

Enduring Cultures of Laity

Charles Crow, D.Min.

Introduction

At the Evangelism Conference in Fort Worth, Texas I was captivated by a comment made by Dr. Bill Sullivan. In a seminar presentation, he reflected on the observation that in general, most local Nazarene churches had not grown larger in the past twenty five years. He paused and then in what appeared to be an after thought he said "they don't appear to have gotten much smaller either."

His comment triggered the thought in my mind that if they are staying about the same size over a long period of time the reason must be located in their culture or their paradigms. Virtually every church loses people every year. They must know how to find and take in new people or they would be getting smaller. Apparently what they don't know how to do is change.

Could it be possible that the laity, the families and individuals who make up these churches, think of their churches in ways that are different from the ways that we as leaders think of them? Perhaps a different size is somehow a different kind (cultural paradigm) of church. Quite possibly certain paradigms impede growth while others are more accommodating of growth.

Intrigued by this thought I returned to Bethany and began to work on ways to uncover the meaning of what he had suggested. I have had the great pleasure of interviewing laymen, pastors, district superintendents, and just about anyone else who would give me the time. I have surveyed the pastor/students in my Master of Ministry classes and in workshops held on various districts. I have completed all but the dissertation for a second doctorate in human service administration. Dr. Sullivan's insight initiated a process that has kept me challenged and motivated from that day to this.

About this same time Dr. Sullivan was also promoting a film by Joel Barker called "Paradigms: the Business of Discovering the Future." In the film, and in the book by the same title, Barker argues that it is our paradigms that keep us from seeing the opportunities for change and defines a paradigm as "a set of rules and regulations (written or unwritten) that does two things: (1) it establishes or defines boundaries; and (2) it tells you how to behave inside the boundaries in order to be successful." (p. 32)

He quotes Adam Smith's definition in his book *Powers of the Mind* as "a shared set of assumptions. The paradigm is the way we perceive the world; water to the fish. The paradigm explains the world to us and helps us to predict its behavior....When we are in the middle of the paradigm, it is hard to imagine any other paradigm." (p. 31)

The point about being able to predict behavior is particularly important to us as we attempt to understand the ways in which different groups of people view the operation of their church.

It appeared to me that each church could be expected to have its own culture, or a patterned set of activities that reflected the groups underlying values. These cultures wouldn't occur randomly. They would occur because the local leaders spent time practicing and rewarding some behaviors and values more than others.

MIT's Edgar Schein in an article titled *Coming to a New Awareness of Organizational Culture* defines organizational culture as "the pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid, and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems."

While the words paradigm and culture are not synonymous, they seem to overlap in ways that are useful to the development of this paper. Both seem to give us insight into the predictable ways specific groups will evaluate and act upon incoming information.

In that same article, Schein gives us an overview of organizational culture that is quite useful:

A. Organizational culture can be defined in terms of a dynamic model of how culture is learned, passed on, and changed.

1. Culture is the pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration.
2. The pattern of basic assumptions is the cultural paradigm on which the perceptions, thoughts, and feelings of organizational members are based.
3. Culture exists in groups - sets of people who have shared significant problems, solved them, observed the effects of their solutions, and who have taken in new members.
4. Basic assumptions inherent in a culture serve to stabilize the group and are highly resistant to change.
5. Culture cannot serve its stabilizing function unless it is taught to new members.

B. Four approaches can be used in various combinations to decipher a culture's paradigm of assumptions.

1. Interviews can analyze the process and content of socialization of new members.
2. Interviewers can analyze responses to critical incidents in the organization's history.
3. Beliefs, values, and assumptions of culture creators or carriers can be analyzed.
4. Interviewers and organization members can jointly explore and analyze anomalies, or puzzling features, uncovered in interviews.

C. Cultures may serve different purposes at different stages in the development of an organization.

1. Culture serves as a source of identity and strength for young and growing companies. Little chance exists for successfully changing culture at this stage.
2. In organizational mid-life culture may be change, but not without consideration of all sources of stability. Managers must decide whether to encourage diversity of subcultures to promote flexibility, or attempt to create a more homogeneous, stronger corporate culture.
3. Maturity or decline resulting from excessive internal stability which prevents innovation may be combatted by changes in culture. This is a painful process, however, and one likely to elicit strong resistance.
4. Attempts at culture management strategies must begin by considering the organizational life cycle.

In an article titled *The Paradox of "Corporate Culture": Reconciling Ourselves to Socialization* Richard Pascale contends that business schools "find themselves in a particular dilemma since, in extolling management as a profession, they foster the view that a cadre of "professional managers can move from firm to firm with generic skills that enable them to be effective in each. This runs squarely against the requirements of a strong culture." He then quotes Schein stating: "I believe that management education, particularly graduate (business schools), are increasingly attempting to train professionals, and in this process are socializing the students to a set of professional values which are, in fact, in severe and direct conflict with typical organizational values." (p.19)

It is possible that we as educators have a tendency to do the same thing in the preparation of ministers. It could be that we enjoy what we value so much that we end up training students to pastor churches that we would attend or that we would want our children to attend.

In addition to what we may inadvertently do in the classroom, it appears that in the attempt to control continuing expansion of the large list of unassigned elders and licensed ministers, we have in the past few years adopted increasingly restrictive requirements for ministers in the Church of the Nazarene. For most of our history, a small church could count on the ministry of a long term, licensed minister who might even have been one of their own congregation, but who was not seeking ordination. The current system assumes that a request for a district license is a request to enter the ordination process and demands that the education portion of that process be completed in a ten year period.

Perhaps Schein is right. Perhaps we are socializing the students to a set of values that are incongruent with the values of the typical church they will be called to serve. If the church hires a pastor who has been socialized to a set of organizational values which are divergent from the organizational values of congregation, the ability of the church to achieve its goals and their view of the effectiveness of the pastor might be adversely affected. In the churches which are the least like the values of the larger denominational culture we could expect to see a higher rate of pastoral turn over.

Pastors are prepared in officially prescribed ways to meet what the denomination perceives to be the educational and training needs for ministry in any church in the denomination. The educational requirements are the same for all who wish to be ordained to pastoral ministry in the Church of the Nazarene. While differences among congregations are acknowledged, there is very little required in the training that would prepare the pastor to effectively serve in different settings.

If it were possible to describe the differences among congregations in terms of their cultural characteristics, our ability to train pastors would be enhanced, and the pastors would have a greater opportunity to effectively lead the congregation for a longer period of time.

While churches are, of course, organizations they are also ongoing social groupings. The variation among social structures has been a subject of research at least as far back as Ferdinand Tonnies's *Community and Society*, published in 1887. He proposed understanding the way groups are structured and operate along a continuum between poles he labeled *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*. *Gemeinschaft* is a type of social organization in which "social bonds are based on close personal ties of friendship and kinship.... [It is] characterized by the predominance of intimate primary relationships and emphasis upon tradition, consensus, informality and kinship."

