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As the kingdom of God is a relational construct, this project argues that it is possible to quantify and influence the health of an oikos (a sphere of influence), framed by the reality of the kingdom of God, which ultimately transforms communities in which program participants of Arrow Leadership serve. Many Christians are embracing aspects of the kingdom of God beyond the scope and ministry of their local congregation. For some Christians, living in missional communities is a faithful alternative (both in orthodoxy and orthopraxy) to participating in a local congregation.

In light of this move towards a post Christendom environment, the missional purview initiated and intended by the missio Dei, wherein the missional reality of the kingdom of God is expressed through the existing social infrastructure or networks in which Christians are placed, becomes increasingly normative for Christ followers. This paper asserts that the health of networks can be measured and therefore become increasingly healthy, growing, and full of love (Ephesians 4:16).

The purpose of this dissertation is to utilize a methodology by which the health of an oikos, framed by the reality of the kingdom of God, can be measured (via survey) and influenced. This project will have particular focus on the past participants of the Arrow Leadership Program which is offered by Arrow Leadership, a national, non-denominational, leadership development Christian not for profit organization. As a result, these past participants, and eventually those who subsequently access the survey, will be practically equipped with the capacity to develop their oikos, such that it reflects with greater clarity the reality of the kingdom of God, thereby impacting positively the broader community in which their oikos exists.
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INTRODUCTION

Jesus’ words captured in Luke 17:21, “The kingdom of God is among you,” serve as a continual reminder of the relational reality of the manifest purpose and presence of God’s kingdom on earth. ¹ The prayer that Jesus taught his disciples to pray, often referred to as the Lord’s Prayer, includes “your kingdom come and your will be done, on earth as in heaven” (Mt 6:10). The temporal, ultimate and eternal rule and reign of God is a reality in which followers of Jesus are invited to receive, enter into and inherit (Mt 5:3; Lk 18:17). ² Jesus urges his disciples and by implication his disciples throughout the ages to “seek first the kingdom of God and live righteously” (Mt 6:33). The kingdom of God therefore is not merely a conceptual reality to be appropriated at some future point upon the return of Jesus, but is a present continual relational dynamic in which the patterns and practices of Jesus are imbibed by his followers in all facets of life. Necessarily there are implications of this reality on the life of faith today.

Many Christians are embracing aspects of the kingdom of God beyond the scope and ministry of their local congregation. For some Christians, living in missional communities is a faithful alternative (both in orthodoxy and orthopraxy) to participating in a local congregation. The kingdom of God is not confined to congregational expressions of the Church. God is pursuing his purposes in the world, allowing the fullness of his rule and reign to be experienced beyond the boundaries of organized,  

¹ All Scripture quoted is from the Common English Bible, unless otherwise noted.

² “The kingdom of God is not Christianized society. It is the divine in the lives of those who acknowledge Christ. It has to be ‘received,’ ‘entered,’ or ‘inherited’ by humble and penitent faith in him. God’s new society is called to exhibit the ideals of his rule in the world and so present the world with an alternative social reality.” John Stott, Issues Facing Christians Today (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 29.
orchestrated activities of the local congregation. The world today is generally a post-Christendom environment, where the local congregation is not central to the functioning of societies or communities. In light of this reality, the missional purview initiated and intended by the *missio Dei* (wherein the missional reality of the kingdom of God is expressed through existing social infrastructure or networks in which Christians are placed), becomes increasingly normative for Christ followers. It is possible for followers of Jesus to reflect on and respond to the extent to which this network experiences the realities of the kingdom of God. In other words, believers can consider the question: what fruit might be evident in the life of someone who epitomizes embracing the now and not yet tension of the kingdom of God?\(^4\)

This paper suggests relational networks and spheres of influence are constitutive of the Koine Greek word “*oikos*.”\(^5\) Irrespective of a person’s faith position, their life is expressed in the context of relationships with others. A relational network is necessarily a centered approach, such that everyone will always be part of an *oikos*. If disciples of Jesus are aware of the extent to which their lives epitomize the kingdom of God, decisions around behaviors and relationships can be determined and executed to more fully embrace expressions of the kingdom of God. As most of the survey respondents to this survey are Christian leaders, their *oikos* often incorporates their networks of


\(^5\) Strong’s Concordance 3624, *oikos*, “a house or household, family, lineage.”
relationships connected with their local congregation, their family, friends, work
colleagues, and neighbors.⁶

The *Oikos* Project, developed primarily by Adam Johnstone from Natural Church
Development Australia, is designed to help people discover the extent to which the fabric
of their relationships demonstrate and declare the coming of the kingdom of God. The
methodology, questions, and framework utilized within this project are applied to
Christian leaders and are discussed more fully in chapter 5. The scope of this topic could
be quite broad, conceptually applying to the billions of Christians that express their faith
around the world. However it is recognized that in many non-Western contexts, the ideas
of this topic are already natural to Christian faith expression. Accordingly, it has been
necessarily restricted to a group of Christian leaders serving in Australia. This group is
united by shared experiences that form part of the leadership development programs of
Arrow Leadership which is a national, non-denominational Christian leadership
development not for profit organization. This project will specifically examine the extent
to which Arrow leaders (those who have completed a leadership development program
offered by Arrow Leadership) represent the realities of the kingdom of God to those in
their network of relationships.

