1-1-2007

Organic Change: 12 Emerging Communities of Missional Theologians

Bob Whitesel

C3 International, bob@churchhealth.net

Organic Change:
12 Emerging Communities of Missional Theologians

Bob Whitesel

Presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Society for Church Growth, Kansas City, Missouri, Nov. 2, 2006

Abstract

My journey into postmodernal progressions of ecclesial change began with an ethnographic survey of 12 Christian congregations that were largely led, staffed and populated with adults between the ages of 22 and 35. My research within these communities was designed to uncover synergies and strategies that might inform further research among our masters and doctoral students in the College of Graduate Studies at Indiana Wesleyan University.

The result of the above and subsequent research has led the present author to believe that the topic of organic change among emerging communities of missional theologians will be of both research and pragmatic interest to those engaged in discovering and eliciting the focus of the Church Growth Movement, which Donald McGavran called *effective* evangelism (McGavran 1988). [The author prefers to italicize the adjective *effective* to delineate between many of the theological conversations that dissect evangelism, sometimes without a requisite productivity (e.g. see conversations in Conn 1976; Shenk 1983; Wagner 1971, 1981).]

The Research Sample: Postmodernal Ecclesial Organizations

I have chosen to delimitate this study to youthful congregations largely led, staffed and populated with adults between the ages of 22 and 35 because of their emerging influence, popularity and impact within and upon the Church Growth Movement.

Postmodernal, as a descriptor, connotes of the postmodern

epoch, rather than postmodern, meaning of an ideology that rejects most of the values of modernity. The ethnographic survey that formed the basis of this research (Whitesel, 2006a) suggested that while these churches live and evangelize in and among the postmodern culture/era, and subsequently often adopt postmodernal style and customs; they do not embrace all of philosophical conventions of the postmodern ideology, such as the rejection of meta-narratives (Dockery et al. 1995; Leland 2004). Thus, these case studies are best described as primarily postmodern (of the epoch), rather than postmodern (of the ethos).

Yet, due to a postmodern ethos that began to influence my journey, I did not limit my ethnographic survey to growing congregations, but to ecclesial organizations that possessed transferable and actionable strategies. Thus, the import of my research was generalizability, rather than teleological productivity. Subsequently, to enhance this generalizability as well as introduce the topic of this year's Annual Meeting of the American Society for Church Growth, I will commence with an explanation of certain metaphors I found epistemologically helpful in describing these congregations that practice "church out of the box."

A Personal and Collegial Research Journey

A journey seemed a fitting expression for my travels along with these young congregations. Donald McGavran, in his influential book *The Bridges of God* (McGavran 1955), peppered his arguments concerning how peoples become Christian with copious mini-travelogues. And subsequently McGavran introduced the non-missionary to the milieu and tensions of missiological strategy and effectiveness. The metaphor of a journey also appealed to my case studies, for as I have argued elsewhere these young congregations often view discipleship as a journey, crossing uncharted territory, encountering unforeseen surprises, accompanied by unexpected detours, but always progressing forward (Whitesel 2006a:xxii).

And thus, the metaphor of a journey emerged as an apt, though not necessarily welcomed description of my etic relationship with these congregations that were brimming with a fusion of ideas, improvisations, innovations, and originalities.

Organic was a more intentional descriptor, and functioned as an attempt to bypass the temporal limitations of the oft-used designation: emerging. As I probed the derivation of the term, it appeared to be a self-applied label connoting perceived parallels with the so-called emerging postmodern philosophy of the twentieth century.

But, more on this shortly, since my personal academic bias at

this juncture must be probed. My research interests have been in the fields of ecclesial change and planning as long-term (i.e. strategic) processes. As such, the strategic leadership and management of Church Growth have been a foci of my academic research, mentoring and writings. Thus, as a person engaged in strategic issues of Church Growth, I found the contemporaneous and temporal aspects of the appellation "emerging" insufficient for scholarly inquiry and debate. The choice then was to substitute for this term an equally engaging designation that would hold up under interdisciplinary scrutiny.

