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ABSTRACT

Ken Wilber’s integral theory (methodological pluralism), as applied to Unity and New Thought churches, is a holistic lens through which to view spiritual communities as living systems. This dissertation puts forth an integral map of church organization based on the All Quadrant / All Level (AQAL) integral approach and applies integral principles and Spiral Dynamics to issues of church growth and development. Two-hundred ninety-eight Unity, Religious Science, and other New Thought churches participated in a survey designed to map key indicators associated with the four quadrants of the organizational holon of the church: Organizational Practices, Social Systems, Culture, and Consciousness; and along developmental lines within each quadrant: Structures, Intimacy, Identity, and Intentionality. The study compares two groups of respondents—those that self-identified as leaders of thriving, coherent, and integral ministries, and all others—across 75 organizational issues. The study examines leadership practices and indicates how, in those instances where second tier practices were prevalent, churches reported a high degree of organizational health and integrity. In those churches where first tier practices dominated, the tendency was for the church community to be driven by subsistence imperatives. The study corroborates the researcher’s formulation of an integral map of ministry and the efficacy of an integral approach to church development strategies. It makes clear the relationship between leadership capacity and organizational integrity. It shows how the integral framework provides a relevant system for cultivating a whole system approach to working with the challenges and opportunities of organizational development.
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CHAPTER 1:
INTRODUCTION

In his seminal book *A Theory of Everything—An Integral Vision for Business, Politics, Science and Spirituality*, Ken Wilbur points out the distinction between the words *Kosmos* and *cosmos*. Kosmos is the Greek principle for wholeness or the whole of all existence, including the physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual realms. 1 Ultimate reality is not merely the cosmos, or the physical dimension, but the Kosmos, which includes both essence and form—spirit and matter. According to Wilber, any theory of anything must embrace this integral view for it to be an accurate representation of reality. As this principle is applied to churches, the whole of ministry, therefore, can be understood in terms of its interior and exterior natures; its cultural and systemic configurations; its structural and communal idiosyncrasies, and its developmental and evolutionary trajectory. By framing ministry in holistic terms—as a living system—it is possible to embrace both the organization and the organism of ministry without diminishing one or the other.

The integral approach, as developed by Ken Wilber, provides the principles upon which an integral map of ministry can be formulated as a means of understanding better and navigating more effectively the complexities of church developmental dynamics, while maintaining the holistic integrity of the living system. Based on this methodologically pluralistic approach, the Principal Researcher (PR) blended the relevant issues associated with church growth and development with the salient principles of the integral model. The following is a general overview of how integral theory can be applied to organizational dynamics of churches.
The Quadrants

Wilber uses the acronym AQAL—all quadrants, all levels—to refer to the basic framework of his integral theory. The quadrants are the domains within which the two basic dimensions of development occur: the interior and exterior (being and doing), and the individual and collective (agency and community) dimension. With respect to the PR’s application of integral theory, the agency / being quadrant (upper-left / UL) represents organizational consciousness and leadership intentionality: the context out of which the leadership matrix of the church executes its responsibilities. The community / being quadrant (lower-left / LL) represents the cultural identity of the congregation—its history, values, traditions and consensus reality. The agency / doing quadrant (upper-right / UR)
denotes the organizational structures that underlie organizational practices, behaviors, and systems. And, the community / doing quadrant (lower-right / LR), pertains to the relational dynamics of the congregation and the social systems that emerge in the context of intimacy and care-giving issues.

All of the quadrants are interrelated. From left to right, the holonic entity can be seen as a dynamic of being and doing—the implicate and explicate order of an entity—the interrelatedness of the interior and exterior dimensions of reality. The upper and lower facets of the quadrant matrix denote agency and community or communion and refer to the dynamic of self in relationship to all other selves. In my application of integral principles to the organizational holon, the self or individual within the collective more accurately refers to the authoritative, administrative, and executive aspect of the organization responsible for order and integrity in the relationship of constituents.

The Levels

The levels associated with AQAL theory refer to developmental stages within each quadrant. Early versions of Wilber’s theory integrated the research of a psychologist, Clare Graves, who formulated a theory of human development that postulated eight levels of existence. Each level and its corresponding color code represent values spheres or world views along a developmental spiral. Graves used the spiraling double helix in DNA as a metaphor to explain the dynamic of the interaction of the persons on one side and their life conditions on the other. This interaction generates adaptations out of which social development occurs. The first six levels are subsistent levels similar to Maslow’s deficiency needs schema, according to Beck and Cowan, and
are marked by “1st tier thinking.” First tier thinking—of the individual, group, society, or organization—is preoccupied with how life conditions (time, place, problems, and circumstances) look and feel. In contrast, “2nd tier thinking” represents the emergence of being levels, the value spheres of integration and holism. Second tier dynamics are directed toward supporting a meaningful partnership between the individual, organization, society, and the planet through the healthy activation and balance of the entire spiral of development.4

With regard to organizational dynamics, the distinction between 1st and 2nd tier practices is similar to the imperatives of having and being in relation to changing life conditions. A subsistent life orientation asks, “What do we need (to have) in order to
deal with the current situation?” The context of the question is always utilitarian, ego or ethno-centric and outward directed to manage perceived threats, challenges, or opportunities. Second tier or being level orientation asks, “Who have we come here to be? Given who we are and what we value, what is ours to do?” The context of the question is about life’s meaning and an integral relationship to arising conditions. Put another way, 1st tier organizations discover their identity through their doing (or having). Second tier organizations discover their doing by discerning who they are. While stimulated by external conditions and forces, the emphasis is on integrating present conditions and future possibilities into the broader framework of actualizing the organization’s capacity to fulfill its purpose.

While the spiral of development consists of eight levels (the Spiral Dynamics model), the number of levels that an integral model can include is arbitrary, providing that the “minimum include a formative level of development, an average, or normative and a higher potential or advanced level.” The Integral Map of Ministry denotes three levels: Levels 1 and 2 (1st tier) and Level 3 (2nd tier). Upon each developmental line, within each quadrant, a developmental stage (level 1, 2, or 3) can be used to illustrate evolutionary milestones.

The Lines

In addition to the four quadrants and developmental levels or stages are developmental lines. The integral framework can accommodate any number of developmental lines in each quadrant. While the number of lines is arbitrary, I use one developmental line per quadrant. Developmental lines differ from levels or stages of
development insofar as lines refer to a specific category or theme of development as opposed to the level of development itself. For instance, in the relational quadrant (LR), the intimacy / care-giving dynamic is designated as a developmental line upon which the three levels or stage milestones are situated—Family system (level 1); Egalitarian system (level 2); Holonic system (level 3). In early development, intimacy / care-giving is patterned after family dynamics. Churches replicate this system very effectively. The next developmental milestone is the Egalitarian system where intimacy / care giving is a dynamic of the broader community rather than the function of parental figures within the system. It is developmentally a more effective configuration in large group dynamics. Development—movement from Family to Egalitarian systems—is an evolution of how intimacy and care-giving is delivered or configured. Finally, the Holonic system

**Figure 3. Developmental Lines**
represents the advanced developmental dynamic on the intimacy / care-giving line where all participants are each, and individually, a self-care system unto themselves as well as to each other.

The Integral Map of Ministry

The Integral Map identifies the part/whole relationship of the organizational holon and plots each stage transition along a developmental line. Church growth can be framed in terms of stage or level transitions within the four-quadrant matrix. “Wilber’s proposition is that “each of the four quadrants…must develop in balance with each other (or tetra-evolve). If one quadrant develops at a faster rate than the others, the holon will exhibit unhealthy distortions.” It is very common, for instance, for a large church to

---

Figure 4. Integral Map of Ministry
have a complex organizational structure, while at the same time, be dominated by family systems dynamics associated with a long-tenured minister. When the minister retires or vacates the system, the organization can be easily thrown into chaos because it lacks the developmental balance of an egalitarian social system. Another example is when a church experiences rapid increase in attendance (influx into the social system) without a corresponding reconfiguring of the cultural dynamics that underpin the church’s identity and purpose, the growth in numbers can lead to competing agendas because it threatens the status quo. “An integral approach sees organizational health as the dynamic balance of an organization’s interiors, e.g. people well-being and cultural life, and its exteriors, e.g. systems effectiveness and efficient processes.” The quadrants of organizational structures / practices, relational systems, culture, and consciousness map out the territory upon which all levels of organizational development unfold simultaneously.

**Stage Designations**

Names for each stage within a particular quadrant along its corresponding developmental line have been chosen to illustrate a specific aspect or attribute of the stage at its particular level relevant to its position within the AQAL matrix. These designations need to be thought of as metaphors rather than concrete conceptualizations of a particular developmental dynamic. They represent my attempt to generalize the evolutionary process while honoring holonic developmental principles. (It is important to point out that it is impossible to describe accurately any level or stage designation without consideration of its relationship to the other stages on the same level throughout the quadrants.) The specific designations for each stage in each quadrant are as follows:
**Organizational: Simplex, Multiplex, & Holoplex.**

Simplex refers to a unidirectional form of electronic communication, such as in a public address system. Multiplex refers to two or more-way transmission circuitry commonly found in carrier wave technology or satellite data transfer. Holoplex is a term applied in holographic imaging systems and conveys a part/whole principle where theoretically every part of the organization possesses the capacity to replicate the whole of the organization.

The usefulness of these terms becomes apparent in the broader context of their relationship to the *same level* dynamics of the other quadrants. For instance, it is easy to see how Simplex—one-way communication—can be a metaphor for an organizational paradigm that effectively supports a Family social system, rooted in a Pseudo community culture. In the Family system—where the parent / child dynamic is prevalent—communication, authority, and influence is top-down, hierarchal, and one-way.

In contrast, the bottom-up, *everyone has a voice* dynamic of the Egalitarian system is best served by an organizational structure that is capable of maintaining multiple avenues of communication, system-wide participation, feedback, and a capacity to influence the direction of the ministry. The multiplex designation works well in this respect. It supports and is supported by the Authentic (community-centric) community culture where the church’s identity arises independent of the minister or spiritual leader.
All Level 3 designations are purely theoretical and represent projections based upon the trajectory of each developmental line. The Holoplex stage transcends and includes the Multiplex structure. Whereas in the Multiplex structural dynamic communication and influence is multi-directional and prevalent through the system, the Holoplex structure permits a simultaneous conveyance of information and responsiveness throughout the organization instantaneously. Further explanation of this principle would require the introduction of transpersonal and quantum concepts (such as non-local interconnectedness and morphic field theory) that are beyond the scope of this dissertation. Suffice it to say, all Level 3 milestones have yet to be manifested in societal organizations, much less in church organizations.

**Relational: Family, Egalitarian, & Holonic Systems**

The relational quadrant pertains to the intimacy / care-giving delivery system within the community. All social dynamics of the church can be categorized in terms of their capacity to develop, support, protect, and sustain the various ways people are in relationship and feel emotionally and spiritual connected. As previously mentioned, the Level 1 Family system is the most basic and effective structure for an intimacy / care-giving dynamic that is intended to replicate familial themes among and between community members. Ministers become surrogate parents. The pastor / flock social structure preserves the ultimate care-giving paradigm
where the congregation—God’s children—is in the trusted care of the Divine Parent—
Father / Mother God.

In contrast, the Level 2 social system is Egalitarian. No longer is the intimacy / care-giving role deferred to one individual or group. The bulk of the system takes on the responsibility to provide care and connection throughout the community. It should also be apparent that the Egalitarian social dynamic can only emerge in conjunction with Authentic Community and a Multiplex organizational structure. As the majority of community members takes on more ownership of the organization and its mission, the dynamic of how people form meaningful alliances naturally shifts away from the parent/child (Family System) structure.

The Holonic Level 3 system incorporates the part/whole principle of the Holoplex organizational structure supporting a holarchal social system where people are both the *means* and the *ends* in the chain of care and intimacy. One way to conceptualize a holonic social system is to imagine a community bound together by a transcendent purpose that both fulfills the organization’s mission as well as draw upon each individuals capacity to make a meaningful contribution to the integrity and capacity of the whole. Intimacy and care-giving becomes the embodiment of valuing and honoring the intrinsic worth and sacredness of each individual and all individuals in their individual and group relationship to the whole.
Add to this image a world-centric cultural identity that seeks to create a world that works for everyone through a balance of self-responsibility and sacred activism, and you will come close to what Wilber describes as the “One Taste”—the Taste of the Divine⁸. This is what I conceive to be the essence of the Holonic System.

**Cultural: Pseudo, Authentic, & Integral Community**

Pseudo community denotes a cultural identity embedded in the relationship between the minister and the congregation. It is ego-centric. The minister represents the egoic self of the church. The ministry cannot see itself distinct from the personhood of the minister. The ministry looks to and sees the minister as its organizing principle of the church. The minister is a surrogate parent responsible for the well-being of the congregation. Pseudo community is prevalent regardless of church size. It is very common for large corporate or mega churches to be dominated by the Pseudo community cultural dynamic. While they typically have complex organizational structures and clear missions, people’s ownership of the church arises solely in the context of their loyalty and devotion to the minister. Should the minister fall from grace or leave the system, the church is inclined to suffer by association.

The Authentic cultural dynamic emerges as the community differentiates from its spiritual leader and becomes its own organizing principle. Identity arises from the community, not from the leadership or minister. It is ethno-centric. The culture sees and values the role of spiritual leader as that of a coach not a parent. One way to
determine if the communal dynamic is Pseudo or Authentic is to watch what happens in the community when it experiences the loss of its minister. In Authentic community, while there is often a natural grieving process associated with the departure of a beloved pastor, unlike the Pseudo community, it will not experience the trauma or chaos that befalls a church whose identity is entangled in the spiritual leader. Another distinguishing characteristic of Authentic community is that it is capable of differentiating from its story. Unlike Pseudo community, it is able to integrate its history in a similar way self-actualized persons reconcile their shadows in the broader context of the spiritual journey.

The Integral community refers to a world-centric disposition, linking the congregation’s cultural identity to its capacity to impact the global arena. The community sees the minister as a role model and a global citizen inspiring and empowering the community to take on advocacies and missions reflecting the organization’s capacity to make a difference in the world.

**Associative, Differentiated & Integrative Consciousness**

Associative Consciousness refers to the mind-set that associates itself with its experience. “We are our experience.” Experiences and situations have to be a certain way; otherwise there is cause for alarm. Consciousness or the intentionality of the church’s leadership is associative insofar as it confuses itself with what is happening or not happening. It is driven by how life looks or feels. What is seen and what is experienced is inseparable
from its sense of self. Therefore, situations must be controlled and precautions implemented to maintain the illusion of security.

Differentiated consciousness refers to the capacity to disassociate identity from experience and therefore respond without intimidation. “As a community, we have experiences, but our experiences are not who we are.” It is free to relate to current circumstances and future possibilities consistent with its values and purpose. As a precursor to 2nd tier thinking, it represents a progressive orientation that seeks to take charge by taking responsibility.

It views challenges as feedback to the creative process rather than problems-to-solve.