Gesellschaft is at the opposite end of the continuum where "social relationships are formal, contractual, expedient, impersonal and specialized....*Gesellschaft* is most typically approximated in modern urban society...because of its weak family organization, the emphasis on utilitarian goods, and the impersonal and competitive nature of its social relationships." (1957)

If there is a relationship between the size of the church and where they fall along the continuum suggested by Tonnies, larger churches would be expected to be more *gesellschaft* like and smaller churches would be expected to be more *gemeinschaft* like not only in their value systems, but also in a variety of operational characteristics.

In *Management of Human Service Programs* Lewis, Lewis and Souflee' (1991) suggest that the six functions of management of human service organizations are; planning, organizing, developing human resources, budgeting, supervising, and evaluating. The ways in which churches carry out each of these functions might be expected to reflect the characteristics suggested by Tonnies.

For example churches at one end of the continuum would do their planning, organizing, developing of human resources, budgeting, supervising, and evaluation in informal ways that value relationships above structure. Churches at the other end would carry out the same functions in formal ways that value organization and structure above particular individual relationships.

One of the basic premises of this paper is that the number of different local church cultural types or paradigms is limited. While on the micro level of sociological or cultural investigation we might be led describe an infinitely large variety of church types, I shall assume that on a macro level these fall into four stable types.

Arlin Rothauge in a booklet titled *Sizing Up a Congregation for New Member Ministry*, suggests that the organizational characteristics of local churches can be grouped according to size. In his model, sizes are based on Sunday morning worship attendance with the "Family" church averaging fifty persons or less, the "Pastoral" church model fifty to one hundred fifty, the "Program" church one fifty one to three fifty, and the "Corporation" church three hundred to five hundred or more.

Although Rothauge was describing Episcopalian Churches, his size groupings seem to fit very well with the size groupings of churches of the Nazarene, so I have used them for this study.

It appears that small churches operate with a *Gemeinschaft* type of structure characterized by functions being based on tradition, consensus, informality and kinship. Larger churches appear to be operating as a *Gesellschaft* with functions being based on policies and procedures which are formal, contractual, expedient, impersonal and specialized. Smaller churches appear to have an introspective focus aimed at serving the perceived needs of the members. Larger churches appear to have an external focus aimed at not only serving the needs of the members, but also serving the community and accomplishing the traditional business goals of continuous expansion and beating the competition.

While small churches make up most of the pastoral jobs available, denominational leaders are more frequently elected or appointed from the larger churches. *Gesellschaft* values and skills could be assumed to be seen as the way to the top. As denominational leaders and educators who train ministers may be reinforcing this perception.

Local churches in the Church of the Nazarene seem to fall into two major value categories; families, and enterprises. There are those churches that look and act like big families with all the positive and negative results, and then there are those who have adopted a business like organizational structure and value organizational success.

Each of these two major types have internal differences which break them down into two additional categories which gives us four types which are specific enough for description and analysis. These are not obscure and hard to identify. Quite the contrary, they are very well known. The issue is not so much in our ability to identify them as it is in our ability to recognize them as valid organizational cultures for churches of the Nazarene. In most cases we know them for what they are, and want them to change to be what we value. I see them as:

1. The Basic Family Church
2. The Extended Family Church
3. The Family Owned Enterprise Church
4. The Corporate Enterprise Church

These organizational cultures are very stable and resist change. The following is an overview of the four types.

Descriptions—The Basic Family Church

Overview: The basic family church is perhaps the most obvious expression of the *gemeinschaft*. This church looks like a family and in most cases is inseparable from family life. The limited number of families and individuals involved allows each participant to know every other participant very well.

While this church can run up to fifty people, it more frequently runs 30 to 40 in Sunday morning worship. This is the most common type of church in the Church of the Nazarene. For example, when all churches are grouped in increments of 10, the modal church in the Church of the Nazarene has a morning worship attendance of from 31 to 40. When grouped in increments of 25, the modal church is 26 to 50. Thirty nine percent (39%) of the churches in this study (1977–1995) would generally fit into this category if the only criteria was size. In 1996, forty percent (40.1) were in this size category.

This church focuses on building and maintaining relationships. Intimacy, accountability, and responsibility are key words. The reason they exist and continue to exist against significant obstacles is based in the value of these relationships to the persons and families involved.

With few exceptions, these individuals know each other very well. They know the insides of each other's homes. They know where they work and often how much they are being paid. They know all of the names of the kids in every family, where they are in school, who their teachers are and how well they are doing academically. They attend school functions to support the kids of other families. Although the kids don't refer to the other adults as aunt and uncle, they often have a relationship with them that is much like being related.

Their theme song could well be "You may notice we say brother and sister 'round here. It's because we're a family and these folks are so dear. When one has a problem we all shed a tear, and rejoice in each victory in this family so dear..." The Bible is very supportive of the values exhibited by this church.

The relationships provide the driving energy for the organization. That is to say, the church is successful when the relationships are good. The joy of that accomplishment keeps the participants involved and motivated. This is a significant piece of information because when the quality of the relationships deteriorates then the energy to run the program of the church also deteriorates and in most cases attendance drops. In contrast to a very large church where relationships could be expected to develop in the context of programs, in this church, programs can be expected to develop in the context of healthy relationships.

Planning: The basic family church does its' planning in an informal way. Rather than a leadership coalition, there is generally one patron or matron who makes it possible for this church to continue to exist and as a result, ultimately has the final say. Frequently, the church is either largely made up of actual family members of the patron/matron, or the church has become a surrogate family for this person. This persons' decisions are final and can override a decision made by the official church board.

While it is tempting to refer to this person as a "church boss" or "power broker" he/she is more often a deeply committed person who thoughtfully cares for and provides for the

spiritual and emotional needs of the "family." Without this person, many basic family churches would cease to exist.

Like a family, this church does not have a written statement of purpose and mission. However, the church has informal goals that are very meaningful to the patron/matron who takes his or her role very seriously.

Needs assessment is personal and subjective rather than a specific objective process. With one person in final control of the operational resources, the planning that arises out of the needs assessment is also neither formal nor long range. The patron/matron is very able to respond to changing needs and opportunities. However, his or her basic plan to care for, and protect the family will not change much from year to year.

This person is the primary stakeholder and source of stability in the basic family church.

Organizing: Family churches of both categories are organized informally to accomplish the informal goals. Relationships are considered more important than results. Actually, relationships form the basis of the desired results.

Basic family churches face a particularly challenging task in filling the positions in the organizational structure. Frequently the number of positions on the list of names of leaders requested by the denomination exceeds the number of capable leaders in the church. Desiring the legitimacy of being part of a denomination, and in fact being quite loyal to that denomination, these churches assign the same persons to more than one position regardless of the usefulness of that function in their church.

With limited resources, the basic family church focuses on the most general activities. There is seldom the luxury of running programs just to meet the requirements for the honors and awards spelled out by the various departments of the denomination.

The activities of the church are designed in such a way that everyone could participate in nearly everything. With programs centering around fellowship and worship, complete participation is not only expected but forms the basis for the group to evaluate spiritual commitment and growth.

There are no written procedures or policies. This does not mean that the way things are done is not orderly or predictable. It means that the way things are done is generally understood by every one in the family.