Adding to this challenge was a postmodernal proclivity to eschew labels because they fail to denote flexibility and fluidity. Thus I sought a sort of Archimedean fulcrum point, a descriptor that has not only a theological underpinning, but also a inter-disciplinary acceptance that can be combined with a fluidity to make it a tolerable descriptor in a culture that eschews labels and staticness.

Organic

A resultant investigation into the Scriptural, sociological, organizational and Church Growth organization theory resulted in the appellation "organic." This designation may be only the most unobjectionable of many identifiers, but it does have several rationales in its favor.

First, in theological and missional writings "organic" has be appropriated when referring to a system of interrelated parts that make up a holistic and healthy living entity. Thus "organic" has generally described a church that is composed of a network of interdependent people and sub-groups who thrive in relative harmony (Dyck and Starke 1999) as a living and growing entity.

In this vein Charles Singletary asseted that organic church growth "pertains to the infrastructure or cellular growth within churches. It consists of all sorts of sub-groups, small groups and networks so vital to the assimilation, nurture and mobilization of the membership. Organic growth involves the leadership and shepherding network of a church. Its health is normally a function of the number and quality of well-trained leaders or workers which are able to be mobilized in a local church context" (Singletary 1986:114) Such an emphasis on a matrix of intimate discipleship groupings and missionally mobilized endeavors is a good descriptor of my observations of the emerging organic church (e.g. Whitesel 2005:112-114).

Missional writer Alan Roxburgh, focusing on the leadership aspect of this, described organic congregations as those that employ an expansive lay leadership model. Roxburgh recounts that

the healthy leadership structures of the Free Churches of the Reformation were a "recovery of an organic, lay-led church seeking to restore pre-Constantinian images of church and leadership" (Roxburgh 1998:193).

Similarly, Howard Snyder describes a healthy church as a "charismatic organism." By the term "charismatic," he suggests a church empowered by God, and by the designation "organism," his purpose is to connote that all of its people are ministers (Snyder 1975:157). This synergy between divine empowerment and collective participation is what I discovered to be a reoccurring attribute within emerging organic churches (Whitesel 2006a:xiii-xix, xxviii-xxxiii, 127-133).

Secondly, borrowing from the social sciences, James F. Engel describes the "organic church model" as a growing and living network of people with five characteristics: (1) one body, under one leadership, (2) equipped by God with supernatural giftings, (3) led by God through disciplined planning, (4) ministering to one another in community, and (5) ministering to the world (Engel 1979:93-95). Engle's description of a holistic and interrelated model would also closely parallel my observations of leadership structures within emerging organic churches (Whitesel 2006b:1-D; 2006a:10, 28-30, 48-50, 65-67, 107).

Thirdly, the field of political science repeatedly employs the term "organic intellectual" in a way that is reflected in the emerging organic church. An organic intellectual is one who has the duty and skills to explain intellectual concepts to modern cultures. Although the author of this concept, Antonio Gramsci, used his understanding for Marxist ends, his term "organic intellectual" gained acceptance as a descriptor of those who are skilled at helping a modern culture understand grand and pervasive concepts (Davidson 1977). Gramsci believed such organic intellectuals were not just academicians, but also journalists, novelists, playwrights, authors, and media professionals. In addition, to accomplish their work, organic intellectuals study, experience, and analyze a culture, traveling along with it to better comprehend it. Finally, the organic intellectual contextualizes grand truths in terminology that a modern culture can understand, so as not to obliterate the modern culture. This idea of an organic intellectual who does not emasculate a culture, but sojourns along with it to translate grand understandings to it, mirrors the missional attitude of the organic church (Whitesel 2006a:6-8, 19-20, 25-26, 30, 55-57, 72-74, 102-106; e.g. 48-49, 62-65).