Integrative consciousness refers to the blending of “who we are” (being) and “what we have” to actualize the capacity to interact (what we do) with life conditions consistent with holistic goals and values. As a 2nd tier framework, Integrative consciousness is concerned with the health and integrity of the entire living system that is ministry. It sees the church’s purpose inextricably linked to what is happening in the world. Rather than being eclipsed or driven by worldly concerns, it represents an authentic optimism that is empowered by the possibility of making a difference in the world.
First Tier (Level 1) Ministry

Each level of the integral map of ministry denotes a particular developmental dynamic of interlocking systems and structures representative of 1st tier, high 1st tier, and 2nd tier organizational, relational, cultural, and consciousness matrices. In other words, Level 1 ministry, for instance, is a dynamic of a simplex (single cell) organization that supports a familial relational system, which is in turn underpinned by a pseudo community culture that arises out of associative consciousness. The entire system is configured to maximize intimacy, care-giving, security, and to maintain the status quo. It is dominated family system dynamics and governed by subsistent imperatives. Level 1 churches are typically less than 150 adult worshippers, but exist in larger congregations as well.

Figure 5. Level 1 Ministry
High 1st Tier (Level) Ministry

Level 2 ministry is remarkably distinct from Level 1. Structurally, it shifts from being top-down to bottom-up. Its egalitarian social system is enriched by a community-centric cultural paradigm. It is purpose driven and capable of adapting to shifting demographics. Typically, Level 2 churches have congregations larger than 150 worshippers, but exist in smaller communities as well.

Figure 6. Level 2 Ministry
Second Tier (Level 3) Ministry

The Level 3 configuration is hypothetical and based on a plausible projection of the dynamics that theoretically support a 2\textsuperscript{nd} tier organizational paradigm. Because the 2\textsuperscript{nd} tier wave matrix has only been accessible to humanity in recent history (1950 for the yellow meme and 1970 for the turquoise meme), there has yet to be established a full functioning Level 3 organizational dynamic in post-modern society.\textsuperscript{9} As 2\textsuperscript{nd} tier leadership practices integrate advances in technology and the paradigms of quantum and whole system thinking, 2\textsuperscript{nd} tier organizational structures, systems and relational dynamics will emerge as a developmental possibility.

![Figure 7. Level 3 Ministry](image)

Figure 7. Level 3 Ministry
Background of Problem

Since the birth of the church development movement in 1955, increasing numbers of worshippers has been fundamental to church growth methodologies. Over the years, church development specialists and consultants have sought to integrate business models and corporate organizational paradigms into the methodologies and programs designed to stimulate church growth. These approaches have included promotion and marketing, strategic planning, community building, visioning, capacity building, leadership training, conflict management, as well as other programs believed to be effective in optimizing a church’s capacity for expansion.

The current statistics regarding congregational size demographics, however, indicate the vast majority of North American congregations are small churches. Seventy-five percent have congregations of less than 100 worshippers. The normalcy of the small church phenomenon is supported by the research of anthropologist Robin Dunbar who studied primates as they formed social networks. He found that the largest group possible in which human beings can be in active relationship with each other is in a group of 150 people. He links this postulate to size of the brain and its capacity to handle the complexities of active relationships in a group of this size. Dunbar’s research suggests that it is unnatural for churches to organize in larger groups when intimacy and mutuality are primary values. This observation is corroborated by the fact that the Pastoral to Program size transition is the most difficult and conflicted to effect. “One can expect enormous resistance on the part of a Pastoral Church as it flirts with becoming a Program Church. Many churches make an unconscious choice not to make the transition and keep hovering around the level of 150 active members. The two treasured features of a
Pastoral Church that will be lost if it becomes a Program Church are ready access to their religious leader and the feeling of oneness as a church family, where everyone knows everyone else and the church can function as a single cell community.12

Increasing numbers of worshippers, while universally welcomed and perceived as evidence of organizational success, can create a dichotomy of imperatives especially in smaller churches. While providing a high degree of intimacy and care giving, small churches tend to be subsistent organizations and driven by family system dynamics. The prospects of enhancing financial support and expanding the pool of able volunteers makes the increasing numbers track to church growth very tempting. However, as more and more people enter the social system, how people are in relationship with each other and their minister must change in order for new people to find authentic intimacy bonds within the larger community. When numbers increase to the point where the minister can no longer function as the primary care-giver within the system, tensions build as people compete for the minister’s presence. As the church grows and as the minister spends more time cultivating new relationships, the rank and stature of established members is ostensibly diminished. When an element of the congregation begins to feel abandoned by the minister, church growth initiatives lose credibility among elders and parental figures in the church. Growth is resisted. Conflict arises. Drama eclipses spiritual imperatives.

This is but one of many complexities associated with the entire arena of church growth and development. Small churches inherently resist strategies to increase numbers and the adoption of organizational practices that are necessary to support larger congregational dynamics because small church identity and relational systems are embedded in first tier practices configured to maintain the intimacy / care-giving matrix.
of the family system church paradigm. While larger churches easily accommodate increasing numbers, they are vulnerable to administrative, competency, staffing, and leadership issues that are often ignored in traditional church development programs.

Church growth and development strategies have primarily dealt with the visible and external (the material universe) domains of organization—structures, competencies, strategic planning, fiscal management, marketing, and increasing numbers thus reducing the whole of ministry to a segmented combination of its many parts. An integral approach to church growth and development sees the church as a living system, where the principles which underpin a ministry’s evolution are largely governed by the invisible domains of the community—social systems, unspoken rules, cultural imperatives, traditions, history, mutuality, shared identity, and consciousness—just to name a few. Without an integral model for understanding ministry in its Kosmic sense or the leadership capacity that can embrace it, the ability to actualize the developmental capabilities of the church is limited.

Statement of the Problem

As integral principles are applied to church developmental issues, it becomes apparent that stage shifts (development) require not only a capacity to move from simple to complex, from utilitarian to integral, but also require the surmounting of obstacles to cultural and systemic reconfiguration. Size transitions are not just developmental shifts in structures capable of accommodating increasing numbers but are, instead, evolutionary progressions governed by a church’s capacity to reconfigure itself in terms of identity, purpose, and care-giving bonds.
Thus far, traditional church growth and development programs have focused on increasing numbers as the primary means for generating the energy to induce size transitions. This approach is largely ineffective and troublesome, especially in churches of Family and Pastoral size. The focus of increasing numbers is diametrically in opposition to family system dynamics which inherently resist efforts to reconfigure established relationships—a necessity in growing congregations. What’s more, an emphasis on increasing numbers reinforces the myth that more is better or that increasing numbers is the benchmark of a successful, prosperous ministry.

Second tier practices shift the goal of church growth from increasing numbers (first tier) to increasing congregational ownership. Second tier strategies focus on integrating the generative qualities of each meme along the spectrum of the communal values matrix into the broader construct of organizational integrity and coherence. Thus, a whole system or integral approach seeks to align development strategies with inherent evolutionary systems akin to all living systems. The integral approach also embraces both the interior and exterior domains of self, organization, and society.

**Purpose of the Study**

What has yet to be devised and implemented is a methodologically pluralistic approach to church growth that both honors the holism of ministry as well as navigates the topography of the developmental process. To this end, I have reframed the church development issue from a process of increasing numbers of worshippers in order to generate momentum for size transitions, to an integral approach that focuses on creating thriving, coherent, and integral organizations. My thesis is that such a focus will
activate a tetra-evolution of the church within the AQAL matrix. In addition, I theorize that the use of 2\textsuperscript{nd} tier methodologies and organizational practices (whole system) are the most effective means to the activation of developmental dynamics within the living system of ministry.

In addition, by categorizing church development holonically—as a evolving dynamic of organizational complexity, cultural centrisms, leadership function, intimacy and care-giving matrices—a new approach becomes evident that is capable of working with, not against, the framework of the living system. The integral approach, therefore, goes much further with the inclusion of a ministry’s interior dimensions and the emphasis on consciousness and cultural and social system transitions. It embraces the entire dynamic of ministry as it looks at and works with transitional issues in all quadrants and along each developmental line. Furthermore, a focus on creating thriving, coherent, and integral organizations shifts the emphasis of development from being a linear phenomenon (transition in size) to one that is inter-dimensional and holistic. This approach minimizes the activation of immune systems within the relational network that instinctively resists change. It also optimizes balance within and between the quadrants because development is not compartmentalized, but tetra-activated. An integral approach blended with 2\textsuperscript{nd} tier practices creates healthy energy and authentic enthusiasm within the spiritual community because it focuses on congruence and coherence in all aspects of organization and community life.

Since there has yet to be an application of integral principles to issues of church growth, or a comprehensive study of the efficacy of such an approach, this study is intended to break new ground and to bring into greater clarity how the integral model can
also aid other programs such as transition ministry, peacemaking, new ministry
development, and other aspects of organizational development.

The purpose of this proposed study is to show how, in the context of an integral
model and map of ministry, 2nd tier practices correlate to thriving, coherent, and integral
organizations regardless of church size; and that first tier practices perpetuate subsistence
imperatives that actually undermine growth initiatives. Research and study into this
correlation will help formulate a whole system (holonic) approach to church growth and
development within the New Thought movement and beyond.

**Research Question**

What, therefore, are the organizational practices, relational dynamics, cultural
imperatives, and leadership qualities that underlie thriving, coherent, and integral church
organizations? What characteristics and trends do thriving, coherent, and integral
churches possess that differentiates them from other church organizations, and to what
degree are these distinctions evidence of 2nd tier practices?

To answer these questions it was necessary to construct a survey questionnaire
(see Appendix C: *Integral Church Profile Survey*) specifically designed to assess the
spectrum of practices, behaviors, imperatives, and trends of each church’s leadership and
its congregation in association with all quadrants of ministry. A comparative
correlational design is used to denote the distinction between first and second tier
organizational practices in churches and their relationship to issues of organizational
integrity, intimacy and care-giving matrices, cultural centrisms, and intentionality.
Scope of the Study

The scope of this study is limited to a theoretical application of integral principles to developmental issues of New Thought churches in North America. The research study is intended to compare responses between two groups within the survey population: a *thriving, coherent, and integral* group; and the *all other responses* group and formulate conclusions based upon the principles of Integral theory and Spiral Dynamics.

Definition of Terms

- **AQAL**: acronym for all quadrants and all levels—refers to the basic framework of Wilber’s integral theory
- **Associative Consciousness**: the blending of subjective and objective reality where the identity of the congregation is associated with external circumstances
- **Authentic Community**: a community centric cultural matrix
- **Corporate Church**: a church organization with greater than 400 weekly adult worshipers
- **Differentiated Consciousness**: the differentiation of subjective and objective reality where the identity of the congregation arises independent of external circumstances
- **Egalitarian System**: a relational dynamic where intimacy and care-giving bonds are maintained by those who are members of the spiritual community at large
- **Family Church**: a church organization with 50 or less weekly adult worshipers
- **Family System**: a relational dynamic where the intimacy and care-giving delivery system replicates the familial patterns of the congregation
- **First Tier**: subsistent level practices, relational dynamics, and cultural imperatives
- **Holon**: a whole that is itself a part of a larger system of wholes
- **Holonic development**: an ascending evolutionary movement toward the next level of whole-system development
- **Holonic System**: a hypothetical transpersonal relational dynamic were all community members, in the very act of being present to one, also contributes to the intimacy and care-giving needs of whole
- **Holoplex**: an organization structure that permits a simultaneous conveyance of information and whole-system responsiveness to situational dynamics
- **Integral Approach**: an all quadrant and all level approach to understanding and working with church organization and community
- **Integral Community**: a world-centric cultural matrix
- **Integral Theory**: a methodologically pluralistic framework for understanding the development of any part/whole relational dynamic
- **Integral View**: a holistic embrace of reality that includes the spiritual as well as the material dimension of reality
- **Integrative Consciousness**: the integration of subjective and objective realities to affect a holistic framework for relating
- **Levels**: the developmental stages within the quadrants that denote evolutionary milestones
- **Lines**: developmental themes specific to a domain or quadrant of development
- **Mega Church:** a church organization with greater than 1,000 weekly adult worshipers
- **Meme:** a value system, belief structure, organizing principle or world-view constructed in response to life conditions
- **Multiplex:** an organizational structure that supports multiple avenues of communication, participation, and influence
- **New Thought:** an amalgamation of Unity, Religious Science, Divine Science, Universal Foundation for Better Living, and independent metaphysical congregations comprising over two million members world-wide
- **Pastoral Church:** a church organization with 51 – 150 weekly adult worshipers
- **Program Church:** a church organization with 151 - 400 weekly adult worshipers
- **Pseudo Community:** a minister-centric cultural matrix
- **Quadrants:** relating to integral theory, the domains within which development occurs
- **Second Tier:** holistic and integrative organizational practices, relational dynamics and cultural imperatives
- **Simplex:** a simple, top-down organizational dynamic
- **Spiral Dynamics:** a theory of human and organizational development introduced in the 1996 book Spiral Dynamics by Don Beck and Christopher Cowan based on the research and theories of Clare Graves
- **Tetra-evolve:** four quadrant evolution
- **Thriving, Coherent, and Integral:** the emphasis and goal of integral development and second tier organizational practices in church growth
methodologies; **thriving**: having more than enough money, volunteerism, and organizational ownership to meet the developmental needs of the ministry; **coherent**: clarity of community generated identity and purpose, and capacity to implement strategic plan; **integral**: functional structures of accountability within the shared partnership of the minister, board of trustees and voting membership where only those who are in authentic ownership of the organization are permitted to become voting members

- **Triangles**: an interlocking matrix of interpersonal connectiveness.

### Abbreviations

- **AOG**: All Others Group
- **ANTN**: Affiliated New Thought Network
- **AGNT**: Association for Global New Thought
- **AUCI**: Association of Unity Churches International
- **PR**: Principle Researcher
- **RSI**: Religious Science International
- **UCRS**: United Church of Religious Science
- **TCIM**: Thriving, Coherent, and Integral Ministries group
Delimitations and Limitations

The delimitations to this research study are as follows:

- The researcher has over fifteen years of professional consulting experience in working with New Thought churches and is considered an authority on church organizational issues.
- The researcher is well-known in the New Thought community with VIP access to organizational leaders who are supportive of this research study.
- This study corroborates the theories and suppositions of the researcher.

The limitations of the research study are as follows:

- Only New Thought ministers and spiritual leaders were involved in this study.
- New Thought Churches that did not have an email address may have been excluded from the study.
- The Integral Church Profile Survey is an “untested” instrument formulated by the researcher.
- There is no established consensus regarding the definition of what constitutes a thriving, coherent, and integral church.
- It is likely that survey participants have a personal knowledge of the researcher and his work in the New Thought church community.
• This study lacks an intervention and a rigorous descriptive statistical framework that would permit the exclusion of chance as an explanation of part of the research results.