Power is vested in a specific person or couple, the patron/matron. In his or her absence no action will be taken unless all are sure what he or she would do. If the pastor takes advantage of his or her absence to force a decision on an action he or she wants done, it is at great risk. The pastor is not the person with power in the basic family church.

Authority is located in the family. The family gives the patron/matron the power based on a long history of being able to provide workable solutions to the problems facing the group.

Decisions are made by consensus with leadership or by direction from the patron/matron. In either event, the basis of the decision will be "what is best for the family." That is to say they will value persons and relationships more than they will value achieving goals and objectives set by headquarters or even the district.

Rather than leaders being organized into a system of committees, this church may seem to carry out its' entire operation like a single committee. Every (committee) member has a voice and the freedom to agree or disagree.

Enacting change in the basic family church requires first the consensus of the group, but ultimately the permission of the patron/matron.

Since the basic family church exists as an extension of the individual families all church property, including the church building, is seen as an extension of family or personal property. If they have something at home that they need at the church, they simply go get it. If they have something at the church that they need at home, they simply go get it. Every adult has a key to the building.

Developing Human Resources: Volunteers are the human resource in the basic family church. Even the pastor is normally bi-vocational providing much of his needed income from other sources.

The program of the church is simple, and for the most part the same people have been doing the same jobs for quite some time. It isn't based so much on design as it is based on necessity.

The pastor has the responsibility to see that an adequate number of persons have volunteered, but the motivation for volunteering comes from the group rather than the pastor. However, if the pastor has challenged them to add a program, the pastor has the task of developing the human resources for the task.

The family social networks form the basis of how work teams develop. For example, in the event of a serious illness or death in one of the church families, everybody already knows who will be calling to organize for meals to be taken to the house, and everybody pretty well knows what each person will be preparing and delivering. But they also know that the "family" can be counted on to provide in times of crisis.

There are no formal personnel policies. There are no written job descriptions. There is not even a formal job description for the pastor. However, everyone is informally accountable to everyone else so, like a family, they guide and motivate each other to at least adequate performance and compliance with assumed responsibilities.

The limited work load makes it possible for this system to function reasonably effectively and efficiently.

This pastor is hired to maintain the family property (church), service the family, and be a friend to the patron/matron. Friend is the key word. The role of the pastor in this church more

closely resembles the role of the chaplain in the military than it does the chief executive officer of a corporation. He or she is there to comfort, guide, and tend to the spiritual welfare of the family members, but not to make decisions for the group.

While scripture, tradition, reason, and experience support this role as valid and valuable, this role is often regarded in the larger denominational culture as secondary to being a change agent and growth leader. Few pastors' workshops and virtually no rewards and honors are focused on the values held highest by family churches.

Confusion about the role of the pastor causes many pastors to experience a sense of failure when they are actually accomplishing what the church hired them to do. When they cannot succeed at accomplishing the goals rewarded by the denomination, they look for another church in which they can accomplish these things.

If he or she leads at all, the pastor leads by influence gained by identifying with the patron/matron. The pastor is actually a figurehead leader hired to help the real leader accomplish what he or she thinks is important.

Decisions are not made by the board in the board meeting. The role of the board is to make sure that the decision already made by consensus and the direction of the patron/matron gets carried out. If the pastor wants to participate in the decision making process he or she must participate where the decision is actually being made: in the homes of the people, and particularly the home of the patron/matron.

A new pastor would be wise to go to the patron/matron within the first few weeks and simply ask two questions: "What needs to happen in this church?" and "How can I help make that happen?" If the pastor listens and attempts to help the real leader accomplish his or her goals, they will make sure that the pastor succeeds. If, on the other hand, the pastor regards this person as a "church boss" and attempts to overthrow his or her power, they will make sure that the pastor fails.

Since the pastor is expected to be a part of the family it is also expected that he or she will work for what family members receive when we invite them over to work on our house: a lot of thanks, a good meal, and if necessary a place to sleep. Everybody knows what the pastor is being paid.

Budgeting: There is no formal budget for this church. Spending is based on the current needs as determined by the patron/matron. By design or default, the lack of a formal budget leaves more power in the hands of the patron/matron. The pastor has no authority to spend money other than his own and often must obtain approval for even standard supplies.

While it appears that the basic family church raises very little money, in reality they raise eighty five percent (85.1%) of the average amount per morning worship attender in all churches, and seventy three percent (73.5%) as much as the group of corporate enterprise churches. In 1995 churches in this category averaged 31 persons (the median was also 31) in morning worship and raised an average of \$27,060 (median = \$24,403) for an average of \$873.

In basic family churches a very high percentage of the total raised for all purposes comes from the patron/matron. As is the case in a family, what the parents want done gets done because they hold the power of funding.

The treasurer functions as a controller and may be the patron/matron.

Supervision: Supervision can broadly be understood to be the process of overseeing the work of paid staff and volunteers. Supervision in this church is provided by the informal social network that is the reason for the existence of the church.

Since most workers are involved in most activities, supervision is informal and undocumented. The informal system values relationships more than tasks or accomplishments. There are no formal evaluations of worker performance. The people celebrate with each other over each accomplishment, and support each other through each failure.

The pastor may be used by the patron/matron to supervise other members of the family and may expect him or her to do this in matters not related to the church.

Evaluation: Once each year, every church is required to submit a report to the denomination with process evaluation data. Attendance at various standard activities, number of the activities held, money raised, and how the money was spent in certain categories are all reported, but not audited. Since this is a denominational thing rather than an internal thing, it is often of little interest to the patron/matron. Most often it is the responsibility of the pastor to compile that data and to file that report. Unless there is a question about falsification of records, no one else even sees the report.

The real evaluation is subjective and ongoing. The family decides if things are going the way they think they should be going with the patron/matron having the final say. If they are happy, everything is fine. If they are not happy, they make changes. It is an ongoing formative evaluation.

In a subjective way, they also evaluate the outcome in terms of spiritual development of the participants. However, this evaluation is not based on measurable criteria and may be used to form an argument to control a wayward members' behavior.

The Extended Family Church

Overview: Like the basic family church, the extended family church is an expression of the *gemeinschaft* however, this church looks more like a family reunion. It is still a family with family values, but three or four family leaders have emerged to run things for the family.

While size is not the most important characteristic, this church will normally run from about fifty up to one hundred and fifty. The point at which it must shift to the next type of culture is related to that great desire to know everyone in the church in every area of life. By adding a great children's program, this church might reach two hundred, but normally around one hundred and fifty the adults have reached the point at which they are having to give up knowing everyone. In 1996, forty four and one half percent (44.5%) of the churches in the

Church of the Nazarene would fit into this category if the only criteria was size. Combined, the two types of family churches make up nearly eighty five percent (84.6%) of the churches in the church of the Nazarene.

The focus of the extended family church is much the same as the focus of the basic family church with building and maintaining relationships as primary, however a slightly larger group hold power. The recent emphasis on family values in American politics is not new to these churches. Many people openly claim to prefer "smaller" churches for these very reasons.

Their theme song is still "I'm so glad I'm a part of the family of God."

Not only are 84.6% of our churches in the two family types, over half (52.5%) of our people attend Sunday morning worship in a family church.