Fourth, organic as noted above has a linguistic validity for a scenario that "emerging" cannot muster. Though the term "emerging" is fluid and dynamic, it also denotes a coming-out or

an advent. As such, emerging will at some point become an ill-suited expression if the postmodern church wanes in flexibility and/or emergence. Although this author would hope that this would not be the case, church history is replete with examples of promising new experiments in discipleship, spirituality, and evangelism that become marginalized over time (Moberg 1962). Moberg in fact describes his grounded theory of institutional life cycles, where renewal networks often migrate from functional to marginal (ibid.: 119-123). Subsequently, the appellation "organic" connotes the living and networked characteristics of the organism, rather than its outward advent (or descent). Here again the interconnectedness and cohesive nature of the organic churches studied in my ethnographic survey begged this descriptor (Whitesel 2006a:10-12, 26-27, 28-30, 37-41, 49-50, 65, 75, 83-87, 107).

"Organic" also appears as a recurring Scriptural metaphor connoting an interdependent and living organism, equivalent to the church. 1 Corinthians 12:12, 14, 20, 27; Ephesians 1:22-23, 4:11-13; Colossians 1:17-18, *24*; and Romans 12:4-8 remind us of the living, macrobiotic essence of the church, not as an organization, but as an organism.

Thus, because of efficacious use in the Church Growth Movement, biblical/theological studies, interdisciplinary arenas and linguistic legitimacy, the author will urge that organic be used as an equivalent descriptor for emergent, and thus *organic church* can be utilized as the touchstone of inter-disciplinary inquiry.

An Inter-disciplinary Understanding of Change

The second delimiter, change, seems on the surface self-explanatory, but an expansive literature within organization theory regarding change necessitates some explanation before examination.

The case studies that informed my ethnographic study revealed an ongoing engagement with change among organic congregations. They see it not as a hazard to be surmounted, but a force to be embraced and molded. In a forthcoming journal article I have developed from organization theory four generative and sustentative forces of change and proposed a new ecclesial model called the Four Forces Model (Whitesel 2007). Each of the case studies involved demonstrated a mix of the four forces. A careful analysis of each case study and their matrix in the four Forces Model awaits another opportunity. Suffice it to say for the present discussion that future Church Growth Movement research upon growth and its relationship to change mechanisms

and processes, will require as in secular organization theory, a holistic analysis via a Four Force Model (Van de Ven and Poole 1995; Poole 2004).

Theories of Change and Theories of Changing

Within Organization Theory

As a result, this present discussion must delineate, as does organization theory, between *theories of change* and theories of changing (Bennis 1996). Theories of change are constructs that explain how organizations change and factors that bring about that change. Theories of changing deal with how change can be manipulated and managed to elicit ultimate organizational performance. In the book that resulted from my ethnographic survey, I dedicated the first half of each chapter to assist the reader in understanding the theory of change evident in each case study, then concluded the chapter with three lessons that suggested corresponding theories of changing (Whitesel 2006:a).

Within the Church Growth Movement

The present exercise, due to brevity and in order to not cover previously published material, will only refer briefly to the Four Forces Model for change and changing. Instead we will inquire (as I have begun to do above) about patterns and organic church reactions that can form a foundational understanding for the ensuing presentations at this 2006 meeting of the American Society for Church Growth.

And, since this *is* the American Society for Church Growth, it requires us to briefly consider the import of change and changing in the understandings of the Church Growth Movement.

In *Understanding Church Growth* (1970), McGavran touches routinely on *theories of change*. He examines the life-cycle forces that contribute to or undermine church growth (ibid.: v-xi), as well as discusses how change is often mingled with compromise, urging an engagement and understanding of oppositional perspectives that are rooted in cultural rather than theological differences (ibid.: 207 – 265). Still McGavran lends significant space in his writings to *theories of changing* urging teleological goal-setting to bring about change (McGavran 1955:7, 53-55, 126-128), where the "universal fog" of knowledge (McGavran 1970: 76-78) is pierced by facts and strategic verifiability (ibid.: 93-102). And, toward the end of this influential volume he returns to a customary emphasis that change must begin with an epistemological change. He suggests that we "lay down that defeatist attitude which keeps us convinced that the Church is not only at a stand-

still but in retreat…. Let us brush aside the cobwebs of opinion which obstruct our vision…" (ibid.: 458) and "march with Him down an ever-widening avenue to the hearts of the nations" (McGavran 1955:158).