The *Oikos* Project, as it applies to Arrow leaders in Australia, is of particular
interest to the writer for a few reasons. Firstly, the health of the relational networks of
Arrow leaders will be measured and could therefore become increasingly healthy,
growing, and full of love (Eph 4:16). This will be significant not just for the Arrow

---
⁶ That is, perhaps paradoxically, a relational network is not restricted only to a gathered context,
but equally to a scattered context. Details of the survey will be examined further in this paper.
leaders themselves, but also for the people with whom they serve and those whom they are serving. Arrow leaders are serving in a broad variety of contexts including traditional churches, itinerant evangelists, missional communities, not for profit organizations, and increasingly in a part time function, whereby their business or employment is an expression of their missional calling.

Secondly, understanding of common themes revealed through the survey data will assist Arrow Leadership in bringing appropriate modification to the curriculum, competency and capacity training elements included in the leadership development programs. As a result, future participants’ experience and relative contribution to partnering with God to see his kingdom come on earth as in heaven will be enhanced. Further, such empowering experiences for participants’ ongoing kingdom service in the context in which God has placed them will result in a ripple effect in many communities around Australia.

Pertinent discoveries made as a result of undertaking this project can be shared beyond the boundaries of Australia. Arrow Leadership in Australia forms part of an international alliance in which other member countries train their own Arrow leaders.\(^7\) The sharing of resources may ultimately lead to other international leadership development programs being enhanced, thereby improving many ministries in which Arrow leaders serve.

Additionally, as the trend towards embracing the broader bandwidth of God’s kingdom grows beyond the expressions of the local congregation, leadership will be

\(^7\) Member countries include: Australia, Canada, Denmark, England, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, and the United States of America.
strategic in accelerating the demonstration and declaration of the good news of the kingdom of God. There is an abundance of material around the development, health, growth, and incarnational and missional expressions of the local congregation. However, there seems to be less material available (particularly diagnostic materials) to assist the disciples of Jesus in holistically reflecting the light of God’s kingdom (2 Cor 3:18). This project seeks to address this deficit.

The purpose of this paper is to establish a methodology by which the health of an oikos, framed by the reality of the kingdom of God, can be measured via survey and influenced. This project has a particular focus on the past participants of the Arrow Leadership Program. As a result, these Arrow leaders and eventually those who subsequently access the survey will be practically equipped to develop their oikos, such that it better reflects the reality of the kingdom of God, thereby impacting positively the broader community in which their oikos exists.

The first part of this paper identifies the context in which Arrow Leadership serves, starting with an examination of the Christian influence on the development of Australia. It also provides an initial survey of basic demographic data of Australia, including an analysis of data regarding Christian faith participation. Finally, emerging trends of the Australian population are explored by comparing present and past demographic surveys.

Having understood the Australian context, the second portion of this dissertation seeks to bring insight into the history of the ministry of Arrow Leadership in Australia,

---

8 See for example, CP Wagner’s book *Church Growth*, Christian Schwarz’s *Natural Church Development*, Reggie McNeal and Mike Breen’s *Missional Communities*, and Mike Frost and Al Hirsch’s *Apostolic, Incarnational, and Missional*. 

---
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starting with initial exposure to North American Arrow. Then it focuses on the strategic intent of Arrow Leadership, incorporating its call, vision, and values. This part of the dissertation articulates the methodology utilized by Arrow Leadership to develop Christian leaders. The next portion of the paper examines the results of some initial research into community transformation emanating from the life and ministry of Arrow leaders. Finally, consideration is given to the implications of identifying transformational influence through a centered-set perspective (center of oikos inspired) rather than bounded-set perspective (local congregation inspired). That is not to say the local congregation is not undertaking important missional and incarnational initiatives, but for the purposes of this paper, the goal is to explore what transformational influence can be rendered by an Arrow leader the sphere of influence within his or her network of relationships.

An examination of pertinent literature seeks to provide insight into expressions of the kingdom of God in the contemporary context. It then examines the biblical understanding and use of the Greek word oikos and its derivations. Finally the paper explores the interaction between oikos and the kingdom of God.