The driving energy for the extended family church organization is seen more in the responsibilities within the relationships. While everyone can still know everyone else, they are more apt to be dividing up the work load and relating to each other overlapping roles.

This church is large enough that one person cannot control everything, and intergroup conflict (politics) about the operation of the church is often a source of family dysfunction.

Planning: The extended family church does its' planning in an informal way. The dominant coalition is made up of the husband/wife teams of a small group of families, usually three or four. While it is currently popular for pastors to lead the people to write a statement of purpose and mission, it is also common for it to be discarded or at least disregarded by the church when he or she moves on to another church.

The church has informal goals that are very meaningful to the families in the church. For example, the church could be said to exist to serve the needs of the families. The overriding plan is for the church to continue to serve these families. Needs are assumed rather than being formally assessed by the leaders.

While planning is not formal or long range, the guiding coalition is very quick to respond to changes or sudden needs. When faced with a task or problem to be solved, these leaders are very capable planners and problem solvers.

Planning looks like planning done by families. The plans have emerged over a period of many years, and the church has reflected the stability of those plans.

Organizing: This church is organized informally to accomplish the informal goals. Relationships are considered more important than results. Actually, relationships form the basis of the desired results.

Programs are designed to be general in nature, requiring little training for the participants. Most people are expected to participate in most programs and activities. Programs are based on the way things have been done in the past which tends to give more power to those with longer histories and better memories. Programs center around fellowship and worship.

Education is considered very important for younger members, but educational events for adults are best attended if the fellowship function remains a large part of the activity.

The procedures and policies are not written or formal, but exist in the collective memory of the group. Disputes about procedures and policies are settled by the guiding coalition, normally in a kind way based on their personal memory of how things are done here.

Power is vested in a very small group of patrons or matrons. The key leadership positions have been in the hands of the same families for two and even three generations. While this is appropriately described as a dominant coalition, the people would be more comfortable calling it a guiding coalition and openly support those in the coalition.

Authority is located in the family, but may for the most part be delegated to the church board. Since this group has a long history of providing workable solutions to the problems facing the group, they are generally trusted to make sure that the decision the family has made outside of the board meeting will be carried out by the pastor and church leaders.

Decisions are made in the same way basic family churches make decisions with an added step of the patron group reaching consensus before giving direction to the larger group. "What is best for this church family" is still the basis of the decision. The persons and values of this local congregation will be held as more important than denominational quotas and contests.

Meeting the needs of this family group is such a priority that having the sanctuary rearranged for a Saturday night wedding of one of the children of a church family would often be considered more important than having the sanctuary in perfect order for worship the next morning.

This church still doesn't have much in the way of committees since most of the involved people would be on most committees anyway. However, some people are primarily concerned with only one area or another.

Enacting change in this church requires the permission of the dominant coalition.

Most extended family churches view church property in much the same way as the basic family churches. Not everyone has a key but for those who have been there long enough, the church property is their property to use.

Developing Human Resources: With the exception of the pastor, all human resources are volunteers. Since volunteering is an assumed role of those who participate in the life of this church, recruiting is informal and usually takes the form of an announcement about what needs to be done.

The programs the volunteers are to run are general in nature, and require little training for active participation. The skills are learned through years of participating in the same activities and eventually becoming a leader of some activities.

The pastor has the responsibility to see that an adequate number of persons have volunteered, but the motivation for volunteering comes from the group rather than the pastor.

The work teams are most often based on the informal social networks rather than on skills and abilities.

There are no formal personnel policies. There are no written job descriptions. There is not even a formal job description for the pastor. However, everyone is informally accountable to everyone else so, like a family, they guide and motivate each other to at least adequate performance and compliance with assumed responsibilities.

The limited work load makes it possible for this system to function reasonably effectively and efficiently.

The pastor is hired to help the guiding coalition in its tasks of maintaining the family property (church), servicing the family, keeping within the budget, and being a friend to the leaders. Friend is the key word.

As in the basic family church the role of the pastor in this church more closely resembles the role of the chaplain in the military than it does the chief executive officer of a corporation. He or she is there to comfort, guide, and tend to the spiritual welfare of the family members, but not to make decisions for the group.

To be successful, this pastor will need to identify with the patron group. He or she should be aware that it is more important to be in the stands with the parents at the high school ball games than it is to be in the study preparing masterpiece sermons. The pastor in an extended family church leads by influence gained by identifying with the patron group.

This church can spread the cost around a little better and often will pay the pastor a little better salary, but everybody still knows what the pastor is being paid.

Budgeting: There is no formal budget for this church. Spending is based on the current needs as determined by the guiding coalition. The guiding patron group will often have an informal idea of what they intend to spend, but to formally establish a budget would commit them to carrying out a plan for the year, and in a sense undermine their power to make changes as they might want. The treasurer is the controller for the group. His decision is final and in many churches he or she can override a decision made by the official church board.

The lack of a formal budget leaves more power in the hands of the coalition. The pastor must get approval to spend money on anything other than standard supplies. The pastor has about the same ability to spend money as an office manager in an agency owned by someone else, for example an insurance agency.

A very high percentage of the total raised for all purposes comes from the guiding coalition. Often 60% to 70% comes from these three or four families. As is the case in a family, what the parents want done gets done because they hold the power of funding. It would also be fair to say, that for the most part the funds are lovingly spent on the needs of the members of the

church family. This is not a domineering group, but a group that is supportive beyond what is actually required in other local churches. They stay and support a particular church because they love the people and the relationships the church fosters.

The extended family churches raised an average of \$955 per morning worship attender in 1995.

Supervision: Supervision in the extended family church is provided by the informal social network that is the reason for the existence of the church.

Actually, most workers are unsupervised most of the time. While anyone can criticize the work of anyone else, the group informally decides whether the criticism is valid and just. The criticizer is subject to the same judgement as he or she wants to bring on someone else. People learn their place in the system.

The informal system values relationships more than tasks or accomplishments. They will, for example, tolerate very poor preaching from a friend, but will not tolerate poor relationships from the best of preachers. The same would be true of any of the other tasks and assignments. There is more concern for people than for production.

Performance evaluations are entirely subjective, and spontaneous. There are no formal evaluations of worker performance. When the group is happy with the performance of a person or unhappy with their performance the group has no need for formal processes. They are quick and profuse with their praise or criticism.

Lewis, et al. (1991) suggest that the "purpose of supervision is accomplished through the assumption by the supervisor of three corollary roles and functions: *manager*, *mediator*, and *mentor*." (pp. 221–222) Not all of these roles and functions are available to the pastor of the extended family church. In this church the pastor must accomplish his or her supervision primarily as a mentor and occasionally as a mediator. The guiding coalition maintains control of most of the management functions, and the structure is not complicated enough to need much in the way of mediation or integration of vertical and horizontal interactions between different levels and units of the organization. He or she must become part of the operating group if he/she is to accomplish much in the way of guiding the growth and development of the volunteers.

Evaluation: As with the basic family church, in the extended family church virtually all evaluation in this church is informal

and subjective. The same annual report of activities is required by the denomination, and for the most part it is left to the pastor to prepare and submit the report.