Looking ahead, Chapter 2 examines how the framework for understanding and working with churches has evolved from a dynamic of increasing worshippers to a process of reconfiguring cultures and relational systems. Each development of a new and innovative method for enhancing congregational life has both strengths and weaknesses depending on the context out of which church growth is approached. The review of literature will show that the variety of methods, processes, surveys, audits, and developmental tools all portray a component of what can be more broadly defined as a holistic and integral embrace of ministry. As new paradigms for conceptualizing the dynamics of churches has emerged, a more coherent and comprehensive framework for mapping the developmental trajectory of church organizations has come into view.
Chapter 1 Endnotes:


CHAPTER 2:
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The New Thought came directly from mental science, and hence it is explicable by the movement which went before and which dated from Quimby's pioneer work in Maine. But interest in mental healing gave the disciples of the New Thought a point of view, a way of approaching all questions, a way of looking at life as a whole; it gave an impetus toward individualism, toward freedom; it implied religious liberalism; it implied idealism as a working or practical philosophy. Hence the special interest is related with all other interests, and we find the disciples of the New Thought advocating it as an all-inclusive program. If they sometimes made their work too broad and so lacked definiteness, if they sometimes claimed too much for their special interest, it was because their first desire was to gain recognition for their point of view, with sufficient emphasis to achieve results. The devotees were eager to show that the New Thought not only stands for a method of healing but for a philosophy, a positive or affirmative idealism; hence for religion, applied Christianity, the rediscovery of the gospel of healing. In the course of time, the New Thought as thus conceived became sufficiently known and recognized to make possible the successful representative movement of today.¹

New Thought churches are an amalgamation of Unity, Religious Science, Divine Science, and Universal Foundation for Abundant Living, and independent metaphysical congregations comprising over two million members worldwide.² They are the subjects of this study primarily because of the researcher’s ability to access a broad and inclusive sample for study. With no previous examination of the New Thought movement with respect to the application of integral principles, and with no previously known application of integral theory to formulate an integral map of ministry, irrespective of denomination, this study breaks new ground in the church growth and development arena.

With its origins in the late nineteenth century, the New Thought movement began as a wave of intellectualism and pragmaticism (in contrast to Catholics’ and Protestants’ dogmaticism) emphasizing the “centrality of mind, the focus upon the immanence of God and the divine within, the clear distinction between Jesus of history and the Christ, and
the practice of metaphysical healing”. New Thought study groups emerged at the turn of the 20th century as people of like-mind and spiritual interest gravitated together to pray, participate in Truth classes, and explore the principles of a metaphysically-based spirituality. In 1915, under the leadership of Charles and Myrtle Fillmore, co-founders of the Unity movement, Unity School took a leadership role in institutionalizing the formation and development of formal study groups and the training and ordination of ministers and licensed teachers. In 1927, a contemporary of the Fillmore’s, Ernest Holmes founded the Institute for Religious Science in Los Angeles that would later become known as the Church of Religious Science.

While neither Holmes nor the Fillmores saw the formation of churches or an emphasis on “movement-making” as being a focus for their New Thought influence, it was evident that churches would become a practical structure to communicate Truth principles, and support the study and demonstration of healing practices. Their organizations eventually configured themselves to actively support church growth and development as well as credentialed leader-training programs. In 1953, the Church of Religious Science split into two separate organizations, ostensibly due to differences in corporate management and church administration: United Centers for Spiritual Living (formerly the United Church of Religious Science) and Religious Science International. At Unity School, the Field Department was supplanted in 1966 by the establishment of the Association of Unity Churches. Then in 1974, the Rev. Dr. Johnnie Coleman, a Unity minister, founded the Universal Foundation for Better Living, an organization that supports the growth and development of 30 affiliated churches and study groups. In addition to these primary organizations there are a dozen independent New Thought
institutions supporting the proliferation of New Thought churches and training seminaries worldwide.9

The Birth of the Church Growth Movement

While missionary work has been the traditional delivery system for evangelism and the proliferation of Catholicism and Protestantism throughout the premodern world, it was not until 1955 and the cultural imperatives of the modern and postmodern societies that the church growth movement came of age. Researcher and theologian Donald McGavran saw evangelism as a fragmented effort to bring people into an authentic relationship to Christ. Without churches and church membership as evidence of responsible discipleship, the work of evangelism could not cross social, linguistic, or class barriers.10 Later, church growth advocates would look to active membership in churches as an indicator of doing God’s work and a component of fruitful evangelism. In other words, effective evangelism could be measured by numerical church growth.11 Insofar as the rationale for church growth, in most branches of Christianity, has been linked historically to theological issues and pressures to counterbalance scientific assertions of modernity, in practical terms the drive to establish and grow churches has become a universal directive across all denominational lines—linked not only to the mandate of message proliferation, but to the struggle to survive as a societal institution as well.

Church Size Statistics

According to the National Congregations Survey (1998), a landmark study where 1,236 congregations were selected randomly to provide information about the worship,
programs, social composition, norms, and organizational structures inherent in American religious life, 50% of congregations have fewer than 75 regularly participating adults making up only 11% of the total number of those attending churches. The study also projected calculations for all U.S. congregations and determined that “while the median congregation has only 75 regular participants, the median person is in a congregation with 400 regular participants. From another angle, only 10% of American congregations have more than 350 regular participants, but those congregations contain almost half of the religious service attenders in the country”.12

These statistics reflect well on the demographics of the New Thought movement. In the Association of Unity Churches, for instance, there are 650 churches in the United States 55% have a Sunday worship congregation of 50 adults or less in attendance. Another 27% have less than 150 adult worshipers. Less than 4% have congregations of 350 or more. This means that 82% of all U.S. Unity churches have congregations less than 150 adults. In spite of their contemporary theology and appeal to the nine million estimated Americans who are aligned with New Thought teachings, less that 100,000 attend Unity churches.13

Figure 8. Unity Movement Demographics
The Impetus to Grow

Although larger congregations account for a greater proportion of total membership in the U.S., it is not realistic to think that the multitude of smaller churches and their clergy must or can transition to greater organizational complexity and size. There are, however, real pressures exerted on smaller congregations to grow. According to Theodore W. Johnson, an Episcopal priest and church developmental expert, smaller churches are compelled to grow (increase in numbers) due to:14

- Increasing costs of clergy salary, housing allowance, health insurance, and pension benefits.
- A shortage of clergy willing and able to serve smaller congregations.
- Rising societal expectations for the quality of facilities, staff, and programs.
- The ability to compete with larger congregations that have greater resources, higher quality ministries, and the ability to attract youth.

By the late 70s, church growth and the institutionalized methodologies that supported it, shifted from an evangelistic approach rooted in theological imperatives (church growth theology) to an organizational developmental paradigm that sought to conceptualize churches as living systems.15 In 1974, the Alban Institute, an ecumenical interfaith organization grounded in research and the real-life realities of congregations and their leaders, emerged as a vanguard institution that networked leading developmental theorists across denominational lines.16 In addition to providing resources, education, and publishing, the Alban Institute created a consulting industry
which helped to generate empirical data to support progressive and whole-system based
church growth strategies.

The Real Issue: Size Transition

Over the past two decades, the Alban Institute has based a good deal of its work
with congregations on several observations about size:

- “Congregations fall into distinctive size categories, and congregations of
different sizes organize in different ways. Each has its own way of ‘being
church.’
- Average attendance—all ages, all Saturday evening or Sunday worship
services combined over a whole year—is apparently the best single
indicator of size for Christian congregations.
- Congregations do not grow smoothly, but tend to ‘plateau’ at certain
predictable levels of attendance.
- In order to break through an attendance plateau, a congregation must
deliberately relinquish familiar patterns of behavior and begin to act as
larger congregations act.”

The fundamental issue regarding church growth as it relates to church size and
increasing numbers of congregants is that churches transition from one type or category
to the next. Movement from one development milestone to the next entails transitioning
from one size and systemic matrix to the next. Church sociologist Arlin Rothauge, in his
ground breaking 38-page book, Sizing up a Congregation, recognized the ways different
sized churches assimilate new members. “A family church incorporates new members
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the way a family does—by birth, marriage, and adoption. A pastoral church does it based almost exclusively on the relationship the new comers develop with the pastor. New members of a program church are primarily attracted by the congregation’s programs, whether for children or adults…And a corporation church draws newcomers with its human, financial, and physical resources for high quality ministry that rival major secular corporations and that operate in a fashion similar to them.”

This discovery revealed an internal correlate to the external organizational dynamic associated with church size: churches are social systems as well as organizations. Rothauge in his forward to Size Transitions in Congregations says,

"I have been fascinated with the overwhelming influence of three variables in congregational life: context, life cycle, and size. All three factors are inherent in being alive. Size determines shape, while life cycle and context contribute to the process of development. Size never exists apart from the ongoing processes at work in the life cycle and context of any given entity."

Rothauge goes on to caution that any conceptualization of the social experience that church communities embody can lead to confusion and distortion. Size analysis is a valuable lens through which to view organization dynamics so long as it does not eclipse the organism that ministry is at its heart.
Organism and Organization

The pseudo-integral framework that Rothauge put forth opened the door to a holistic approach to church growth and development. As congregations, based on their size, were viewed as living organisms, possessing unique attributes associated with their social and cultural centrisms, new approaches to effecting size transitions were discovered. Fundamental to this effort was the application of family systems theory to working with and understanding the church as an emotional system. Family therapist and Jewish rabbi Edwin H. Friedman saw that “religious institutions not only function like families, they contain families. Indeed, they often derive their very structure from families. Thus, emotional process in religious organizations . . . mirrors emotional process in personal families.”21 This piece of the conceptual puzzle also revealed that the church family system has a natural tendency for homeostasis. In other words, churches inherently resist growth—moving from one size to the next larger—when such growth necessitates the reconfiguration of established triangles. Reconfiguring how congregants develop, maintain, and enhance intimacy and care-giving bonds posed the next great challenge in a systems approach to church growth. In addition to this, a need to develop processes and methodologies for managing conflicts that arise from unskillful application of church growth initiatives became evident. Consequently, strategies to effect authentic size transitions became linked with fully understanding the distinctiveness of each congregational size dynamic, their corresponding family systems, as well as the need to manage conflicts that accompany change initiatives.

It is helpful to keep in mind two perspectives with which to view church growth:

1) Churches can be viewed as organic systems which evolve and approach developmental
milestones naturally, intuitively, and synergistically; and 2) Churches can be seen as objects where church leaders attempt to stimulate growth independent of and often indifferent to the natural processes inherent in the church community. Economic pressures, for instance, can be a motivation for growing the church, but may inadvertently disrupt the natural unfoldment of the church as it acclimates to developmental possibilities. It is like prying open the pedals of a rose in hopes of hurrying up its unfolding, attempts to grow the church superficially, with disregard for organic processes or without the emerging impetus for expansion from within the culture of congregation itself, will result in systemic reaction. “Organic processes are not linear. They are not merely progressive or expansive. Some organic growth is downward—a deepening, a rooting, a maturing process. An organic view will not allow us to make health synonymous with enlargement and mass. Organic life comes in many sizes and shapes, all of which may be said to be healthy in one or another of their individual phases.”

Alice Mann, a senior consultant for the Alban Institute, has studied the dynamics of churches in the throws of the most difficult size transition—moving from a pastoral to a program ministry. Her research in seven United Church of Christ churches in southwestern Massachusetts in June and July of 2000 led her to conceive of four preparatory tasks essential to churches in the pastoral to program size transition:

- Excavating the religious culture(s) of the congregation
- Building up a foundation for change using the congregation’s own cultural materials
- Enriching the congregation’s practices of democracy and discernment
Assessing the congregation’s progress on key dimensions of system change.

To the extent a church congregation can enter consciously into a growth process, the likelihood of such an adventure has the potential to be fruitful. Clarity and understanding of the change process enhances a community’s capacity to manage the organizational change process.

Ministry Audits, Indexes, and Surveys

Given the perils associated with pushing or pressuring a congregation to grow before they are ready and able, more congenial methods of assessing a congregation’s capacity to embrace the rigors of moving from one size to another have been developed. The ministry audits, surveys, and assessment tools vary widely and are largely linked to the non-scientific research of highly experienced church growth consultants who have had years to test their hunches and intuitions regarding effective church growth principles. Such organizational gurus have formulated comprehensive approaches to determine a congregation’s readiness and capacity to grow, not only in numbers, but in coherence and organizational integrity as well.

The Complete Ministry Audit developed by William M. Easum has been shared with more than 500 pastors in 44 states surveyed churches ranging in size from newly established to memberships of 3,300. The audit measures 20 principles associated with what Easum describes as the building blocks that form the vision for growing healthy, mainline Protestant churches. It requires a painstaking and dedicated engagement to complete the 338 questions that span the principles:

1. Growth is not concerned with numbers, but with meeting people’s needs.
2. Growth occurs when people are given a variety of choices (programs).
3. Growth occurs when people are matched with their skills.
4. Growth does not dictate that more people will become inactive.
5. Growth provides a wider outreach to people in need.
6. Growth need not be hampered by participation (social action) in the public arena.
7. Growth will occur when worship is intentionally emphasized.
8. Growth usually occurs with the addition of each new morning worship service.
9. Growth is directly related to the leadership strength of the pastor.
10. Growth is directly related to the attitude of the paid staff.
11. Growth is directly related to the unpaid staff’s perception of the congregation’s size and ability, rather than the reality.
12. When 80% of any space is in use, it is time to make plans to move.
13. Growth is encouraged when parking is adequate.
14. Growth can occur even though a church cannot afford to build.
15. Growth can occur without merely transferring members from one church to another.
16. Growth almost always occurs if the congregation is friendly toward visitors.
17. Asking for money encourages growth.
18. Long-term growth needs a solid foundation (vision).
19. Regular strategic planning is necessary for healthy growth.
20. *It takes more effort to implement change than to maintain the status quo or exercise veto power.*

*The Complete Ministry Audit* is no disappointment to anyone seeking a comprehensive instrument for exploring the minutia of ministry. It provides a detailed analysis of how to interpret the responses and a spreadsheet disk for compiling data and report writing. While there is much praise for the benefit of this instrument, there is no empirical data to support specific outcomes beyond the fact that the use of the audit can be very illuminating for the church leadership and congregation. This alone may stimulate church growth.