In his later books McGavran's foci became more precise, when with colleague Win Arn (McGavran and Arn 1977) he touches on a multi-force approach to *theories of change* via a step-by-step process, whereby churches grow as they follow *theories of changing* that include his 10 principles (ibid.: 15-115), assimilation of newcomers (ibid.: 80-91) and a fostering of ecclesial reproduction (ibid.: 92-101). Still, before long McGavran and Arn consider dialectic forces for *theories of changing* with propositions of "rightly discerning the Body (of Christ)" (ibid.: 67-73) followed by a plea by that "… the *key* (italics authors) to the turn-around was a thought-through, prayed-through, God-inspired decision by pastor and key leaders" (ibid.: 121). Yet, evolutionary forces also emerge as the "risk" of following or not following Church Growth understandings is discussed (ibid.: 117-125). Though slim, this volume demonstrates that a Four Force model can be described with lucidity as well as succinctness.

One contribution to understanding church change only a little less influential than McGavran's *Understanding Church Growth*, is Eddie Gibbs' contribution to *the I Believe In…* series for Eerdmans (Gibbs 1981). Titled *I Believe in Church Growth*, Gibbs explains *theories of change* growing out of church life-cycle dynamics (Gibbs 1981:17-48, 364-366), accompanied by *theories of changing* that include Biblical goal entailments (ibid.: 131-186, 275-312, 392-431), which require dialectic compromise in methodology yet not so in theology (ibid.:17-24, 133-138, 195-198, 315-319, 406-411, 416-427, 423-429). Gibbs also emphasizes that *theories of changing* must be evolutionary (though he uses this term differently than organization theorists and this author with regard to *theories of change*), stating "…(for) it (evolution) stresses continuity with the past and thinks in terms of what we have inherited to meet the demand of today and tomorrow" (ibid.: 364), and "…the innovative leader does not destroy all that he has inherited as an essential prerequisite for a successful investment in the future" (ibid.:365). More recently Gibbs has joined with colleague Ryan Bolger to describe the dialectic/communal nature of postmodern *theories of change* and *theories of changing* (Gibbs and Bolger 2005:191-238).

George G. Hunter III is another prolific writer in the Church Growth Movement, whose *The Celtic Way of Evangelism* (Hunter 2000) offers a goal-orientated *theory of changing* rooted in intercultural *theories of change* that resulted from a collision be-

tween Roman and Gothic worlds. Hunter skillfully describes in narrative form the motivation and persistence of Patrick's mission to bring about change in Celtic theology and ideology (ibid.:13-23), and one that would result in new indigenized goals (*theories of changing)* that connected a Romanized epistemological culture with a Celtic aesthetic one (*theories of change*) (ibid.:27-35, 53-54, 56-75).

These few representative volumes demonstrate, albeit briefly, how the Church Growth Movement and her literature sees an inaugural understanding *of theories of change* and a resultant *theory of changing* at the crux of our endeavors. And as we shall see, examples in the organic church demonstrate parallel understandings. In addition, I have argued elsewhere (Whitesel, 2007) that *theories of changing,* evident in organic church reactions to postmodern patterns, parallel the organic change of the Jesus Movement revival of the 1970s. Herein lies this treatise's call for further study, that the revival of the 1970s led to similar missional reactions, with the emergence of an organic forerunner of the postmodernal church.