In family churches of both types, the real evaluation is subjective and ongoing. The guiding coalition decides if things are going the way they think they should be going. If they are happy, everything is fine. If they are not happy, they make changes. It is an ongoing formative evaluation, useful and effective in the eyes of the patron group but often frustrating

and upsetting to pastor and district superintendent who want the church to get excited and accomplish something great.

The Family Enterprise Church

Overview: The family enterprise church looks like a business owned and operated by a family to meet the needs of the family by reaching outside the family. The focus has shifted from internal to external. This church wants to be successfully active in the denominational organization. This church wants to achieve. This church wants its' pastor to be on the district boards, and elected as a delegate to General Assembly. This church wants to win the contests. This church wants to be the one of the major churches in the community. This church wants to accomplish more than just meeting the needs of the family of participants.

However, this church is still under the control of a family coalition. The dominant coalition may be slightly larger than that of the extended family church but specific families have controlled the leadership positions for a long time.

This church may be as small as one hundred and fifty but may also run up to around three hundred and fifty. The size issue is related to the size required to be one of the three or four leading churches on the district. When that is achieved, particularly when the church becomes the largest church on the district, there is no longer an urgency to grow. It is actually possible for a church to operate in this style at a much larger size than 350 if it grows slowly enough and changes pastors frequently enough for the dominant coalition to maintain power.

Thirteen percent (13.01%) of the churches in this study (1977–1995) would generally fit into this category if the only criteria was size. In 1996, twelve percent (12.3%) were in this size category.

The culture or paradigm of the family enterprise church doesn't so much set the upper size limit as it controls the speed of growth. This church can grow very fast while the key people have the time, money and motivation. The church will grow only as fast as the family is capable of managing the growth. It will stop growing when the coalition is satisfied.

The family enterprise church focuses on building and managing the organization. Programs, processes and promotions are key words. Programs attract the energy of the people, and provide the energy for growth. For example, it is in this type church that we first see long term staff in addition to the pastor. The youth program that struggles in the extended family church has a paid director in the family enterprise church and not only provides energy to the local church, but also to the district youth program.

Concern about not knowing everybody in the church is an ongoing source of frustration.

Planning: The family owned enterprise church does its' planning in a formal manner that remains flexible. Many of these churches have developed a long range plan which is reviewed each year and adopted for the following year. However, the progress on the accomplishment of the plans is tied to events and needs as they emerge. The document doesn't so much provide the motivation for initiating action as it provides a basis for decisions when action is

needed. For example they wouldn't pave the back parking lot because it was in the plan, but if the city told them they had to pave the lot, the plan would tell them where it should be and how it should be done.

The guiding coalition is made up of four or more families that have served the church for as much as three generations, and the church is perceived as existing to serve the spiritual needs of the families of the church about equally as it is viewed as serving the community.

This church also operates much like a family, but a larger family. The guiding coalition is quick to respond to the needs of the families and the church family as a whole.

Needs are assessed each year as a specific action of the board, but there is not broad spread participation in the collection of information for the needs assessment. The needs assessment is part of the reevaluation of the long range plan. As such, it still does not initiate action, but forms the basis of how to act when particular needs become urgent.

Organizing: This church has a departmental structure that forms the organizational chart. The educational program is divided into children, youth, and adults, with most other activities structured to fit this model. In addition to education, there are groups for missions and music.

Everyone has direct access to the leadership of the church, and there is an attempt to structure activities in general ways so that nearly everyone can be involved in nearly everything that is going on. Although new programs are initiated nearly every year, the core activities have remained relatively unchanged for many years.

While the church would be regarded as an open system, the reliance upon how things have been done in the past for a measure of how they should be done now, gives power to those who have been here the longest.

As in the smaller church, programs still center around fellowship and worship however, in this church worship is probably the more important of the two.

Procedures and policies are written but not followed by the leaders. The policies may actually be in place to control persons who are not on the board or part of the leadership coalition.

Power is vested in an expanded group of patrons or matrons. The key leadership positions have been in the hands of the same families for two and even three generations. Whereas in family churches the people would openly support those in the coalition, in this type of church it is often a source of conflict. It may well be either a positive or negative factor in the churches' ability to grow. It is undoubtedly a key source of stability.

Authority is located in the board and shared to some extent with the pastor. In most cases the group has some history of looking to the pastor for providing workable solutions to the problems facing the group.

Decisions are made by the board with input from the pastor. The basis for the decision will be "What is best for the church." The success of the organization (church) will be held as more important than individual desires.

Typically this church has organized the church board into committees. However, the committees end up functioning more like a fact finding task force. When the committee brings its' report to the meeting, the board starts all over at the beginning discussing the entire problem rather than simply voting to accept or reject the recommendation of the committee.

Enacting change in this church requires a decision of the board. The board takes its' work seriously and may have a tendency to micro manage the operation.

The family enterprise church views the church property as a resource for building the enterprise. Most persons do not have keys and equipment is reserved for church use.

Developing Human Resources: Most of the human resources are volunteers. Most family enterprise churches want a full time pastor and pay him or her the same kind of salary that a manager of a store might receive. Frequently these churches have paid staff consisting of a youth pastor, a part time music minister, and a secretary.

Workers are recruited by announcing the need, and asking for volunteers. There is an intention to keep programs general so that most people can be involved without the necessity of special training. When people volunteer for most activities, they are given a written job description for the position they are considering. In this sense, the development of human resources is formal.

The recognition of workers is formally done in some of the programs with presentation of certificates, plaques, and awards often at a banquet.

Workers are reasonably aware that they will informally be expected to volunteer for their assignment again and again. Few jobs are regarded as one time assignments.

For the most part, the role of the pastor is more like the acting director of an agency or the manager of a franchise than it is like a chief executive officer of a corporation. He is responsible for the operation of the church on a twenty four hour basis. His responsibilities include making sure the doors are unlocked and locked at the appropriate times as well as supervising every committee and department. The staff members are viewed as his assistants, and he is responsible to supervise their work and behavior. In addition, he has the role of chaplain. He must see to the spiritual welfare of the members, but he also participates in the decision making process as a valued source of information for the guiding coalition. While he might not be able to make decisions for the group, the group will often make a decision based on his suggestion or direction. Manager is the key word to describe this position.

The pastor leads by participation and authority shared with the board. He or she must identify with the values and vision of the leadership group.

This church is hiring a manager, and will attempt to pay what a good manager should be making. While not everybody would know how much the pastor is being paid, everybody on the board and probably a few key others have this information.

Budgeting: This church has a formal budget. The budget is based on last year's spending more than it is based on this year's needs and funds available. The pastor has the authority to see that the normal operational expenses are incurred and paid, but not the authority to initiate new spending.

The funding of this church is spread out across a broader portion of the membership. While the largest donors are members of the guiding coalition, their combined giving is usually not 20% of the total raised.

While the guiding coalition has the ability to influence the direction of the church by the trust the people put in them, they do not have the ability to force issues by threatening to withhold the giving of their own funds. The opposite would be true however, they can lead the church in new directions by directly funding specific new activities and programs.

Fund raising is both formal and informal in this church. While most of the funding comes from regular individual giving, the church also conducts formal fund raising campaigns for specific projects like missions, and building projects.