Alice Mann has created an easy to use *System Change Index* that is meant to assist congregational leaders in evaluating their progress through the pastoral size to program size transition. The index inventories responses pertaining to nine factors relevant to the pastoral size to program size transition:

1. Congregational self-definition
2. The Pastor’s role
3. Size of paid staff
4. Optimum unfilled capacity of worship facility
5. Degree of moment toward “multicell” reality
6. Delegation of planning and change management tasks to special groups with appropriate gifts
7. Growing aspirations to quality worship experience
8. Infrastructure for member care and involvement
9. Conflict prevention and management
Using a spectrum rating system—low, medium, high—respondents obtain a score within each category. Numerical scores are then plotted on the vertical axis of the graph. Average church attendance for the past year establishes the horizontal axis.\(^28\)
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**Figure 10. System Change Index.**

The pastoral-to-program plateau zone is represented by two curved bands labeled “T1” (depicting an early stage of size transition) and “T2” (depicting an advanced stage of size transition). According to Mann, “a congregation falling into the shaded box area has the greatest potential for continued growth. Congregations located below the wedge and to the right may be changing their way of operating too slowly to support their current attendance level and to allow for further natural growth. Congregation located above the wedge and to the left may not be drawing sufficient numbers to sustain a program style of operation.”\(^29\) Given that, according to Mann, “the pastoral-to-program size transition is
the most difficult transition for a congregation to make,” the System Change Index is a useful tool for evaluating the readiness of a congregation contemplating a size transition initiative.\(^{30}\)

According to Church Management Consultant Barbara O’Hearne, size alone does not determine whether a ministry is growing, viable, declining, or dying. “Congregations need to master new styles of association, organization and leadership over and over as they grow and mature from one size ministry to the next.”\(^{31}\) Key to such growth and maturity is an emphasis on quality, excellence, and organizational integrity.\(^{32}\)

Dr. Robert Ellsworth, in his work with the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Episcopalian, Methodist, Presbyterian, Independent Community, and New Thought churches has developed a Church Life Survey that assesses seven essential factors of church life that distinguishes between the quality of essentials found in growing, plateaued, and declining congregations:

- **Life changing impact** (coming here makes a positive difference in my life)
- **Worship** (helpful sermons, emotional-spiritual experiences, quality music)
- **Leadership** (congregants see leaders as enthusiastic, positive, and accountable)
- **Empowerment,** (people feel encouraged and safe, and discover and use their gifts)
- **Purpose or mission** (identified and clearly communicated)
- **Transforming teachings** (attending classes, finding the teachings helpful)
- **Prayer** (church really shows people how to pray through sermons and classes)

Between 1998 and 2006 Ellsworth surveyed over 140 congregations ranging in size from 50 to 1,500 regular attendees. He measured the extent to which people were connecting, the quality of small groups, and the level of excellence in programs and activities. His
findings clearly correlated a relationship between *quality* and growing churches.\textsuperscript{33}

Between 2002 and 2006 Ellsworth compiled results for a revised survey that measured aspects of “changed lives.” The survey asked congregants how the church had made a positive difference in their lives, spiritual well-being, their sense of joy and enthusiasm toward themselves and their church. Ellsworth found that in 23 out of 24 growing congregations, more than 84% of congregations answered “yes” to the items measuring life-changes.\textsuperscript{34}

**Maps and Models of Ministry**

Developmental models of ministry have aided in mapping the quagmire of size categories and their corresponding transitions, and the science of church change management. By categorizing each church size in terms of organizational complexity, cultural centrism, leadership function, intimacy, and care-giving matrices church development consultants have been successful in discerning the terrain of size transitions. Rothauge developed the following topography of congregations as arranged by size (average regular weekly attendees including children):\textsuperscript{35}

**Family-Size Church** (Average attendance: 1 – 50)

- Is like a family with strong parental figure(s)—matriarch/patriarch in charge
- Invites mutual cooperation in which leaders can offer spiritual gifts
- Minister’s role is more that of a family chaplain
- Offers rich familial support and a sense of belonging
- Assimilates new members by “adoption” rather than formal membership
- High turnover of clergy because congregants believe this is the minister's stepping-stone for a larger ministry
Pastoral-Size Church (Average attendance: 50 to 150)

- The central figure is the minister who needs strong interpersonal skills
- Offers some programs to keep the congregation together
- Minister shepherds new members through an assimilation process
- Governing board operates more like a committee
- Members know each other’s faces, names, and will notice if someone new is present at worship
- Minimal paid staff

Program-Size Church (Attendance: 151 to 400)

- Minister’s role is to recruit, equip, and inspire key lay and ordained leaders to unleash their passion for serving
- Organizes more consciously to achieve and maintain intimacy
- Pastoral care is shared by laity
- Known for the quality and variety of programs
- New comers enter the system to have a relationship with small groups rather than the senior minister
- Strong guest follow-up program
- Empowering people to follow their passion for serving in all areas of the ministry
- Three or more full-time paid staff

Corporate-Size Church (Average attendance: 401 to 1000+)

- Known for excellence in worship, music, and for a range of diverse programs
- Offers programs seven days a week
- Specialized ministries are provided for narrowly identified groups of people
- Subcongregations form around multiple worship services
- Decision making is carried out by a multilayered structure of staff, boards, and committees
- Complex organizational infrastructure
Rothauge’s student, Theodore W. Johnson, took his work further by correlating church size with relationship style and leadership structure. The table below shows that relationship and leadership style are unique to each size of congregation. Each type has its own way of being a congregation, and that distinctiveness is seen in each variable.36

### Table 1. Relational Style vs. Leadership Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP STYLE</th>
<th>LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1 - 50</td>
<td>One group consist of tightly knit extended families or “clans” that center on matriarchs and patriarchs.</td>
<td>Family matriarchs and patriarchs make decisions. Pastor (part-time, retired?) functions as chaplain. Board conducts business and ministries in support of matriarchs and patriarchs. Other staff—usually a musician—is part-time and performs a limited but essential function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral</td>
<td>51 - 150</td>
<td>One large group centers on the pastor, with some members in loosely knit functional or friendship circles.</td>
<td>Pastor is the hub of the wheel, master coordinator, and chief minister. Board members are short-term task-doers, micro-decision makers. Ministry coordinators are permanent task-doers who value close working relationship with the pastor. Other staff—usually a musician and a secretary—is part-time and performs limited but essential functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>151 - 350</td>
<td>Two or more distinct worshipping congregations include one-third of all members (in small groups of 5 to 15 people) that center on skilled and empowered staff or lay leaders.</td>
<td>Program group/teams/committees have their own empowered lay leaders and plan and implement programs and activities. Board members are managers, policy-makers who oversee but do not lead program groups. Pastor functions as the executive. Other staff (one or more ordained) includes full-time and part-time assistants to the pastor, program resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>351 +</td>
<td>More than two worshipping congregations include half of all members coalescing by affinity into small “congregations” of 30+ people.</td>
<td>Pastor is chief executive officer. With mythic qualities. Staff (several ordained) includes full-time executives in charge of program areas. Program groups/teams/committees with virtual autonomy operate programs as almost independent organizations. Board functions as board of directors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Johnson, in his doctoral dissertation critiqued Rothauge’s size theory, pointing out that relationship and leadership style differentiations could help leaders and outside church development consultants identify areas of dysfunction or incongruence by assessing a church’s topography based on his prescriptive chart. This approach complemented Rothauge’s original theory by providing more detailed descriptions of the leadership structure and the social system of a “congregation before and after a transition and made clear the overall goal of bringing them into congruence with respect to numerical size.”

With a general consensus regarding the elements of church size, and the need for congruence between size, leadership, and relationship style, what was still needed was a clear, simple road map for moving from one type to another that could transcend the problem of cultural reconfiguration. Johnson postulated that the various church types (family, pastoral, program, and corporate) were so ordered by factors (systems) that support the interconnectedness (intimacy) of a congregation. Basing his premise on the anthropological research of Robin Dunbar who studied primates as they grouped to formed social networks, Johnson formulated a block model depicting the basic building blocks (groupings) of each congregational configuration. The smallest building block is a group of 12 to 15 people, called a sympathy group based on the fact that most people, when asked to list the people for whom they will profoundly grieve when they die, list about 12 family members and friends.

The next building block is the primary group, which is larger than the small group (sympathy group) but has no more than 50 people. The family church is a stand-alone primary group governed by a single individual (matriarch or patriarch) responsible for maintaining family bonds and cohesiveness.
The third building block is the community group, which is larger than the primary group but has no more than 150 members.

Figure 11. Building Blocks of Congregations

The pastoral church is a stand-alone community group where the church pastor facilitates the relationships of the group members. The community group (between 51 and 150) is the basic building block of the program and corporate church. The dimensional leap between pastoral and program size church lies in the capacity to
organize distinct community blocks (cells) within one organizational structure while
managing to transcend the boundaries of individual groupings so that the sum of the parts
can form a synergetic whole. Thus, the cultural ramifications of transitioning in size is
that a family church seeking to become a pastoral church must give up functioning as a
family group and become a community or fellowship group. A pastoral church seeking
to transition to a program church must give up being a single cell community and become
a multiple celled organism under a new and more complex organizational structure.

The nuances of cultural reconfiguration in church congregations were also
explored by Alice Mann who formulated the N-Curve map (below). The movement
from family to pastoral (the upward arrow on the left hand side of the chart) involves a
change in the way the system centers its life. The family church feels like a tribe or

“committee of the whole.” When church attendance stretches beyond 50, the
congregation encounters an identity crisis where the formerly unbroken circle of
members is no longer able to define the constellation of the congregation’s life. The
movement of centrism, from group to pastor, constitutes a cultural shift that necessitates a
redefinition of identity and purpose. As attendance approaches 150, another crisis looms

![Figure 12. The N-Curve.](image)
on the horizon. If the congregation’s trajectory follows the downward arrow, once again, the centrism must shift, from pastor back to group. Since there are just too many individuals to interface with a single care-giver (pastor), the system must retrofit the bonds of intimacy along communal lines if the program cultural shift is to occur. In the corporate-size congregation (as the movement follows the upward right-hand arrow), the need for more pastor-centered leadership emerges. The caveat for both the program and corporate church is that they are organizationally complex with respect to their structural dynamics; and distinctly different from their smaller, more organic and free-flowing sisters. As a church grows in size and organizational complexity, the need for a high-profile leader that can be both the CEO and the cultural centrism is necessary to affect corporate church stability. “This leader must find a reliable way to maintain spiritual perspective and must use the aura of headship to help the whole system grapple with its core identity and purpose.”44

In contrast, Rick Warren of Saddleback Church in Lake Forest, California, senior minister of a mega-church with over 25,000 members, espouses a model for ministry that focuses exclusively on leaders that develop members rather than organizational imperatives. “Since the church is a living organism, it is natural for it to grow if it is healthy. The church is a body, not a business. It is an organism, not an organization. It is alive. According to Warren, if a church is not growing, it is dying.”45 He equates church growth with church health and claims that the role of leadership is to minister to the health of the body. According to Warren, the role of the church leader is to challenge people to a serious commitment to the spiritual life. In his experience this approach has contributed to the overwhelming success of his ministry. Having taught seminars to over
22,000 pastors and church leaders from sixty denominations from over forty countries, Warren has success, not science, to substantiate his principles. The Life Development Process chart resembles a baseball diamond and is illustrative of the bases an

![Figure 13. The Life Development Process.](image)

individual tags as he or she works to fulfill a sequence of progressive and deepening commitments to the church and one’s personal spiritual life. According to Warren, “you don’t get credit for leaving runners on base.” While the emphasis is not on organization, it would be naïve to assume that the Saddleback Church is void of rigid structure and a cadre of highly competent staff (ordain ministers, executives, and professionals).

Another “mega-church maniac” is church development consultant William Easum, who takes a more rational approach to the mechanics of church growth focusing on the leader as being the pivotal element of whether or not a church is capable of
growing. Easum’s model is based on his decades of serving growing churches. He has created a hierarchy of leadership modalities essential to all growth churches regardless of size:  

- Leader of Leaders of Leaders—The lead pastor
- Leader of Leaders—All staff
- Leader of Systems—Lay mobilization of small group system
- Leader of Major Ministries—Small Group system
- Leader of Programs, short and long term—Sunday school or vacation bible school
- Leader of Committees—Lowest level of leadership
- Apprentices in Training—Anyone in the congregation
- Visitors

### Methodological Pluralism: The Integral Approach

Given the variety of church developmental approaches and experiences, and the questionable efficacy of any one modality over another, it is prudent to acknowledge that no one perspective embraces the entire field that comprises the holism that churches represent as living systems. The integral approach, as formulated by Ken Wilber, provides a valuable lens through which to view a possible synthesis of all developmental paradigms, as well as to formulate an integral map of ministry useful in identifying a whole system approach to creating thriving, coherent, and integral church organizations.

“Integral theory has as its goal to contextualize the “truth” about everything—that is, to show the domain of validity of any theory—its truth and its limitations, as well as the relationship of the theory to other theories.” Relevant to this dissertation are three
fundamental aspects of integral theory (or the integral approach): the four quadrant model, levels or stages of development, and lines or streams of development.

**All Quadrants / All Levels (AQAL)**

“The quadrants are the domains or worlds within which development occurs. One of Wilber’s great insights was to see that all the maturational levels and various lines could be categorized according to two basic dimensions of development. These are the interior-exterior dimension and the individual/agency-communal dimension” constituting the four quadrants. “The four quadrants jointly represent a holon. Holons are complete entities made up of smaller holons. Each holon is also incorporated into larger holons. The organization can be viewed as a holon” and, according to Arthur Koestler, who first introduced the term “holon” in his book, *The Ghost in the Machine*, nested systems such as organizations are more adequately represented as complex strata of holons rather than as networks of individual parts. “Wilber’s proposition is that each of the four quadrants of each holon

---

**Figure 14. AQAL Matrix**

The AQAL Matrix illustrates the four quadrants and their interconnections, showing how development occurs across different levels and streams.
must develop in balance with each other (or tetra-evolve). If one quadrant develops at a faster rate than the others, the holon will exhibit unhealthy distortions.”53 (This is a crucial principle in explaining many church conflicts and dysfunctions that will be explored in reviewing the research study portion of this dissertation.) “An integral approach sees organizational health as the dynamic balance of an organization’s interiors, e.g. people well-being and cultural life, and its exteriors, e.g. systems effectiveness and efficient processes.”54 The quadrants of consciousness, culture, relational systems, and organizational practices map out territory through which all levels of organizational development unfold.

In addition to an all quadrant schema for understanding the dynamics of any “thing”, Wilber integrates the research of psychologist Clare Graves who formulated a ground breaking theory of human development that postulated eight levels or waves of human existence. Grave’s work was later applied to organization and society by his students, Don Beck and Christopher Cowen. In their book, *Spiral Dynamics*,55 Beck and Cowen formulated a spiral of development that represents an evolution of values spheres, or world views, linked to unfolding human development. The first six levels or *memes* are subsistent levels similar to Maslow’s deficiency needs and, according to Beck and Cowan, they are marked by “first-tier thinking.” In other words, within the first six levels the predominant driving influences are survival, continuity, dominance, conformity, achievement, and cohesiveness. First-tier thinking is hypersensitive to how life looks and feels. In contrast, “second-tier thinking” represents the emergence of *being levels*, of which there are two major waves: integration and holism.56
Developmental Lines

The AQAL approach also maps developmental lines or streams of escalating sophistication and complexity. Developmental lines differ from developmental stages insofar as lines refer to a specific dynamics of development within which movement from simple to complex or primitive to sophisticated can be observed. \(^{57}\) Stages represent evolutionary milestones.

An application of these principles (AQAL) as they relate to church growth and development is as follows: \(^{58}\)

- In the organizational quadrant, there is a developmental line associated with organizational structure, moving from simple to complex; from simplex to multiplex, to holoplex.
- In the relational or social system field, there is a developmental line associated with how intimacy and care-giving is delivered—from family to egalitarian to holonic types of social systems.
- In the cultural field, the development of an identity matrix evolves from egocentric to ethnocentric to world centric.
- And, in the consciousness quadrant, the developmental line of intentionality moves from associative to differentiated to integrative.

The dynamic of development within each quadrant is actualized as evolutionary pressures expose the inadequacy of established structures, systems, and relational norms, “The process of development is one of fusion or identification with one level, a differentiation from or transcendence of that level, and an integration and inclusion of the new level.” \(^{59}\)
An Integral Approach to Organizational Development

Ron Cacioppe and Mark Edwards have researched the application of integral approaches to organizational development. In their article, *Adjusting Blurred Visions: A Topology of Integral Approaches to Organizations* they have proposed a topology to aid in the understanding of how different authors, researchers, and practitioners represent and apply the integral principles within organizational contexts. Their approach derived from Ken Wilber’s integral framework sought to assess integral approaches to organizational life by categorizing structural focus and the emphasis on spirituality or essential purpose. Four type categories result from applying the structural criteria ranging from a general type that utilizes holistic principles to those which focus on the full implementation of the AQAL approach as formulated by Ken Wilber.

