate School

IRB Approval

Liberty University | Training Champions for Christ since 1971