In 1996, churches in this category raised an average of \$1109 per average morning worship attender.

Supervision: Supervision is provided in this church by the leaders of the particular programs. These leaders are themselves volunteers, and are led and supervised by the pastor or paid staff.

The form of supervision is relationship oriented more often than it is results oriented. The system highly values the goal of personal growth of the individual, and will often put that goal ahead of task goals. Like the smaller church, there is still a desire to have more concern for people than for production. Conflict arises when that desire is disregarded for the sake of growth or some other success.

In terms of the supervision roles suggested above, this pastor functions as a mediator and mentor, but also as a manager.

The pastor is responsible as manager to supervise all of the staff. If the pastor resigns, all of the staff is required to resign also.

Evaluation: While this church has some formal evaluation built into its annual review of the long range plan, the evaluation that guides the activities of the church is more often subjective and formative. The decision making coalition does an ongoing subjective evaluation of their satisfaction with the process and results.

The same annual report to the denomination is required for this church, so the process issues are reviewed each year for an outside entity.

This church also evaluates the outcome in terms of spiritual development of the participants without measurable criteria or structured analysis.

The Corporate Enterprise Church

Overview: The corporate enterprise church looks like a corporation owned by stock holders and run in the style of American big business. It is the most complete example of Tonnie's gesellschaft. Max Weber's description of a bureaucracy comes to mind as we look at this group of churches.

Like jurisdictional areas, the departments of the church are officially outlined and governed by the rules and policies established by the board. Authority within the structure is clearly spelled out in job descriptions.

The organization is hierarchical in structure with specified levels of authority in a series of levels that resemble a pyramid with the senior pastor at the top.

The corporate enterprise church has written rules and policies guiding nearly every aspect of the management of the organization.

Individuals holding positions in the organization have special training for their jobs.

Management is a full time activity as compared to being a secondary activity in family churches.

Virtually all of the official activities of the organization are covered by carefully written policies or rules and knowing those rules constitutes a special skill which gives the person added power.

While a new church could make a decision to set up a corporate bureaucracy from the beginning and be operating in this style at a much smaller size, most of the churches of this style would be over 350 in average worship attendance. Three percent (3.09%) of the churches in this study (1977-1995) would generally fit into this category if the only criteria was size. In 1996, three percent (3.1%) were in this size category.

This church has a focus that is similar to the family enterprise church, however the vision and systems are different. While this church will be very supportive of the denomination, and the pastor and staff are often quite involved in denominational activities, the church has a life of its own that seems to exist beyond the denomination and supporting the denomination rather than drawing from the denomination. When introducing a General Superintendent to speak the pastor might need to explain the role of the General Superintendent in the Church of the Nazarene for many of the people to fully appreciate the importance of the guest.

Events, particularly worship events, provide the driving energy for the people of this church.

Planning: The corporate enterprise church does its' planning in a formal manner that frequently has some flexibility built in, but is designed to carry plans and processes from one leadership group to the next. In most cases a master plan has been adopted following a process which intentionally attempted to involve a broad spectrum of staff, volunteers, and participants.

The guiding coalition in this church is not made up of a set of particular families, but is a somewhat fluid group with the pastor as the CEO type of leader. While it would be true to say that a group of six to ten persons will be particularly influential in the decision making process, it frequently would not be true to say that these persons have held this position for any great length of time.

This church operates more like a corporation, or a university. Most of the leadership and day to day management of the church comes from the pastor and the staff. The board is elected every year, with many of these churches imposing a limit of a certain number of years of continuous service. The function of the board is to set policy and provide support and oversight. Because there are frequently new members of the board some years the board is made up of better thinkers than other years.

Occasionally board members who have come from smaller churches want the church to operate like a family with the board micro managing the day to day operation. As might be expected, this causes conflict and slows down the progress of the corporate agenda.

The master plan is used to initiate action in a timely manner as funds become available.

Organizing: This church has a departmental structure that is built on the areas listed in the master plan. There are professionals hired in each of these areas who are charged with the development of programs and processes to accomplish the objectives of the master plan.

While anyone could have direct access to board members and senior leadership, most participants relate to the structure through program directors and group leaders.

There are more events and activities that are for a specialized group of people than there are that would be generally designed to involve nearly every one. Participants are expected to select the groups and activities that fit their personal growth needs rather than being expected to be involved in all activities of the church.

From the intentional changing of the makeup of the board to the freedom to participate in programs without joining any membership list, this church is a very open system. Worship is the one activity that is considered common to all participants.

This church has a well developed operations manual. Policies and procedures are not simply in place to control certain individuals, they are the basis for how things happen. The policies are reviewed on an ongoing basis rather than a single annual review of the entire book. Great care is taken to insure that the manual remains consumer oriented rather than control oriented.

Power is vested in the pastor with the specific backing of those who would have the power if there were no pastor.

Authority is located in the pastor and professional staff.

Decisions are made by the board with input from the pastor. The basis for the decision will be "What is best for the church." The success of the organization (church) will be held as more important than individual desires.

This church has organized the church board into committees and most frequently receives the committee report and after discussion simply votes to accept or reject the committee's recommendations. Occasionally an item will be referred back to the committee for more work.

For the most part, new items cannot be brought up in the board meeting and acted upon in that same meeting. The new item is referred to the appropriate committee for study with a report and recommendations expected at the next meeting.

Enacting change in this church requires permission of the pastor. The role of the board is to see that the decision the pastor has made gets carried out.

The family enterprise church views the church property as belonging to the church. In the larger churches of this category, equipment is purchased and maintained by individual departments. For one department to use another department's equipment, special arrangements must be made in advance.

Only officers and staff have keys. Staff members may not have keys to each other's areas. Few master keys are in existence.

Developing Human Resources: Although most of human resources are volunteers, all programs and activities come under the oversight of a paid staff person. The staff consists of the pastor, full time ministers, full and part time program directors, and paid assistants. The clerical support and maintenance staff are in addition to this list.

All staff, paid and volunteer, have job descriptions. Paid staff have an annual performance evaluation and frequently they will also have a six month progress check up.

Volunteers are recruited for specific positions and are provided with a written job description for that position. The recognition of workers is formally done in some of the program areas and informally done in others. Volunteers agree to certain lengths of service with the ability to drop out if necessary. Revolunteering is greatly encouraged, but not so definitely expected as would be the case in smaller churches. Sabbaticals are common and encouraged.

Many volunteers find their fellowship needs met within the group of persons involved in their same program area so they tend to remain active until other responsibilities draw them away.

The role of the pastor, in this church, is like the chief executive officer of a corporation. He is active in the day to day operation, but is most specifically charged with providing vision and direction to the organization.

To be successful the pastor must give up the urge to micro manage the daily events of the church. He or she leads by both authority and power. He or she must articulate the values and vision for the leadership.

These churches pride themselves on paying what it costs to have the best leadership available. Only the finance committee knows how much the pastor is being paid, and in some cases only a personnel subcommittee of the finance committee has this information.

Budgeting: This church has a formal budget. In some cases it is funded from reserve accounts and available to the staff and departments as needed. In other cases it is not fully funded and the spending budget is only funded as money becomes available.