The four type categories and the two enrichment criteria can be used to establish the sense in which the term “integral” is being applied within organizational settings. The typology could also be used to categorize the type of applied measures and

---

**Figure 15. Plurality of Integral Approaches**

full implementation of the AQAL approach as formulated by Ken Wilber.

The four type categories and the two enrichment criteria can be used to establish the sense in which the term “integral” is being applied within organizational settings. The typology could also be used to categorize the type of applied measures and
instruments being used in organizational interventions. For example, in the case of this dissertation, an integral approach to church development would fall into Type 4-Integral QL and Enriching Criterion 1-Integral S.

Cacioppe and Edwards have also devised an integral approach to organizational development, proposing a meta-model of OD. The following six factors are suggested as key characteristics of such a model:

1. The four quadrants or domains of development that describe the most fundamental aspects of an organization.
2. The basic developmental levels.
3. The relevant developmental lines that need to be included in a particular analysis.
4. The developmental dynamics that describe how the relevant change processes.
5. The generation of valid and reliable research questionnaires and tools that are necessary to provide accurate measures of the levels, quadrants, lines, and dynamics.
6. Flexibility in scale of application so that all characteristics of the model can be focused on the micro-, meso-, and macro- levels of the organization or its environment.

From these characteristics Cacioppe and Edwards put forth the following definition of integral organizational development (IOD):

IOD is the balanced (all quadrants), transformative (all levels), multidimensional (all lines) growth and integrative sustainability (all dynamics) of the whole organization and its employees to achieve worthwhile visions and goals for
owners, customers, industry, natural environment and the community which it serves.\textsuperscript{64}

**Conclusion**

An integral view or map of ministry exposes an aggregate of interrelated and interdependent fields of energies comprised of organizational, systemic, cultural, and spiritual dynamics—a view that goes beyond most contemporary models of ministry—“here is the church, and here is the steeple; open the doors and see all the people.” It synthesizes the best of all church developmental processes and opens doors to spiritual transformation. “Spirituality is a whole that has many faces. In its broadest sense, it is about the connections between the whole person and the whole community. The integral model…helps us to see those faces in their many guises and manifestations.”\textsuperscript{65}

The challenge of studying any organizational demographic, and especially churches, is in defining the parameters for what constitutes a realistic framework for assessment, observation, and understanding. To this end, the next chapter outlines a structure for unraveling the complexities of churches as an interrelated and mutually dependent array of structures, systems, imperatives, and group dynamics, and the methodology for compiling an integral church profile.
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CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

This study required the formulation of a research instrument called *Integral Church Profile Survey* (See Appendix C) created by the Principal Researcher (PR) to identify a broad spectrum of organizational practices, relational dynamics, cultural imperatives, and leadership characteristics prevalent within each New Thought church surveyed. Whenever possible, survey questions were designed to pose gradient selections indicative of Level 1, 2, and 3 dynamics in each quadrant or the generalized distinction between 1\textsuperscript{st} tier and 2\textsuperscript{nd} tier tendencies.

- **Level 1** selections reflected simple and utilitarian organizational structures and practices; the prevalence of family system dynamics; a cultural identity embedded in the minister or eclipsed by its history; and intentionality driven by external circumstances.

- **Level 2** selections pertained to more complex organizational practices and structures supportive of best practices; an egalitarian social environment where intimacy / care-giving functions are shared by community members; a ministry-centric cultural matrix; and intentionality driven by intrinsic values.

- **Level 3** selections are indicative of very complex organizational structures, integral practices and a high degree of systemic congruence; a world-centric cultural matrix; and a purpose driven disposition.

In addition to questions designed to identify trends and practices throughout the AQAL matrix, respondents were asked to provide demographic and contact information.
The analysis of the survey is based on comparing two groups of respondents:

- Those who selected Thriving on a scale of Surviving, Neutral, Thriving; and Coherent on a scale of Incoherence, Neutral, Coherence; and Integral on a scale of Out of Integrity, Neutral, Integral. This group is designated the thriving, coherent, and integral ministries (TCIM).

- The All Other group (AOG) consisted of those that did not align with Thriving and Coherent, and Integral responses (all other variations and combinations of responses).

Determination along each scale was made solely by the individual respondent based on the following explanation of terms:

- **Thriving:** If *thriving* is all about having more than enough of everything needed (money, volunteerism, and capable people), and *surviving* is about just making it from month to month, indicate where your ministry is along the spectrum:

- **Coherent:** If *coherence* is all about clarity of purpose (shared identity and shared future) and single mindedness of intent where everyone knows what the church stands for and where it is going, and *incoherence* is about confusion, competing agendas, or lack of shared purpose, indicate where your ministry is along the spectrum:

- **Integral:** If *integrity* is about the minister / board / membership partnership where members possess the capacity to hold the leadership accountable, where membership is only available to those who are in ownership of the organization, and *out of integrity* is where anyone can become a member and there is no real
The PR’s role consisted of formulating the research instrument (Integral Church Profile Survey), conducting a pilot study of a draft survey questionnaire, formatting the survey for online access administered by www.surveymonkey.com, identifying the data sources, contacting organizational leaders of New Thought denominations for assistance in launching the online survey, monitoring responses for alignment with research protocols, expunging responses that did not meet inclusion requirements, and analysis of data collected.

**Data Sources**

**Population**: Credential spiritual leaders of a nationally recognized and sanctioned New Thought church, ministry, or center. It is estimated that 800 North American New Thought churches are eligible.

**Inclusion Criteria**

- Senior minister or credential spiritual leader of an established (at least one year) New Thought church who is willing and able to complete the online research survey (Integral Church Profile Survey).
- Serve in a church organization affiliated with its denominational headquarters, conduct regular worship services and ministry operations.
- Be willing to participate in this study and grant consent.
Exclusion Criteria

- Serve in a church with less than one year of established history.
- Serve in a church with no denominational affiliation to a recognized New Thought sanctioning entity or conduct worship services and ministry operations only irregularly.

Data Collection

An invitation to participate in the study was sent via email to all New Thought churches in North America by their respective organizational headquarters, representing approximately 800 churches, centers, or ministries. The email contained a hyperlink to the Integral Church Profile Survey (See Appendix D). Multiple requests to organizational leaders to resend the original invitation were made to optimize the promotion of the study. In addition, 360 postcards were mailed to New Thought churches containing the invitation to participate in the study.

The Integral Church Profile Survey was administered online by www.surveymonkey.com which provided a complete itemization of all responses in a password protected virtual environment. Participants who do not meet the inclusion requirements were expunged from the data base. The collection period was from December 15, 2006 to May 15, 2007.

Data Analysis

Two-hundred and ninety-eight viable responses were collected. Using www.surveymonkey.com’s filtering options, the two study groups were identified. A
total of 28 (9 %) of total responses indicated complete alignment with Thriving, Coherent, and Integral criteria. The TCIM group was compared to AOG. Thirty-nine data charts were composed displaying percentage comparisons between the two groups across 72 organizational issues (See Chapter 4).

Verification

All data transcription from www.surveymonkey.com to chart tables was verified at least three times for accuracy. It is assumed that www.surveymonkey.com’s filtering process is reasonably free of error.

Ethical Considerations

There are no known potential risks to taking the online survey to research participants. IP addresses and demographic information of responders was password protected. Only the PR had access to survey data.

At least twenty survey participants contacted the PR to obtain a hardcopy of the Integral Church Profile Survey to be used for training purposes at their respective churches.

Pilot Study Results

A draft paper copy of the survey questionnaire was distributed to a small group of New Thought ministers and spiritual leaders at the Association for Global New Thought Advisory Team meeting on October 25, 2006. Twenty-five questionnaires were returned
to the PR. Written comments and verbal feedback was integrated into the official survey instrument. No data from the pilot study was entered into the research study data pool.

**Conclusion**

The online Integral Church Profile Survey was an effective means for deducing major organizational themes prevalent in New Thought churches as identified by their spiritual leaders. It presented a broad array of conceptualizations that enabled each respondent to proximate the idiosyncrasies of structural, relational, cultural, and intentionality dynamics within their ministry. *Surveymonkey.com* permitted an extensive analysis of the 80 questions in the research survey and the formulation of comparative charts and graphs. This comparative data is presented in the next chapter along with a narrative of how each theme is relevant to the study. Significant distinctions between the comparative groups are noted as well as the prevailing trends or tendencies between the TCIM and AOG.
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS

Approximately 800 North America New Thought churches were contacted via email and invited to participate in the research study. Two-hundred ninety-eight (37 % of the 800) ministers and spiritual leaders from these churches representing all Unity, Religious Science, and independent New Thought ministries submitted viable surveys via www.surveymonkey.com. The PR sorted the responses into two groups: the Thriving, Coherent, and Integral ministries (TCIM) representing nine percent of the total; and All Others group (AOG) comprising the remaining responders. See Figure 16.

Demographics

Figure 16. Survey Demographics
A total of 205 responses were from Unity churches (comprising 69% of all survey responses and representing over one third of all Association of Unity Churches member ministries in the United States, Canada, Puerto Rico, and Costa Rica). The 52 responses from Religious Science International and 31 from United Church of Religious Science comprise 27.8% of all responses. There were five responses each from Universal Foundation for Better Living affiliated churches and the Independent New Thought Network (3% of all the survey).

The ratio between TCIM to AOG in relation to total responders within each denominational demographic is illustrated in Figure 17. For instance, 21 out of 205 responders (10%) in the Unity group reported being TCIM; 3 out of 31 responders (9%) in the UCRS group; and 4 out of 52 responders (7%) in the RSI group. Unity is only slightly more inclined to demonstrate TCIM than UCRS or RSI. There were no instances of TCIM in UFBL or the Affiliated New Thought Network groups.

Figure 17. Denominational Demographics
Minister’s Tenure Comparison

While minister’s tenure spans the spectrum of years in both groups, Figure 18 suggests that a relationship between long tenured ministers and TCIM is ambiguous. It is possible that the spike in the 3 – 7 year range is due to charismatic leadership. Logic dictates that the greater the tenure, the greater the impact of seasoned and experienced leadership, as evidenced by the 7 – 15 year and the greater than 15 year range.

![Minister’s Tenure Chart]

Figure 18. Minister’s Tenure

Church Size

Based on survey responses, the majority of the TCIM group is Pastoral and Program size churches. While they span the church size spectrum, Figure 19 indicates a slight predominance (54%) of the TCIM group in more complex organizations (Program
or larger). TCIM responders in Program size churches were more than three times greater than AOG responders.

Figure 19. Church Size Distribution
Attendance and Financial Support

A positive association between increased attendance is indicated among TCIM responders. Eighty-two percent reporting attendance increases in the TCIM group as compared to AOG, which reports a 47 % increase in adult worshipers in the past two years and a decrease of almost 15 % (see Figure 20 below).

Figure 20. Sunday Attendance
Financial support is also significantly greater in TCIM than AOG. Figures 20 and 21 indicate a positive correlation between TCIM and increased attendance and financial support as compared to AOG. This is not surprising given the definition of thriving, coherent and integral ministry. An abundance of resources, clarity of purpose, and organizational functionality would translate as tangible increases in participation and overall support of the ministry.

![Financial Support in the Last Couple of Years]

**Figure 21. Financial Support**

**Organizational Structures and Practices**

In addition to demographic information, the Integral Church Profile Survey explored each of the quadrants. In Organizational Structures and Practices category, survey respondents indicated how their church assimilated new members and the
competencies associated with voting membership and trustee service. This section also looks at church polices and leadership practices. As the TCIM group is compared to the AOG in the arena of structures and practices, the study shows TCIM are more complex and integral.

Figure 22 indicates that TCIM churches are three times more likely to have a tiered process for becoming a voting member of the church. The value of belonging is differentiated from the organizational structure—voting member.

Figure 22. Joining vs. Voting Member

Figure 23 indicates that TCIM churches have a tendency toward a more extensive process for becoming a voting member, whereas in the AOG, the majority of churches have a very easy and simple practice of establishing membership. The range from very
easy to very challenging represents the spectrum of commitment and ownership that is applied to the organizational structure of voting member. While most churches superimpose the value of belonging on to the organization structure of membership, TCIM are more inclined to differentiate the two.

Figure 23. Voting Member Process

Figure 24 shows a trend in TCIM toward the leadership of the church facilitating the new member orientation process as compared to AOG. For the most part, however, the practice in both groups is for the minister to facilitate the process. This response reflects the demographics of the survey population insofar as the majority of respondents
are from smaller churches where it is expected that the minister facilitate the new member process.

Figure 24. Orientation Facilitation.

Figure 25 lists possible components of a new member orientation process. Survey participants were asked to indicate what practices constitute their current new member orientation. Significant variations between TCIM and AOG exist in the area of prosperity and truth classes, peacemaking skills, commitment to follow grievance procedures, *I of the Storm* class,¹ commitment to mission / vision, meaningful service in the ministry, and a commitment to prayer, education or service programs in the church. Areas of no significant variation are: orientation to parent organizations, bylaws, and policies, community service requirements, signing a member’s code of ethics, and
Components of New Member Orientation

- Prosperity Class (4 -T’s, Keys to the Kingdom, 5-Gifts): 10% Thriving, 18% Coherent, 38% Integral
- Orientation to parent organizations (AUCI, RSI, etc): 9% Thriving, 7% Coherent, 38% Integral
- Commitment to community service projects: 18% Thriving, 12% Coherent, 51% Integral
- Peacemaking Skills / Non-Violent Communicucation Class: 8% Thriving, 18% Coherent, 51% Integral
- Commitment to follow grievance procedures: 12% Thriving, 21% Coherent, 57% Integral
- Orientation to Bylaws, policies, organizational chart: 5% Thriving, 51% Coherent, 61% Integral
- Truth Basics Curriculum: 14% Thriving, 49% Coherent, 57% Integral
- I of the Storm Class: 5% Thriving, 14% Coherent, 49% Integral
- Commitment to mission / vision: 24% Thriving, 25% Coherent, 57% Integral
- Member’s Code of Ethics: 5% Thriving, 24% Coherent, 25% Integral
- Annual financial pledge: 4% Thriving, 18% Coherent, 38% Integral
- Meaningful service in the ministry: 44% Thriving, 54% Coherent, 54% Integral
- Commitment to prayer, service or educational programs: 35% Thriving, 54% Coherent, 54% Integral

Figure 25. Components of New Member Orientation

Making an annual financial pledge. The most profound distinction in this category is the requirement of a truth basics class in TCIM. This suggests a relationship between alignment with denominational doctrine and a demonstrated congruence between belief and spiritual practice.
Figures 26 - 33 pertain to board of trustee service, practices and competencies. In all but two categories, TCIM indicated a higher percentage over AOG. In Figure 26 the significant distinction is regarding a required *I of the Storm* class and board candidate orientation prior to being selected as a board nominee. Only a slightly higher ratio (5 – 10%) exists in the areas of tithing, attendance of annual retreats and training, and formal orientation to bylaws, policies, and procedures.