Missional

Two final terms require brief explanation: missional and theologians. In many of my conversations with organic leaders they recalled with enthusiasm classic Church Growth Movement understandings as elucidated by McGavran, Wagner, Gibbs, Arn and others. However, few recent books were lauded by organic leaders except for one: *Missional Church*, edited by Darrell Guder. The term missional has been exhaustively defined and delineated elsewhere (Guder 1998:1-17). Therefore, suffice it to say for the present discussion that Guder, et. al. put forth the argument that the church in the West has come to think of itself as residing within a Christian culture. However, Guder and his colleagues within the Gospel and Our Culture Network argue that "rather than occupying a central and influential place, North American Christian churches are increasingly marginalized, so much so that in our urban areas they represent a minority movement. It is by now a truism to speak of North America as a mission field" (ibid.:13). Lesslie Newbigin had forewarned of this trend in 1984, when he argued that while the West had once been a Christendom society, it was then (circa 1984) clearly post-Christian, if not anti-Christian (Newbigin 1984).

As a result, a missional perspective belies a belief that the strategic solution for survival is for the church to begin to think of herself as a "missionary" organization within an unsympathetic cultural milieu. This is a church in which people see them-

selves as being "sent," rather than simply sending others (Guder 1998:4-5). Not surprisingly, young organic church growth thinkers are embracing Guder's seminal tome, for "in it Guder has brought back the focus to the basics of church growth understanding: that God wants his lost people found, that unregenerate culture is antagonistic to such efforts, and therefore that every Christian has a crucial role to play in the process" (Whitesel, 2007).

The leaders of these ecclesial case studies talked often of their missional intentions (e.g. Whitesel 2006a:xvii-xix, 19-20) and the term reoccurs in postmodern churches as often as evangelical may have in the 1970s (compare for example Quebedeaux 1973; McManus 2005).

Theologians

The final term that time permits us to consider it the designation theologian. I first came across broad use of this appellation at one of my early case studies: Vintage Faith Church in Santa Cruz California. Here, shepherd Dan Kimball utilizes the term liberally in his admonitions regarding individual congregant actions.

Personally, as a product of a theological seminary which absorbed tens of thousands of my dollars (and possibly hours), I at first chaffed at the thought of untrained congregants grappling with the nuances of my vocation. Yet historical economists Roger Finke of Penn State and Rodney Stark of the Univ. of Washington have demonstrated in their exhaustive research of church growth in America, when theology is conducted and considered outside of cloistered halls and in the markets and backrooms of public gathering places, the church has experienced growth (Finke and Stark 1989, 1992; Finke 1990, 1994). Summating this trend theologian Harvey Cox in 1975 elatedly observed "theology is being done today – in curious places, under unusual sponsorship, by unauthorized person, unnoticed by those who read only the right journals" (Cox 1975:114-115).

Such a democratization seems to have influenced Donald McGavran, whose theology, according to close friend and colleague Arthur Glasser "does not involve the orderly unfolding of a system based on inner-evolved principles. He is no system builder, operating according to a particular set of self-selected norms. Where the Scriptures are silent, he desires to remain silent" (Glasser 1976:26).

Newbigin describes this indigenizing propensity of McGavran in slightly different terms, and as such adds to our understanding of his theological suppositions. In a chapter titled

12   Bob Whitesel

"Church Growth, Conversion and Culture" Newbigin notes that for Donald McGavran missiological productiveness was a telltale residue of the Holy Spirit's participation (Newbigin 1978:121-122). Newbigin adds that productivity and theology often inform each other, and that in Pauline theology "the local ministry of each church is formed from its own membership (ibid.:130), they are fiscally independent from Paul and his entourage (ibid.:129), they are treated as adults and not adolescents (ibid.) and most importantly "when as a result of the preaching of the gospel, a Christian community has come into being, Paul entrust the whole responsibility to the local leadership, and moves on" (ibid.). Paul's subsequent appeal to his ecclesial offspring to develop theological suppositions (as witnessed in the Pauline Epistles) is ample proof of an indigenized working out of theology in practicality. And, Newbigin rooted this argument in McGavran's propensities.