The budget process is carried out almost entirely by the paid professional staff and approved by the board.

The funding of the corporate enterprise church is very broad. The combined giving of the largest donors is often less than 10% of the total raised and they may or may not be considered part of the guiding coalition.

Fund raising is both formal and informal in this church. While most of the funding comes from regular individual giving, the church also conducts formal fund raising campaigns for specific projects like missions, and building projects.

In 1996, churches in this category raised an average of \$1195 per morning worship attender.

Supervision: By denominational policy, the staff technically works for the pastor and is required to resign if the pastor resigns. However, in most corporate enterprise churches the pastor does not manage the staff on a day to day basis. One of the full time ministers is charged with the supervision of the rest of the staff.

Supervision of volunteers, is provided by the staff member in charge of the particular program, and by leaders developed within the programs.

This church would like to value relationships more than results, but in reality, results guide the supervision style most of the time. For example it is more likely that a person would be encouraged to drop a particular responsibility rather than that the program would be changed to fit the person. Programs have a life of their own and in true bureaucratic style, leaders come and go. The concern for people shows up in an attempt to help individuals find a place of service that fits their growth needs.

Evaluation: The same annual report to the denomination is required for this church, so the process issues are reviewed each year for an outside entity. However, this church also

prepares an internal set of reports each year which not only report on the process issues but also on the outcomes.

The outcome evaluation unfortunately is not entirely based on previously established criteria. It is normally anecdotal. However, reasonable evidence of personal, emotional, and spiritual growth in the lives of the participants must be present for the programs to be considered in the following years' plans.

From time to time corporate enterprise churches also conduct participant surveys to identify interests and satisfaction levels.

Analysis

There are several questions which come to mind as we look at these descriptions of the Enduring Cultural Values of the Laity.

1. Are they Really Enduring

The first year we recorded Sunday Morning Worship attendance was 1977. When I started this paper, the last year for which data were available was 1995 so I elected to look at the patterns of those churches who reported a morning worship attendance of greater than zero in 1977 and were in existence for the entire period. There were 4461 churches which met this criteria.

If these types are discrete and enduring we could expect that most churches would resist changing from type to another. To establish a beginning category I took a five year average of the morning worship attendance from 1977 through 1981. I then compared it with the morning worship attendance in 1995. Of the 4461 churches in the study,

3022 (67.74%)	remained in the same category.
577 (12.94%)	moved up to a higher category.
862 (19.32%)	moved down to a lower category.

Over two thirds of the churches remained in the same category. However, we started the study with the assumption that family churches are quite alike in many respects and enterprise churches are also alike in many respects and that they are not really like each other. So how enduring are the family type churches and the enterprise churches? Of the 4461 churches in the study,

4007 (89.82%)	remained in the same general category.
214 (4.80%)	moved from family to enterprise.
240 (5.38%)	moved from enterprise to family.

It would appear from these data that they are at least very resistant to change in size.

In the case of the shift from a family culture to an enterprise culture, the number of people a person can know in more than a general way forms the upper boundary. These data suggest that the change from a family type to an enterprise type is more likely to be resisted than change from one type to another within the broader categories.

2. What About the Reported Growth in Churches each Year?

We could theorize that reported growth in most cases is the up side of a cycle which is offset at another time by reported losses. I took the reported attendance in 1977 and then checked for years above and below that number. Of the 4461 churches in the study,

2344 (52.54%)	had years both above and below.
1567 (34.84%)	always reported higher than 1977.
563 (12.62%)	always reported lower than 1977.

Slightly over half of the churches cycled around their beginning point with another third actually showing long term, steady growth.

The Quadrennial Church Census included a the following question: "On an average Sunday, about how full is your sanctuary at your largest worship service?"With the following responses:

298 (8.6%)	20% or less
803 (23.1%)	21-40%
1,093 (31.4%)	41-60%
906 (26.1%)	61-80%
376 (10.8%)	Over 80%
3,476	(100%)

It could be that the growth is stalled by the size of the building. A church feels comfortably full from around half full up to about 80%. If it gets lower than that they can go get more people without additional cost. If it gets higher than that they will have to build a larger facility or relocate. The stakeholders who would be able to fund a larger facility have enormous power right at this point. It will cost them more than others for the church to break out of a cycle.

Are small Churches at Greater Risk Than Larger Churches

There were 596 churches that reported morning worship attendance of at least 1 in 1977 that were closed or reporting 0 by 1995. Of that number,

458 (76.85%)	started with 50 or less
126 (21.14%)	started with 51 to 150
12 (2.01%)	started with over 150

4. Is it True That Small "Basic Family " Churches are more Likely to Close Than That They Will Make It to "Extended Family" Status?

Of the 1432 churches with a five year morning worship average of 50 or less at the beginning of the study,

458 (31.98%)	were closed or reported 0 in 1995.
293 (20.46%)	moved up to "Extended Family."
7 (0.49%)	moved up to "Family Enterprise."
758 (52.93%)	remained unchanged.

During this period, it was a third more likely that a small church would close than that it would move up to a higher type. However, it was slightly more likely that it would remain unchanged than that it would do either of the other options.

5. How Are The Churches Distributed Among These Size Categories in the 1996 Reports?

Morning Worship Attendance				
	Churches	%	Attendance	%
0-50	2,049	40.1%	60,150	12.3%
51-150	2,273	44.5%	197,242	40.2%
151-350	629	12.3%	137,452	28.0%
Over 350	159	3.1%	95,845	19.5%
Totals	5,110	100%	490,689	100%

Membership				
	Churches	%	Members	%
0-50	1,657	32.4%	49,248	8.0%
51-150	2,289	44.8%	204,581	33.3%
151-350	882	17.3%	193,421	31.5%
Over 350	282	5.5%	166,693	27.2%
Totals	5,110	100%	613,943	100%

Morning Worship Attendance				
	Churches	%	Attendees	%

0-150	4,322	84.6%	257,392	52.5%
Over 150	788	15.4%	233,297	47.5%
Totals	5,110	100%	490,689	100%

Membership				
	Churches	%	Members	%
0-150	3,946	77.2%	253,829	41.3%
Over 150	1,164	22.8%	360,114	58.7%
Totals	5,110	100%	613,943	100%

Morning Worship Attendance				
	Churches	%	Students	%
0-150	4,587	89.8%	244,650	63.3%
Over 150	523	10.2%	141,933	36.7%
Totals	5,110	100%	386,583	100%

7. For a long time we have said that while most of our churches are small, most of our people are in larger churches. At what point are more than half the participants or members in "family" churches?

For morning worship attendance, 142 is number at which we reach this point.

Morning Worship Attendance				
	Churches	%	Attenders	%
0-142	4,251	83.2%	246,985	50.3%
Over 150	859	16.8%	243,704	49.7%
Totals	5,110	100%	490,689	100%

For membership, 188 is the number at which we reach this point.