![Components of Trustee service & Board Practice](image)

**Figure 26. Trustee Service & Board Practice (A)**

The comparison indicates that TCIM are 25% more likely to require a financial commitment from board members (Figure 27) than AOG. This would indicate that
Thriving churches are thriving because the board is modeling ownership of the church.

Thriving churches have thriving boards.

Figure 27. Trustee Service & Board Practice (B)
Figure 28 shows that TCIM have a higher incidence of possessing a board sexual conduct policy, a conflict of interest policy, and the practice of performing an annual self-appraisal (see below). These policies are indicative of mature organizations that are cognizant of the importance of transparency, ethical and moral integrity, and social responsibility.

![Figure 28. Trustee Service & Board Practice (C)](image-url)
The significant distinction in Figure 29 between TCIM and AOG pertains to the practice of filling board vacancies. TCIM are 22% more inclined to base their selection on who is most qualified versus who is most willing. A slightly greater tendency of the TCIM is indicated in the area of the board member’s understanding of their church’s parent organizations.
Figure 30 portrays a clear distinction TCIM and AOG in the arena of leadership and organizational integrity. TCIM leaders are nearly twice as likely to inform the congregation when financial concerns arise. Of great significance is that 100% of TCIM responders report up-to-date bylaws compared to only 66% of AOG. TCIM board members are more conscious of their responsibility to be role models to the congregations and value clear communication between minister, staff, volunteers, and key leaders.

![Board Practices Diagram](image_url)

**Figure 30. Board Practices (B)**
In figures 31 and 32 respondents could agree or disagree with the prevalence of the organizational issue / practice. In both charts, TCIM differ significantly from AOG responders in the area of valuing leadership development and having up-to-date procedures, policies and clear structures of communication.

**Figure 31. Leadership Development.**

**Figure 32. Policies & Procedures.**
While there is no significant distinction between TCIM and AOG responders indicated in figure 33, what is interesting is that the majority of churches have either no minister review process or one that is co-created. Least favored is a board created process that the minister inherits at the beginning of his or her tenure.

![Minister Performance Review Process]

**Figure 33. Minister’s Performance Review Process.**

**Social System & Relational Dynamics**

This section looks at how people are in relationship and the intimacy / care-giving delivery system. The comparison will indicate that TCIM are more egalitarian than familial, and have less drama and dysfunction. Figure 34 displays a spectrum of how responders categorize their community dynamic: family, home, community, or center.
TCIM have a tendency to refer to themselves as spiritual communities, while AOG relate more to the family or church home designation.

![How the Congregation describes their church](image)

**Figure 34. Church Description.**

Intimacy / care-giving bonds are more predominate between the minister and congregation among AOG responders (see figure 35).

![Intimacy & Care-giving bonds](image)

**Figure 35. Intimacy and Care-giving bonds.**
Figure 36 indicates a greater proficiency in managing disagreement among TCIM than Congregation effectively manages disagreement.

![Bar Chart: Congregation effectively manages disagreement.](chart1.png)

Figure 36. Managing Disagreement.

AOG. Ninety-six percent of TCIM responders agree that their congregations effectively deal with interpersonal difficulty compared to 58% of the AOG. The problem of gossip, triangulation and parking-lot conversations is less of an issue as well for TCIM groups.

![Bar Chart: Gossip, triangulation & parking lot conversations are not a problem.](chart2.png)

Figure 37. Gossip, Triangulation, & Parking-lot conversations.
TCIM responders have less of a challenge in securing reliable volunteers than AOG (see figure 38) and are more likely to hold people accountable to keeping promises (figure 39). The principle of expect more—get more—is demonstrated here. TCIM are more inclined to have high standards and expectations of those called to service.

![Figure 38. Reliable Volunteers.](image-url)

![Figure 39. Held Accountable](image-url)
Individuals are expected to fulfill promises and make good on their commitments because the culture of the church values personal integrity. Holding people accountable is less of a punitive dynamic as it is an issue of congruence. In TCIM, organizational integrity begins with individual integrity. As above, so below.

Figure 40 depicts the ratio of the congregation that provides the majority of support. Typically, 20% of the congregation provides 80% of the resources necessary to meet the financial and energetic needs (volunteerism) of the church. The lower the percentage, the more entrenched is the church in a Family system relational dynamic; the higher the percentage the more is the tendency toward an Egalitarian relational system. TCIM tend to have a greater majority of the congregation supporting the overall functioning of the ministry.

![The percentage of the congregation that provide the majority of the resources](image)

**Figure 40. Support Ratio.**
Culture & Identity

This next section plots the trend away from a minister-centric cultural matrix in the TCIM and looks at issues of diversity, mission / vision, and the dynamics of a community-centric or purpose driven church. Survey topics and selections invite participants to make choices consistent with their community’s perceptions and beliefs about the organization and their relationship with the minister—components of the culture and identity dynamic.

Figure 41 suggests a slightly greater emphasis on the minister as being the source of cohesiveness and what may provide the congregation with a sense of continuity within the church. In TCIM and AOG the minister is a component of congregational cohesiveness.

![The minister is seen as the "glue" that holds the church together.](image)

**Figure 41. Minister as the Glue.**
Figure 42 looks at the relationship between what is experienced on the outside and what goes on behind the scenes. The important issue in this question is congruence between the insider and the outside observer. As the chart illustrates, TCIM have a high degree of congruence, while AOG shows notably more disparity between the two.

Figure 42. Perceptions.

Figure 43 suggests that TCIM tend to be more ethnically diverse than AOG churches when the church is situated in an ethnically diverse community.

Figure 43. Ethnic Diversity.
This trend is corroborated by the Hartford Institute for Religion Research finding that 61% of multicultural churches reported experiencing growth, while just 31% of predominately Anglo congregations said the same.2

In Figure 44, 82% of TCIM indicate having a strong sense of shared identity and shared future in their churches. This compared to only 49% of the AOG, which also indicated over 20% in disagreement. High agreement regarding shared identity and future is indicative of organizational coherence—a foundational attribute of TCIM.

There is a strong sense of SHARED IDENTITY & SHARED FUTURE at our church.

Figure 44. Shared Identity & Future.
In a related issue, Figure 45 (below) compares the method of formulating the identity and future of the church. The significant difference between groups is when social action is linked to the mission and vision of the church the ministry is nearly twice as likely to be TCIM. A trend toward TCIM is also apparent in those churches that revisit their mission and vision every two years.

![Formulation of Mission / Vision](image)

**Figure 45. Mission / Vision Formulation.**
Figure 46 shows both groups nearly equal in their agreement and disagreement the topic statement. This suggests that the minister’s prominence is a component of a church’s cultural identity. The underlying issue is whether or not this prominence eclipses the authenticity of the spiritual community. The survey does not shed light on this facet of the interrelatedness between the church’s identity and its mission.

**Our church is known more by who the minister is than by what the church stands for.**

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

Figure 46. Recognition.
Consciousness & Intentionality

This section explores issues of consciousness and how the attitudes, perceptions, and mind-set of the congregation and leadership shape the communal experience. In Figure 47 the issue of a church’s past and how it influences the community is examined. According to the study, TCIM are less likely to be entangled in past hurts, reporting strong agreement with the assertion. Over 30% of AOG respondents indicated past concerns are problematic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 47. Past Hurts.
When asked if the congregation sees the glass “half-empty” (figure 48), the TCIM indicated strong disagreement with the statement three times greater than the AOG. A congregation’s outlook relates to intentionality and reveals the context out of which leaders embrace or circumvent challenges. When there is a positive framework for relating to the challenges and opportunities of congregational life, there is greater capacity to actualize the “field of infinite possibilities.” TCIM thrive because their perspective is likely more appreciative and opulent with respect to their circumstance than AOG.

![Figure 48. Seeing the Glass Half Empty.](image-url)
TCIM also reported (see Figure 49) an emphatic differentiation between financial issues and matters of church well-being. This reflects a significant attribute of TCIM. They are less focused on external circumstances and more attuned to alignment with purpose.

**The well-being of this church is linked to money and attendance.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Thriving / Coherent / Integral Ministries</th>
<th>All other Survey Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 49. Well-being and Money / Attendance**

Whereas AOG linked well-being, finances, and church attendance more than 50% of the time, only one out of twenty-eight respondents in the TCIM group indicated such an association.
Figure 50 looks at the imperatives of what is happening or not, what can be accomplished or not, and the community’s sense relating from purpose. The concerns of organizational leaders affect the directives of the community. TCIM clearly function with a predominate focus on being. Conversely, the AOG is clearly focused on matters of pertaining to the quality of experience—what is happening or not happening.

Figure 50. What Concerns Leaders the Most.
In Figure 51, this theme continues showing that the driving influence in TCIM is a sense of purpose and the fulfillment of the mission and vision. By comparison, the AOG responses are distributed throughout the spectrum of competing attentions.

![What "drives" your church?](image)

**Figure 51. What Drives the Church?**

**Integral Leadership**

The remaining charts are dramatic in that they each show a profound commonality among TCIM—their leaders are thriving, coherent, and integral in their own personal lives. This indicates a relationship between the attributes and qualities of the spiritual leader and the predominant dynamics of the thriving, coherent, and integral organizations they serve. Once again—as above, so below.
Figure 52 suggests that TCIM have spiritual leaders who are twice as likely to be thriving in their own lives that those in the AOG.

![In your own personal life, how do you rate yourself: THRIVING](image)

**Figure 52. Thriving Leadership**

The trend of greater personal coherence is indicated in Figure 53.

![In your own personal life, how do you rate yourself: COHERENT](image)

**Figure 53. Coherent Leadership**
Personal integrity of the spiritual leader (see Figure 54) is remarkably high in the TCIM group as compared to AOG.

![Graph showing personal integrity ratings]

**In your own personal life, how do you rate yourself:**

**INTEGRAL**

- **HIGH**: 54% 93%
- **MEDIUM**: 40% 7%
- **LOW**: 6% 0%

**Thriving / Coherent / Integral Ministries**

**All other Survey Responses**

**Figure 54. Integral Leadership**

**Summary**

The comparison between TCIM and AOG reveals a significant contrast in each domain of development within the four quadrants of ministry. Organizationally, TCIM are structurally more complex and have a higher standard of member and trustee competence. The survey indicates that TCIM are less driven by family system dynamics and are more skillful in managing disagreement. They have a clearer sense of identity and purpose and are capable of differentiating from past issues. They are more prosperous and show a trend toward a greater capacity for increased attendance. While existing across the entire church size spectrum TCIM are most prevalent when their
leadership is capable of modeling and demonstrating principles that underlie personal
ingegrity and coherence as well as personal abundance.

In Chapter 5, the trends that typify the distinctions between the two study groups are identified and their relevance to the efficacy of the integral approach explored. In addition, the distinctiveness between TCIM and AOG is linked to substantiating the developmental hypothesis underlying the Integral Map of Ministry, and how these two groups represent the continuum of 1st to 2nd tier practices and dynamics as applied to the church organizational development schema.
Chapter 4 Endnotes:


2 Facts on Growth, report by Hartford Institute for Religion Research at Hartford Seminary, 2005.
CHAPTER 5:
CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS

Summary

With respect to the Integral Church Profile Survey—thriving, coherent, and integral ministries (TCIM) and all other (AOG) survey respondents—when the two groups are compared the following trends are indicated:

- **Minister’s Tenure**: Fifty-three percent of TCIM’s have a minister’s tenure greater than five years. Eighteen percent of TCIM’s have a minister’s tenure greater than 20 years as compared to only 4% of AOG survey respondents with a greater than 20 year minister tenure.

- **Church Size Distribution**: The greatest percentage of TCIM respondents are from Pastoral and Program churches. However, when the TCIM to AOG ratio is compared within each church size category, the Mega church configuration is 50% more likely to be thriving, coherent, and integral (TCI) than the Corporate church, but only 25% more likely than the Program church. The Program church is 75% more likely to be TCI in comparison to the Pastoral church. The Pastoral church is 83% more likely to be TCI in comparison to the Family church. Thus, the larger the church the more likely the church will be TCI.

- **Ethnic Diversity**: TCIMs are nearly twice as likely to have ethnically diverse congregations when a church is situated in an ethnically diverse community.

- **Sunday Attendance**: No TCIM reported a decline in church attendance. Furthermore, TCIMs are only half as likely to report an attendance plateau. They
are twice as likely to report an increase in Sunday attendance in the past two years.

- **Financial Support**: TCIMs are half as likely to report a decline or plateau of financial support. 78% of TCIMs report an increase in financial support.

- **Membership Process**: TCIMs are three times more likely to have a tiered membership process where there is a distinction between joining the church and becoming a voting member. By comparison, TCIMs tend to have a more complex and demanding process for becoming a voting member of the church.

- **Components of New Member Orientation**: TCIMs are twice as inclined to require a prosperity class, *I of the Storm* class, Peacemaking or Non-Violent Communications class, Truth Basics, commitment to follow a grievance procedure, and commitment to prayer, service, or spiritual education programs. TCIMs are more inclined to include in their orientation process information regarding the organization’s policies, bylaws, mission / vision, and request some form of meaningful service to the ministry.

- **Components of Trustee Service & Board Practice**: TCI’s are more inclined to report that their board members are held accountable to performance, ethical, sexual conduct, and conflicts of interest standards, participate in formal board orientation, annual training and retreats; and they are significantly more inclined to require a financial commitment from their trustees. TCI’s are nearly twice as likely to provide disclosure of the board’s needs and church issues prior to recruiting new board candidates, require an *I of the Storm* class, and attend regional or national conventions.
• **Board Practices:** In comparison to all others, TCIMs are significantly more likely to report clear channels of communication between leadership, staff, and volunteers. Within their group, TCI’s are 25% more likely to be conscious of their responsibility to be role models to the congregation in comparison with all other respondents. 100% of TCIMs reported that their Bylaws were up-to-date as compared to 66% of AOG. TCIMs were twice as inclined to inform the congregation regarding financial issues and concerns. They were 20% more likely to fill vacancies with candidates who were best qualified vs. those who were most willing. TCIM board members were more informed regarding the parent organizations and more likely to remain involved in the church following their board service.

• **Leadership Development:** TCIMs were twice as inclined to report that leadership development was a high priority in their church.

• **Clear and Up-to-Date Policies:** TCIMs are nearly twice as likely to report having clear and up-to-date policies and procedures.

• **Church Identity:** A slightly larger percentage of TCIMs describe their church as a spiritual community rather than their spiritual home. This trend is reversed for AOGs.

• **Management of Disagreement:** TCIMs are twice as likely to report agreement regarding the effective management of disagreement.

• **Gossip, Triangulation & Parking Lot Conversations:** TCIMs are nearly twice as likely to report having no problems with community discontent.
• **What People Say & Do:** TCIMs are more inclined to report congruence between what people say and do.

• **Reliable Volunteers:** TCIMs are twice as likely to attract reliable volunteers.

• **Accountability:** TCIMs are more inclined to hold people in their church accountable for failing to live up to promises.

• **Financial Support Ratio:** TCIMs are significantly more likely to have a giving ratio above the 20/80% rule in comparison to all others.

• **Overall Functioning:** TCIMs report a greater coherence ratio between what goes on behind the scenes and what is demonstrated in public.