Today this is exemplified in a recent sermon series by Dan Kimball titled "The Clash: Exploring Where Church and Culture Collide." Kimball encourages congregants to wrestle with the ramifications and correlations of theological inquiry (Kimball 2006). This process is reminiscent of G. C. Berkouwer's approach, which Lewis Smedes lucidly describes as where "theology is in constant and dynamic relationship with faith and, hence, with the Word of God, on the one hand, and with the Church and the pulpit on the other. Only as it lives and works at the center of this double polarity can theology be meaningful and relevant" (Smedes 1973:96). Not surprisingly, the organic church usually sees part of the dynamic task and duty of not just clergy but laity as well, the exploration of Berkouwer's doublepolarity. Such efforts postmodern organization theorist Mary Jo Hatch calls the "leadership collage" (Hatch 1997:53-54; e.g. Whitesel 2006a:124-133).

Finally, permit me to digress to a salient, yet important point at this juncture, and I will promise not to return. Louis Berkhof makes a helpful distinction between the church as "organism and institution" (Berkhof 1954:567). And he effectively points out that this is different from the church invisible and visible, where the latter distinguishes between the "now" church and the former the "ideal and completed" church (ibid.:565-566). Rather Berkhof beneficially points out that the church as organism and institution are two further sub-designations "within the visible church" (ibid.:567) called *apparitio* and *institutio*, which more-or-less still "have their spiritual background in the invisible church" (ibid.). Thus the church as an organism is the "*coetus fidelium*, the communion of believers, who are united in bond of

the Spirit, while the Church as an institution is the *mater fidelium*, the mother of believers …. and agency for the conversion of sinners and the perfecting of the saints … the two are co-ordinate in a sense…" (ibid.).

Full Circle:

Toward Theologians in Changing Missional Communities

And thus we have come full-circle. We have returned to the church as organism (*apparitio*) wed with an institutional milieu (*institutio*) that fosters what I have suggested are organic missional congregations engaged in uncovering *theories of change* and *theories of changing*. My terms was chosen, with nods to McGavran, Van de.Ven, Poole, Berkouwer, Berkhof, Bennis and others, to connote the importance of the *coetus fidelium* which emerges from the *mater fidelium*. Paraphrasing Berkhof, the Church as an institution or organization (*mater fidelium*) is "a means to an end" (ibid.). Yet, this "means to an end … is found in the Church as an organism, the community of believers (*coetus fidelium*)" (ibid.). Here would lie much of McGavran's interest.

And, it is this last point that is worth both contemplation and conclusion. And that is that this new organic experiment is imbuing the *mater fidelium* with what it means to be *coetus fidelium*, both *apparitio* and *institutio*.

Writer

Whitesel, Bob. Dr, Bob Whitesel is the founder of C3 International (Creative Church Consulting International) a church growth consulting firm specializing in diagnostic services for churches that typically cannot afford a consultation. He holds a D.Min. degree in Church Growth and Evangelism from Fuller Theological Seminary, and a B.S. degree in Psychology from Purdue University. He is currently working on a Ph.D. in Intercultural Studies at Fuller's School of Intercultural Studies.

NOTES

Bennis, Warren G. 1996. *Changing Organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Berkhof, Louis. 1954. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Co.
Conn, Harvie M., ed. 1976. *Theological Perspectives on Church Growth*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.
Cox, Harvey. 1975. Whatever Happened to Theology? *Christian-*

14   Bob Whitesel

ity and Crisis 35:114-15.

Davidson, Alistair. 1977. *Antonio Gramsci: Towards an Intellectual Biography*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press.

Dockery, David S., Stanley J. Grenz, Carl F. H. Henry, R. Albert Mohler, and Thomas C. Oden. 1995. *The Challenge of Postmodernism: An Evangelical Engagement*. Edited by D. S. Dockery. Wheaton, Ill.: BridgePoint Publications.

Dyck, Bruno, and Frederick A. Starke. 1999. The Formation of Breakaway Organizations: Observations and a Process Model. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44:792-822.

Engel, James F. 1979. *Contemporary Christian Communication*. New York: Nelson.

Finke, Roger. 1990. Religious Deregulation: Origins and Consequences. *Journal of Church and State* 32:609-626.

———. 1994. The Quiet Transformation: Changes in Size and Leadership of Southern Baptist Churches. *Review of Religious Research* 36 (1):3-22.