Membership				
	Churches	%	Members	%
0-188	4,271	83.6%	308,468	50.2%
Over 188	839	16.4%	305,475	49.8%

Totals	5,110	100%	613,943	100%
--------	-------	------	---------	------

For Sunday School attendance, 110 is the number at which we reach this point

Sunday School				
	Churches	%	Students	%
0-150	4,194	82.1%	2194,936	50.4%
Over 150	916	17.9%	191,647	49.6%
Totals	5,110	100%	386,583	100%

Observations

1. Most of the people participate in "Family" style churches.

Over half (52.5%) of the people who worship in Nazarene congregations on an average Sunday do that in a congregation that is in one of the two "Family" size churches. Almost two-thirds (63.3) of those who attend a Nazarene Sunday School are in a congregation in those family-type sizes.

2. People who do not participate on an average Sunday are apparently more comfortable having their membership in a congregation in an "Enterprise", organization oriented church.

3. The mid-point size congregation for the distribution of Sunday School participants is 110. Just over half of the Sunday School participants are in congregations of 110 or smaller.

4. The mid-point size for distribution of Sunday morning worship participants are in congregations of 142 or smaller.

Comments

It appears to me that the persons who control the power and processes of local churches view their churches in different ways than denominational leaders (including pastors) view the same churches.

I believe these churches and their specific ways of thinking, believing, and acting are more inherently owned by the local group than by the denomination. Churches appear to participate in denominational processes to obtain legitimacy, and to expand their mission. Even when you and I join the ranks of denominational leadership and talk about Nazarene Churches, we get involved in discussing them as if they somehow belong to the denomination. For example we talk about "closing" churches. However when we are active in our local Churches, you and I don't think of the denomination as having that kind of control over US.

To put that another way, at the denominational level we think of local Churches as dependant variables. At the local level we (including you and me in our capacities in these churches)

think of the local Church as the independent variable. Denominationally we think of the pastor as an agent of the denomination acting to bring change in the local (dependant variable) Church. The major stakeholders (including you and me) in the local (independent variable) Church think of the (dependant variable) pastor as our employee who should be helping us accomplish our plans and goals for this Church.

When the goals of the local stakeholders match the goals of the denominational stakeholders we probably have a situation more conducive to growth. When we do not, the local stakeholders hold the high ground.

Merging two small churches to create one "with enough strength to accomplish something" will seldom work. Within a year or two the new church has settled down to the size of the cultural paradigm of the stronger stakeholders.

Stakeholders breaking out of the paradigm is more often the cause of the church breaking out of its' paradigm rather than the other way around. As I interview leaders of churches which have broken out, I find an unusual number of them referring to leadership conferences such as the leadership events Don Wellman used to do at Denver First.

It seems to me that our ministerial preparation programs, our pastor's workshops, and our reward systems all focus on the enterprise churches, and the family enterprise church in particular. Pastors are being trained to be managers and rewarded for being managers, particularly managers of growth.

Frequently pastors tell me they were told that they should expect their first church to be a small church but that if they were any good they could make it grow and that their next church would be a "better" church. Few programs give much insight into the actual workings of a family church of either type, and most of our pastors spend most of their ministry in these churches.

When we talk about the "good" churches on a particular district, we are talking about enterprise churches.

Job satisfaction for pastors seems to be centered more in their relationship with the denomination than their relationship with a particular church. For the first two or three pastorates they seem to be able to keep motivated regardless of the local situation. When it appears that they are not moving up in the denominational system (eg. to a "good" church) it becomes harder to keep them. The median length of service as a pastor is just over 10 years or about three average assignments.

Church growth within a particular cultural paradigm is much easier than growth which requires a change in the culture itself.

John P. Kotter, Konosuke Matsushita Professor of Leadership at the Harvard Business School, writes an article titled *Leading change: Why Transformational Efforts Fail* from his experience of watching more than 100 companies try to remake themselves into significantly better corporations. These leadership efforts have been initiated under many of the popular banners:

total quality management, reengineering, right sizing, restructuring, cultural change, and turnaround. Regardless of what the process was called, the key goal was essentially the same. They all wanted to make fundamental changes in how the business was run in order to better cope with the changing market environment.

While a few of the leadership efforts were very successful and a few were bad failures, most fell somewhere in the middle with a concentration at the lower end of the scale.

Kotter draws two general conclusions and then identifies eight errors organizations make. The first general observation is that the change process is a combination of several phases which add up to a considerable length of time. skipping steps looks faster but compromises the end result. Secondly, he observes that critical mistakes in any of the steps can slow the progress of the project and undo previous gains.

The majority of the article is developed around the eight different errors he suggests are commonly made.

Error #1: Not Establishing a Great Enough Sense of Urgency.

Getting a transformation program started requires the aggressive cooperation of many individuals. Kotter claims that well over 50% of the companies fail in this first step.

Error #2: Not Creating a Powerful Enough Guiding Coalition.

Large processes often start with one or two people but in successful cases the leadership coalition continues to grow over time.

Error #3: Lacking a Vision.

In unsuccessful cases the leadership team fails to develop a picture of the future that is relatively easy to communicate and is attractive to insiders and others.

Error #4: Undercommunicating the Vision by a Factor of Ten.

In unsuccessful projects the leaders fail to use all existing channels to communicate the vision and at every opportunity.

Error #5: Not Removing Obstacles to the New Vision.

Obstacles are not all obvious from the beginning. The process of removing them is ongoing.

Error #6: Not Systematically Planning For and Creating Short-Term Wins.

Real transformation takes time, and a renewal effort losses momentum if there are no short-term goals to meet and celebrate.

Error #7: Declaring Victory Too Soon.

Premature victory celebrations kill momentum before the process is actually finished.

Error #8: Not Anchoring Changes in the Corporation's Culture.

Change isn't permanent until it becomes "the way we do things around here." Until the group norms of the various units change and the organizational culture is altered, the changes are likely to be abandoned when the pressure for change is removed.

The strength of the local church organizational culture makes it very difficult for a pastor to lead a church through major change without committing errors very similar to these. Number one on Kotter's list is likely number one on our list. The pastor has a great sense of urgency for the church to change, but the local stakeholders rarely do.

References

Kotter, John P. (1995 March–April). "Leading change: Why Transformational Efforts Fail," *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 59–67.

Gerth, H., and Mills, C. W., (eds.) (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, J. A., Lewis, M. D., & Souflee', F. (1991).

Management of Human Service Programs. Pacific Grove, CA:

Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Pascale, Richard, (1995). "The Paradox of 'Corporate Culture' Reconciling ourselves to Socialization," in Kolb, Osland, and Rubin, eds., *The Organizational Behavior Reader*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rothauge, Arlin J. *Sizing up a Congregation for New Member Ministry*. Published by Seabury Professional Services for the Education for Mission and Ministry Office of the Episcopal Church, Undated.

Schein, Edgar H., (1974). "Organizational Socialization," in Kolb, Rubin, and McIntire, eds., *Organizational Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Schein, Edgar H., (1981 Winter) "Coming to a New Awareness of Organizational Culture," *Sloan Management Review*.

Tonnies, Ferdinand. (1957). *Community and Society* (C.P. Loomis, Trans. and Ed.). East Lansing: Michigan State Press. (Original work published 1887)

Weber, Max. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations*. (A.M. Henderson and T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Free Press.

Copyright (c) 1997, Charles D. Crow, D.Min.