• **Shared Identity & Shared Future:** TCIMs are twice as likely to report a strong sense of congregational shared identity and future in their church.

• **Formulation of Mission & Vision:** TCIMs are twice as likely to link their mission / vision to social action and are significantly more likely to revisit their mission / vision every two years. A greater percentage of TCIM use an AI or Future Search process to formulate their mission / vision.

• **How Financial Challenges are perceived:** TCIMs are more likely to view financial challenges as feedback to their creative process rather than a problem to solve.

• **Dealing with Challenges:** TCIMs report spending significantly less energy dealing with challenges.

• **Past Issues:** TCIMs are nearly twice as likely to refrain from projecting past concerns onto present conditions.
• **Congregational Attitude:** TCIMs are more inclined to have an optimistic view of circumstances.

• **Congregational Well-being:** TCIMs are twice as likely to differentiate their well-being from issues relating to money or attendance.

• **What Drives the Church?** TCIMs are twice as likely to be mission or purpose driven, then situation or circumstance driven.

• **Integral Leadership:** One hundred percent of all TCIMs have ministers or spiritual leaders who report a medium to high score in being thriving, coherent, and integral in their own personal lives.

### Trends and Deductions

Based on the indicated practices, relational dynamics, and distinctive trends, thriving, coherent, and integral ministries possess the following attributes by comparison to the all others group:

- TCIMs are predominately Mega and Program size churches, but can also be Pastoral and Family size
- TCIMs are tenured by long-term, capable leadership
- They are ethnically diverse
- They are more likely to report an increase in Sunday attendance and financial support
- They are more likely to have a tiered process for becoming a voting member
- TCIMs tend to have a more challenging process for becoming a voting member and board of trustee
• They require financial commitment from board members
• TCIM leaders value capacity building, clear communication, healthy ways of managing concerns, accountability, leadership and membership competence, and being role models unto the congregation
• TCIMs refer to themselves as a church community rather than a spiritual family
• They are less dominated by family system dynamics and more egalitarian
• They place a high value on shared identity and share future
• TCIMs are purpose driven, optimistic, and can differentiate themselves from their experience
• They commonly link their identity and purpose with community service and social action
• TCIMs refrain from projecting past concerns onto present circumstances
• And, have ministers and spiritual leaders who are thriving, coherent, and integral in their own personal lives

**Discussion**

While this study focused on comparing two groups of respondents—those who self-identified as aligned with the designations: thriving, coherent, and integral ministries (TCIM); and all other groups (AOG) with partial or less than complete alignment with the aforementioned designations—it is of significance that the groups themselves approximate Level 2 and Level 1 developmental stages of the integral map of ministry. The organizational, relational, cultural, and consciousness (intentionality) trends associated with each group points to developmental dynamics inherent in each of the
quadrants, and the characteristics which distinguish one stage from the other. Level 1 ministry is subsistent oriented (1st tier), configured for simplicity, cohesiveness, and homeostasis as evidenced by the preponderance of responses that describe ministry as a single celled organism, rich in familial dynamics, and driven by issues of well-being and survival. Level 2 ministry is high 1st tier by comparison as indicated by more complex and integral organizational structures, egalitarian relational dynamics, and a cultural matrix linked to communal purpose. These distinctions across the quadrants and the significant distinctiveness between the two study groups lend credence to an AQAL view of ministry.

While it would be incorrect to assert that the attributes of what is supposedly a thriving, coherent, and integral ministry constitutes the Level 2 milestone in and of itself, it is prudent to note that the thriving, coherent, and integral ministry category (as opposed to all other groups) became the PIN number or code for accessing an integral view of the research data. For instance, when the study results are sorted using other independent variables, such as increased attendance or increased financial support, no significant distinguishing trends apparent in data with regard to organizational practices, relational dynamics, cultural imperatives, or leadership qualities. It was only in using the combined thriving, coherent, and integral descriptor that a discernable trend became evident (nearly 10% of the study population).

From another perspective, the study supports the integral approach as applied to distinguishing the dynamics of development between levels. The following table compares the distinctive practices and trends in Level 1 and Level 2 church dynamics.
Table 2. AQAL Comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrants</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>• Simple new member orientation process</td>
<td>• Complex new member orientation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimal board member requirements</td>
<td>• Extensive requirements for board members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less financial requirements for board</td>
<td>• More financial requirements for board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilitarian structures</td>
<td>• Integral structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less accountability</td>
<td>• More accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>• Minister is primary care-giver</td>
<td>• Tendency toward small group ministries fulfilling care-giving needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family System</td>
<td>• Family system dynamics prevalent</td>
<td>• Functional dispute resolution system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>• Church is spiritual home</td>
<td>• Church is spiritual community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian System</td>
<td>• Ownership ratio equals or less than 20/80%</td>
<td>• Ownership ratio equals or greater than 20/80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>• Less ethnic diversity</td>
<td>• More ethnic diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo</td>
<td>• Identity linked to minister</td>
<td>• Identity linked to ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>• Weak sense of shared identity &amp; future</td>
<td>• Strong sense of shared identity &amp; future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Community</td>
<td>• Mission less likely to be linked to social action</td>
<td>• Mission likely linked to social action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness</td>
<td>• May see the glass half empty</td>
<td>• Tends to see the glass half full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associative</td>
<td>• Eclipsed by history</td>
<td>• Integrated history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>• Driven by financial issues</td>
<td>• Driven by purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated</td>
<td>• Tendency to have spiritual leaders who are not thriving, coherent or integral in their personal lives</td>
<td>• Tendency to have spiritual leaders who are thriving, coherent, and integral in their personal lives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table illustrates, the dynamics of Level 1 and Level 2 ministry represent distinct development stages across the full spectrum of church size.
The study also depicts a relationship between practices that have an impact on two or more quadrants simultaneously and church development, and thus unveiling the nature of 2\textsuperscript{nd} tier practices. Whole system processes such as Appreciative Inquiry, peacemaking skills, community-wide inclusion for mission / vision formulation, and small group ministries were prevalent in TCIM. These practices cross quadrant boundaries and support dimensional shifts within the framework of the living system of ministry—a fundamental principle of 2\textsuperscript{nd} tier practices. The key distinction between 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} tier practices is the activation of development across the two dimensions (being and doing / agency and community) within the AQAL matrix.

In the adjacent figure, 2\textsuperscript{nd} tier dynamics are portrayed. Any organizational practice, developmental process or methodologically pluralistic approach that activates developmental movement \textit{and} dimensional congruence (between being and doing) and coherence (between agency and community) can be identified as a 2\textsuperscript{nd} tier dynamic. In contrast (see the figure below), 1\textsuperscript{st} tier dynamics are characteristically compartmentalized, focusing
predominately on one quadrant (the organizational quadrant as pictured) or another without intentional regard to issues of congruence or coherence.

While not directly validating the above assertion, the study suggests that TCIM are developmentally more coherent and congruent organizational systems.

Figure 56. First Tier Dynamics

Returning now to the original research question: What are the organizational practices, relational dynamics, cultural imperatives, and leadership qualities that underlie thriving, coherent, and integral church organizations? Based on the research of this study the following list of practices, dynamics, imperatives, and qualities can be identified that support thriving, coherent, and integral churches:

Organizational Practices

- A clear distinction between the value of belonging to the community and the organizational structure of voting member. The study indicates that a tiered membership process contributes to organizational integrity and membership competence.
- An extensive and challenging voting member orientation process cultivates spiritual awareness and practice, understanding of truth principles, personal
integrity, accountability, financial ownership of the organization, and value in membership in the church.

- Clear policies, communication modalities, decision modes, grievance procedures, ethical agreements, performance expectations, job descriptions, up-do-date governance structures, and transparency optimize organizational functioning and support effective systems.

- An authentic partnership between minister, board, and voting membership committed to fulfill the mission and vision of the church.

- A practice of leading by example. Board members modeling financial commitment and ministry service. Attitude: Be the member you wish the member to become.

- Capacity building and leadership development is paramount to sustaining organizational health and spiritual integrity.

Relational Dynamics

- A movement away from family system dynamics to egalitarian dynamics where intimacy / care-giving needs are met by the community instead of by the minister.

- Low tolerance for gossip, triangulation, and scapegoating. High value for peacemaking skills and non-violent communication principles, and a commitment to healthy ways of managing conflict.

- The prevalence of small group ministries, lay chaplaincy, and meaningful affinity dynamics that foster spiritual education, service, and lay development builds community and creates ownership.
Cultural Imperatives

• The identity of the church is not linked to the personhood of the minister, but rather arises from the community.

• The community is ethnically diverse and socially active in making a positive difference in the world.

• There is a clear sense of shared identity and shared future. Everyone knows what the church stands for and why it exists, and where it is going.

• The community routinely revisits its mission and vision to ensure it is congruent with the congregation’s demographics and values.

• The congregation has integrated its story and does not project past hurts onto current situations and future possibilities.

Leadership Qualities

• Challenges are viewed as feedback to the creative process rather than problems to solve.

• The leadership is capable of differentiating between situations and issues of well-being. It does not necessarily equate financial support or attendance levels with what makes the organization viable, functional, or whole.

• Leaders have a commitment to excellence, integrity, and to their own spiritual journey.

• The church is driven by purpose rather than by fear or lack.

• The minister / spiritual leader is thriving, coherent, and integral in their personal life.
Suggestions for Future Research

The efficacy of integral theory as a framework for understanding and working with the developmental dynamics of church organizations is substantiated by this study. This study has sought to be one of many possible ways to begin the journey, conceive a map, and test the waters. Further research is necessary to clarify and validate the assertions of this research.

The obvious extensions of this effort would include broadening the demographics of this study to include spiritual leaders, lay leaders and worshippers from other religious traditions. Another necessary focus would involve validating the effectiveness of the survey instrument: *The Integral Church Profile Survey*. The standardization of quadrant assessment would make the conclusions of any integral study more…integral.

The most important component of future research would involve case studies of several churches attempting to make the Pastoral size to program size transition. Because this particular transition is considered the most difficult, a study of how integral principles and 2nd tier practices can affect this developmental leap would likely lead to a new paradigm for the church growth and development industry if it were successful. Such a study would need to investigate the efficacy of a methodologically pluralistic approach consistent among research subjects receiving the integral intervention as well as the use of a control group receiving only conventional church growth strategies.
Conclusion

This study has broken new ground in the application of integral theory as applied to developmental dynamics of church organizations. It represents an essential breakthrough in understanding how churches evolve as living systems and behave as conscious entities. It has substantiated the efficacy of focusing on creating thriving, coherent, and integral organizations as the foundation for holistic development. It has clearly linked the issue of leadership excellence and congruence with the health and vitality of the church community.

The integral map of ministry charts the topography of the developmental terrain of churches and suggests the landmarks of each evolutionary milestone. Like a mandala that points to the reunification of self and essence, the integral map brings us closer to seeing ourselves in the broader landscape of the organization. Church development is 10% structural and 90% interpersonal. The integral view helps us to hold both form and essence simultaneously. This is the integral embrace.

Breaking new ground is of no consequence unless it produces a flowering of innovation and the blossoming of transformative approaches that actualize a church’s capacity to fulfill its spiritual purpose regardless of its structural size. If nothing else, this study has contributed to the growing understanding that integral theory is a valuable framework for enhancing the developmental potentially inherent in church organizations.

This study is also a resource for ministerial educators, seminary officials, ministers, teachers, practitioners, church boards, and church growth consultants. As the integral model and holistic approach is applied to ministry arts, it is obvious that the well-
being and integrity of the church is in the hands of those who are called to be leaders.

The strongest correlation in this study is in the relationship between thriving churches and thriving leaders; coherent churches and coherent leaders; and integral churches and their integral leaders. As above, so below.
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Dear participant,

You are invited to participate in a research study to investigate what organizational practices can lead to creating thriving, coherent, and integral churches. We hope to discover how an integral approach to ministry based on integral theories (as developed by Ken Wilber) and Spiral Dynamics can support authentic church growth and development within the New Thought movement and beyond. Participation in this investigation will be ground-breaking insofar as no previous study examining efficacy of integral principles has been applied to church organizations.

This research asks participants to fill out a survey regarding organizational practices and relational dynamics prevalent within their church. It will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

As a special incentive for your participation, your ministry will be entered into a drawing where three participants (among all who participate in the study) will earn a free Integral Leadership & Church Growth seminar to be presented at your church at no charge. This is a $2,500.00 value.

To be a participant in the present study you must:

- Be a Unity, Religious Science, Universal Foundation for Abundant Living or other New Thought member ministry in good standing with your licensing organization.
- Be an established organization with a functioning board of trustees for at least one year before January, 2007.
- You must sign and return the attached consent form with your completed survey.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study please contact Gary Simmons or Robert Nunley by phone, email, or mail.

Thank you in advance for your positive response to this invitation.

Sincerely,

Gary Simmons
Principal Researcher
4222 Nunley Lane
McLouth, KS  66054
Email: Unitypeaceworks@aol.com
Phone: 785-863-2574

Chair of Graduate Committee:
Robert Nunley, Ph.D.
Holos University Graduate Seminary
Email: bnnunley@ku.edu
Phone: 785-863-2176
APPENDIX B
Informed Consent

This study is being conducted as part of the doctoral research requirements for Holos University Graduate Seminary (www.hugs-edu.org).

Holos University supports the practice of protection for subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. All participants enter into this study completely on a voluntary basis and understand that there is no cost to participate. You should be aware that, even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time.

Senior ministers or spiritual leaders are invited to participate in a research study designed to assess key indicators underlying thriving, coherent, and integral church organizations and how an integral approach and whole system practices affect issues of church health, development and growth. This research involves taking a survey used to collect data pertaining to organizational structures, practices, social systems, and cultural and communal imperatives. It is estimated that the completion of the research survey will take approximately 20 minutes of your time.

We assure you that your name or any other identifying information associated with your organization will not be associated in any way with the results of this study. The information will be identified only by a code number.

With my signature, I affirm that I am at least 18 years of age, have read and understand this consent form, and have received a copy of the same to keep.

(Signature of church official agreeing to participate)    (Date)

PRINT YOUR NAME HERE: __________________________________________

If you would like additional information concerning this research study before or after it is complete, please feel free to contact Gary Simmons or Robert Nunley, by phone, mail, or email.

Sincerely,

Gary Simmons
Principle Researcher
4222 Nunley Lane
McLouth, KS  66054
Email: Unitypeaceworks@aol.com
785-863-2574

Faculty Supervisor:
Robert Nunley, Ph.D.
Committee Chair and Professor
Holos University Graduate Seminary
Email: bunley@ku.edu
Phone: 785-863-2176
APPENDIX C
Integral Church Profile Survey

Please provide factual data whenever possible, or choose the response that best applies to your organizational or community dynamic. It is better to be honest, than to try to answer correctly. Some questions are subjective. Try to reflect on the general nature of the issue and respond accordingly.