Finke, Roger, and Rodney Stark. 1989. How the Upstart Sects Won America: 1776-1850. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28:27-44.

———. 1992. *The Churching of America, 1776-1990: Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Gibbs, Eddie. 1981. *I Believe in Church Growth*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Gibbs, Eddie, and Ryan K. Bolger. 2005. *Emerging Churches: Creating Christian Community in Postmodern Cultures*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker.

Glasser, Arthur F. 1976. An Introduction to the Church Growth Perspectives of Donald Anderson McGavran. In *Theological Perspectives on Church Growth*, edited by H. M. Conn. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.

Guder, Darrell L. 1998. Missional Church: From Sending to Being Sent. In *Missional Church: A Vision for the Sending of the Church in North America*, edited by D. L. Guder. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Hatch, Mary Jo. 1997. *Organization Theory: Modern, Symbolic and Postmodern Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hunter, George G. III. 2000. *The Celtic Way of Evangelism: How Christianity Can Reach the West…Again*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Kimball, Dan. 2006. The Clash: Exploring Where Church and Culture Collide.

Leland, John. 2004. Hip New Churches Pray to a Different

Drummer. *The New York Times*, February 18, 2004.

McGavran, Donald A. 1955. *The Bridges of God: A Study in the Strategy Of Missions*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock.

———. 1988. *Effective Evangelism: A Theological Mandate*. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company.

McGavran, Donald A., and Win Arn. 1977. *Ten Steps For Church Growth*. New York: Harper and Row.

McManus, Erwin Raphael. 2005. *The Barbarian Way: Unleash the Untamed Faith Within*. Nashville, Tenn.: Nelson Books.

Moberg, David O. 1962. *The Church as Social Institution: The Sociology of American Religion*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Newbigin, Lesslie. 1978. *The Open Secret: An Introduction to the Theology of Mission*. Second ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Co.

———. 1984. *The Other Side of 1984: Questions for the Churches*. New York: National Council of Churches.

Poole, Marshall Scott. 2004. Central Issues in the Study of Change and Innovation. In *Handbook of Organizational Change and Innovation*, edited by M. S. Poole and A. H. Van de Ven. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Quebedeaux, Richard. 1973. *The Young Evangelicals: Revolution in Orthodoxy*. New York: Harper & Row.

Roxburgh, Alan J. 1998. Missional Leadership: Equipping God's People for Mission. In *Missional Church: A Vision for the Sending of the Church in North America*, edited by D. L. Guder. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Shenk, Wilbert R., ed. 1983. *Exploring Church Growth*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Singletary, Charles B. 1986. Organic Growth: A Critical Dimension for the Church. In *Church Growth State of the Art*, edited by C. P. Wagner and E. L. Towns. Wheaton, Ill.: InterVarsity Press.

Smedes, Lewis. 1973. G. C. Berkouwer. In *Creative Minds in Contemporary Theology*, edited by P. E. Hughes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Snyder, Howard A. 1975. *The Problem of Wineskins*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press.

Van de Ven, Andrew H., and Marshall Scott Poole. 1995. Explaining Development and Change in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review* (20):510-540.

Wagner, C. Peter. 1971. *Frontiers in Missionary Strategy*. Chicago: Moody Press.

———. 1981. *Church Growth and The Whole Gospel: A Biblical Mandate*. San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers.

16   Bob Whitesel

Whitesel, Bob. 2005. The Perfect Cluster: For Young Adults, St. Tom's, Sheffield Creates Extended Families, And Everyone Knows Where They Fit. *Outreach Magazine*, May/June 2005, 112-114.

———. 2006. *Inside The Organic Church: Learning From 12 Emerging Congregations*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

———. 2006. quoted in Prepare Thee for Some Serious Marketing, edited by F. Warner. New York: The New York Times.

———. 2007. Toward a Holistic and Postmodernal Theory of Change: The Four Forces Model of Change as Reflected in Church Growth Literature. *The Journal of the American Society for Church Growth* forthcoming.