General Background:

1. Your Name: ________________________________  Title: _____________________
2. Name of Church: _______________________________________________________
3. Address: __________________________ City ____________________State:______ Zip: ___________ Email: ____________________ Phone: ________________________
4. Affiliation: (Circle the one that applies)
   a) Association of Unity Churches International
   b) United Church of Religious Science
   c) Religious Science International
   d) Universal Foundation for Abundant Living
   e) Other _________________________________________________________
5. Do you wish to be entered into the drawing to win a free Integral Leadership and Church growth seminar? _________
6. What is the population of the area in which your congregation resides? _________
7. What is the year your church was established: ________
8. What is the duration of the longest-tenured minister? _____ years; What is your current tenure? _______. How many ministers or spiritual leaders have served this church throughout its history? _________.
9. What is the average Sunday worship attendance, including children, for the past year? ___________. During the past year, Sunday adult worship attendance has (circle one):
   a) generally increased
   b) has stayed about the same
   c) has generally decreased
10. During the past year, financial support has (Circle one):

   d) generally increased
   e) has stayed about the same
   f) has generally decreased

11. Regarding our facility—we have more than enough space for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofc &amp; Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Structures and Practices:**

This section looks at your process for bringing voting members into your ministry.

12. When someone joins the church do they also become a voting member of the organization? (Circle one): a) YES  b) NO

13. Is there a distinction between those who JOIN the church and those who are VOTING MEMBERS? (Circle one): a) YES  b) NO

14a. Which best describes the process for becoming a voting member of your church (Circle one):

   a) **Easy**—fill out an application for membership and take an orientation class.
   b) **Relatively easy**—includes a formal commitment to prayer, service, and support of the ministry.
   c) **Somewhat challenging**—attends a minimum of 12 hours of classes and commit to some form of measurable active service in the ministry.
   d) **Challenging**—a lengthy process that takes place over many months and includes a commitment of financial support.
   e) **Other**—___________________________________________________

14b. Is taking a class in peacemaking skills (such as the *I of the Storm*) or non-violent communication skills (such as *Compassionate Communication*) a component of your church’s track to becoming a voting member? a) YES  b) NO
15. Is there some grievance process or dispute resolution policy (such as *Agreeing and Disagreeing In Love Covenants*) established in your church that members are asked to observe?  
   a) YES  
   b) NO  

16. What is the **term** of active voting member?  (Circle one):  
   a) One year  
   b) Indefinite—as long as the person is actively attending and financially supporting the ministry.  
   c) Indefinite—as long as the person desires membership in the church.  
   d) Other—_________________________________________________  

17. If the term of voting member is **indefinite**, does your ministry annually update its active membership roster by removing those who have become inactive?  
   a) YES  
   b) NO  
   c) DOES NOT APPLY  

18. Circle those components of your new member orientation process that apply to your ministry.  
   a) Facilitated by the minister  
   b) Facilitated by the board  
   c) Facilitated by the leadership team  
   d) Orientation to the church bylaws, policies, and organizational chart  
   e) Required courses relating to Truth Basics  
   f) Commitment to the mission and vision of the church  
   g) Commitment to a member’s code of ethics  
   h) Must make an annual financial pledge  
   i) Commitment to grievance procedures  
   j) Commitment to meaningful service in the ministry  
   k) Commitment to attend denominational functions such as conferences, retreats, spiritual education programs  
   l) Commitment to prayer, service or spiritual enrichment (education) programs  
   m) Orientation to the parent organizations (such as the Association of Unity Churches, Unity School, RSI, UCRS, or Universal Foundation for Abundant Living)  
   n) Commitment to community service (outside the church) or some form of social action  
   o) A prosperity class such as 4-T or Keys to the Kingdom, 5 Gifts, etc.  
   p) An *I of the Storm* class  
   q) An *I of the Storm* class, including the *Day-By-Day Reconciliation Journal* exercise  
   r) Other: _________________________________________________________
This section examines your board and leadership practices.

19. Circle those components of board service and board practice that apply to your ministry.

   a) Prospective board candidates participate in a board orientation process and education regarding the issues, concerns, and needs of the church before agreeing to serve on the board.
   b) The *I of the Storm* class required for board service
   c) New board members elected or appointed to the board participate in a *new board member* orientation process which includes review of bylaws, policies, code of ethics, and grievance procedures.
   d) Minister / Board retreats are held annually.
   e) An agreement to financially support the church is required.
   f) A 10% tithe to the church is required of board members during their tenure on the board.
   g) No specific financial commitment is required for board service.
   h) Prospective board candidates are active members in the church for a period of no less than one year before they can serve on the board.
   i) Board members sign a board code of ethics.
   j) The board participates in ongoing capacity building programs.
   k) Board members are required to participate in national and regional conferences.
   l) Board performs an annual self-evaluation and addresses competency deficits.
   m) Disclosure of conflicts of interest.
   n) The board has a sexual conduct policy.
   o) Board members routinely hold each other accountable for failing to live up to board agreements and commitments.
   p) Other: _______________________________________________________

20. For the most part, the majority of the church members know who serves on the board of trustees (Circle one):  a) TRUE   b) FALSE

21. For the most part, individual board members are well aware of the relationship between the church and its parent organization(s) (such as the AUCI, Unity Institute, RSI, UFAL, etc.):  a) TRUE   b) FALSE

22. Our practice when it comes to filling board vacancies is to choose who is:

   a) most willing
   b) best qualified

23. In our church, those who retire from board service remain active in the ministry and strong supporters of the church.  a) For the most part, yes.   b) No. They seem to fade away
24. When it comes to money issues, our practice is not to bother the congregation when there is stress over financial decline.  a) TRUE  b) FALSE

25. There have been times in the past when we should have communicated with the membership our concerns over finances before things got out of hand.
   a) TRUE  b) DOES NOT APPLY

26. Ongoing leadership training and development is a high priority in this church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Pick One

27. There are clear, up-to-date policies and procedures for church management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Pick One

28. Committees, ministry teams, and task forces are given written guidelines to help them do their job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Pick One

29. The minister performance review process at your church has been co-created by the minister and the board.

   □ YES  □ NO, the board has an established procedure
   □ We have no such process

30. Your board meetings tend to be: (Circle those that apply)
   a) Focused on people-issues
   b) Very efficient and productive
   c) Spiritually uplifting
   d) Focused on money issues
   e) Focused on facility issues
   f) Worshipful work
   g) Normal
   h) Long and stressful
   i) other ____________________________

31. Your bylaws and policies are up-to-date.  □ YES  □ NO

32. Board members are role models in your congregation. They are conscious of their responsibility to lead by example.

   □ Yes, absolutely
   □ Well, we’re working on this
   □ In my dreams
33. The lines of communication are clear between the minister, board, key leaders, staff, and volunteers. □ Yes □ Could be better □ No

**Social and Relational Dynamics**

34. Which best describes the minister / board relationship in your church? (Circle one):

   a) parent / child  
   b) professional  
   c) employee / employer  
   d) me / them  
   e) collaborative partnership  
   f) collegiate  
   g) a good marriage  
   h) egalitarian

35. How would you imagine the congregation views the board / congregation relationship? (Circle one):

   a) parent / child  
   b) professional  
   c) us / them  
   d) collaborative partnership  
   e) challenging

36. For the most part, members of the board see the minister as their pastor, someone capable of supporting them in time of need. a) TRUE b) FALSE

37. How would the congregation describe the church? (Circle one):

   a) As their church family  
   b) As their church / spiritual home  
   c) As a spiritual center  
   d) As their spiritual community  
   e) As a spiritual organization  
   f) Other: ________________________________

38. Intimacy and care-giving bonds within the church are **primarily** experienced in (Circle one):

   a) the minister / congregant relationship  
   b) lay chaplain / congregant relationship  
   c) small group ministries or affinity groups  
   d) other: ________________________________
39. In this congregation, the minister is seen by the congregation as the (Circle one):

   a) primary care-giver  
   b) spiritual leader  
   c) CEO  
   d) loving parent  
   e) spiritual coach / mentor  

40. The majority of the minister’s time is spent organizing effective ministries—defining tasks, recruiting leaders, establishing teams, planning, training, coaching, and supporting committees. □ YES □ about half the time □ Only a little

41. Your congregation effectively manages disagreement.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
   Pick One □ □ □ □ □

42. Gossip, triangulation and parking lot conversations is not a problem at your church.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
   Pick One □ □ □ □ □

43. At your church, what people say and do are often two different things.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
   Pick One □ □ □ □ □

44. Lack of follow-through and commitment is an ongoing challenge at your church.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
   Pick One □ □ □ □ □

45. At your church, it seems like the same people are doing all of the work. It’s a challenge to get reliable volunteers.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
   Pick One □ □ □ □ □

46. When someone “drops the ball” or fails to live up to their promises, they are held accountable.

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
   Pick One □ □ □ □ □
47. What percentage of the congregation provides the majority of resources (money and volunteerism) in your church? (Note: Typically in churches, 20% of the congregation provides 80% of the resources).

a) 10%
b) 20%
c) 30%
d) 40%
e) 50%
f) >50%

48. Some people complain that the minister is not meeting the pastoral needs of the congregation. ☐ TRUE ☐ FALSE

**Culture and Identity**

49. The minister is seen as the glue that holds the church community together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Pick One

50. People in this church come to this church more so for the minister than for the ministry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Pick One

51. Your church is known more by who our minister is than by what your church stands for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Pick One

52. It has been the practices of this ministry to have the leadership formulate the ministry’s mission and vision. a) TRUE  b) FALSE  c) Other: _____________________

53. This church includes the entire congregation in the formulation of its mission and vision. a) TRUE  b) FALSE
54. How often does your entire congregation participate in a visioning and goal-setting process?

a) never  
b) every year  
c) every two years  
d) Other: _______________________________________________________

55. In your ministry is it an established practice to revisit the mission / vision statement of the church every so often?  
a) YES  
b) NO  
c) Other: _______________________________________________________

The next question is about SHARED IDENTITY and SHARED FUTURE. Shared identity means that the MAJORITY of the church members understand what the church stands for and why it exists. They would have the same response if asked the question: What does your church stand for? Shared future means that the community sees the same future for the church and, thus, all members can see themselves in the church’s future.

56. There is a strong sense of shared identity and shared future in our congregation.

Pick One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

57. Has your church used an Appreciative Inquiry, Future Search, or some other whole system process for creating its shared mission / vision statement?  
a) YES  
b) NO  
c) Other: _______________________________________________________

58. In those times when the church was without a minister, the church (Circle one):

a) seemed to thrive  
b) entered a period of decline  
c) maintained the status quo  
d) does not apply

59. In those times immediately following the arrival of a new minister (within the first two years), the church (Circle one):

a) seemed to thrive  
b) entered a period of decline  
c) maintained the status quo  
d) does not apply
Consciousness & Intentionality

60. Financial challenges in our church are usually viewed as feedback to our creative process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pick One

61. We rarely project past concerns onto current challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pick One

62. Our congregation tends to see the glass “half empty”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pick One

63. Our church has done a good job in dealing with past hurts and disappointments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pick One

64. The well-being of our ministry is often linked to how much money we have or how many people are in attendance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pick One

65. As organizational leaders, it has been our practice to spend most of our time and energy dealing with challenging situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pick One

66. In terms of overall functioning, to an outside observer, this ministry would (Circle one):

a) Be perceived as really having “its act together”.

b) Seem as if everything came together at the last possible moment.

67. In terms of overall functioning, to an insider, this ministry would (Circle one):

a) Be seen as really having “its act together”.

b) Barely come together at the last possible moment.
68. An honest evaluation of what concerns organizational leaders the most is (Circle one)
   a) What is happening or not happening
   b) What can or can’t be done
   c) Who we are or who we are not

69. An honest evaluation of this ministry is that it is (Circle one):
   a) Driven by the likes and dislikes of the congregation
   b) Driven by the most vocal people
   c) Driven by issues of decline
   d) Driven by issues of lack of commitment
   e) Driven to increase attendance
   f) Driven by its mission and vision

70. In the past when the church had lost its minister, the church went through an intentional transition process with a trained interim or transition ministry specialist / consultant. □ YES □ NO □ NOT SURE □ DOES NOT APPLY

**Thriving, Coherent, & Integral**

In this section, consider the energetic nature of your ministry and whether or not it has clear direction, purpose, and integrity as an organization.

71. If *thriving* is all about having more than enough of everything needed (money, volunteerism, and capable people), and *surviving* is about just making it from month to month, indicate where your ministry is along the spectrum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surviving</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Thriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pick One

72. If *coherence* is all about clarity of purpose (shared identity and shared future) and single mindedness of intent where everyone knows what the church stands for and where it is going, and *incoherence* is about confusion, competing agendas, or lack of shared purpose, indicate where your ministry is along the spectrum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incoherence</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Coherence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pick One

73. If *integrity* is about the minister / board / membership partnership where members possess the capacity to hold the leadership accountable, where membership is only
available to those who are in ownership of the organization, and **out of integrity** is where anyone can become a member and there is no real process where members are held accountable to competency standards, indicate where your ministry is along the spectrum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out of Integrity</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Integral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next three questions are about you and how you may or may not be showing up as an integral leader.

74. If THRIVING is all about having MORE THAN ENOUGH of everything you need to meet your material and spiritual needs, and accomplish your personal goals, and SURVIVING is about just making it from month to month and dealing with a sense of “not enough”, indicate where you are in your personal life along the THRIVING spectrum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75. If COHERENCE is all about clarity of purpose and really knowing what you are here to demonstrate and accomplish, both short and long-term, and INCOHERENCE is about confusion, competing issues, or lack of really knowing what the future holds, indicate where you are in your personal life along the COHERENCE spectrum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76. If INTEGRITY is about walking your talk, being an example and role model for others, having a daily spiritual practice, taking good care of your body temple, and having balance between personal and professional pursuits, and OUT OF INTEGRITY is not living consistently with your values, or having only a haphazard spiritual practice, rate yourself along the INTEGRITY spectrum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

77. Has this experience of taking this survey caused you to consider the state of your ministry and how it may or may not be functioning in its highest capacity?

a) YES  b) NO
78. What specific areas of your ministry or issues of organizational integrity do you feel need addressing? _______________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

79. What “aha’s” or insights have been gained in participating in this survey?
_____________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

80. What areas of training, leadership development, or coaching support would benefit you and your ministry? ____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the Integral Church Profile Survey

Would you like to receive a copy of the survey results?
a) YES   b) NO

The complete dissertation will be available on line in October, 2007, at www.hugs-edu.net
Date: __________

Dear Beloved Colleague:

The entire New Thought community has an exciting opportunity to participate in a research project investigating what organizational practices lead to thriving, coherent, and integral churches. This study conducted by Rev. Gary Simmons, Director of Peacemaking Services for the Association of Unity Churches International, is a part of his doctoral dissertation research requirements for Holos Graduate Seminary. He hopes to discover how an integral approach to ministry based on the theories of Ken Wilber can support authentic church growth and development within the New Thought movement and beyond. Participation in this investigation will be ground-breaking insofar as no previous study examining the efficacy of integral principles has been applied to church organizations.

Gary’s goal is to receive input from every New Thought ministry. The information that Rev. Simmons will collect will be valuable to us. Therefore, I urge you to join me in supporting this project by completing the simple online Integral Church Profile Survey: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=812292942101. It will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Complete this survey within the next two weeks and your ministry will be entered into a drawing where three participants among all who participate in the study will earn a free Integral Leadership & Church Growth seminar to be presented at your church at no charge. This is a $2,500 value.

Thank you for taking the time to support this worthy study.

Namaste,