The dissertation then develops a theological framework for the existence, impact, and measure of oikos within the lives of Arrow leaders. It first explores the theological framework for the kingdom of God, reflecting on the relational reality of the kingdom of God and the fact that those in a relational network experience the kingdom of God through words and actions. Having confirmed the relational nature of oikos and expressions of the kingdom of God, it delves into the connection between oikos and the
kingdom of God and the local congregation and society. Finally, it examines the use and meaning of the term *oikos* within a biblical context including the household of God.

In light of the material exposed in the preceding portions of the paper, questions suitable for inclusion in the survey are suggested. This section first examines the statistical process by examining strategy, sampling, and data analysis. It then identifies statistical variants that may be significant upon collection and analysis of data. Finally, questions are developed around the themes of faith, relationships and service that reflect a measure of the health of the kingdom of God in the context of a person’s *oikos*.

The results of the survey data are detailed and initial demographic observations are made about the sample population. Commentary is then provided about the measures of the health of *oikos* for Arrow leaders, including faith, relationships, and service as well as the strength of influence, quality, and size of *oikos*. Pertinent observations are identified and propositions are made, reflective of the verifiable correlations and peculiarities.

Finally, the paper focuses on identifying and developing strategies for *oikos* health development. This last section of the dissertation examines the relative influence of an *oikos* of an Arrow leader, the size of their *oikos*, and the quality of their *oikos*, measured through a threefold paradigm of faith, relationships and service. It then proposes possible enhancements to the Arrow Leadership Program (incorporating recruitment, delivery and post program participation). Finally it explores the flow on effect of an increase in health of an *oikos* for the communities in which the Arrow leader serves.
PART ONE

MINISTRY CONTEXT
The Australian context in which the ministry of Arrow Leadership serves not only informs the leadership curriculum and pedagogical methodology but also highlights the considerable societal change that has been experienced since Arrow Leadership first commenced its program in 1995. Chapter 1 explores the influence of Christianity initially in the development of Australia. After surveying the basic demographic data of Australia, including analysis of data concerning faith participation, this chapter highlights emerging trends relevant for program participants, facilitators, and developers.

**Australian Christian Heritage**

Richard Johnson, a Church of England minister, accompanied the first convicts who were sent to Australia due to overcrowded prisons in England in 1788 as the licensed Chaplain of the First Fleet and Settlement.\(^1\) John Newton and William Wilberforce recommended him for the role to the then British Prime Minister. Johnson commenced the first Christian church service less than a week after arriving in the land.

---

\(^1\) The Church of England is now known in Australia as the Anglican Church of Australia or as the Episcopal Church in the United States.
now known as Australia. From this humble and foundational influence, over the past two hundred years the Christian faith has enabled Australia to become an economic player with an international platform, faith-informed systems including justice, health, and education and a pervasive culture of caring for the last, lost, and least amongst society.

Influence of the Church in the Development of Australia

Johnson did not merely engage in discharging religious goods and services, but also sought to improve public morality, education, and health systems. His experience in farming in England was invaluable in his service to the governor, enabling sustainable crops to be developed for convicts and for free men and women alike. In the mid-nineteenth century, the privileged position of the Church of England was lost through the introduction of the Church Act in the colony of New South Wales, giving equal standing to all denominations including the Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, and Methodist churches. Most Methodist churches joined with the Congregational Church and large portions of the Presbyterian Church in the 1960s to become the Uniting Church in Australia.

---


3 Australia’s influence continues to expand, especially from its relatively significant contribution in the international sporting arena (compared to its size) and the economic Asia Pacific region contribution as well as hosting the recent G20 in November 2014. See Courier Mail, A Growing Nation (Brisbane, QLD: Queensland Newspaper Publications, 2014). See also James Condon, The Salvation Army Australia Eastern Territory Annual Report (Sydney: The Salvation Army, 2014), 21.

Nearly all Australians identified themselves as Christians in 1920.\(^5\) As a result, the Judeo-Christian ethic and belief system was normative for the majority of those and prior generation Australian residents.\(^6\) Until Federation in 1901, when the Australian Constitution provided for freedom of religion, participation in local congregations as expressions of Christian denominations was not in question. The same men who gathered together during the nineteenth century to initiate the first banking service in Australia (Westpac’s predecessor, now the largest bank in Australia) were exactly the same group of twelve men who gathered together to form Australia’s first City Bible Forum.

However, after Federation in 1901, the requirement for church membership to gain voting rights was eliminated. The Church’s contribution to society, however, continued to remain at the forefront, providing input into a wide variety of contemporary issues including the development of social, education, and transport infrastructure in growing numbers of Australian towns. Like other Western societies, however, this centrality was starting to wane.

Along with increasing immigration, the societal landscape of the centrality of the Church in Australia started to change. With each successive generation, fewer parents were sending their children to the local church to participate in Sunday school. Starting in 1813, Sunday schools in New South Wales taught reading, writing, and arithmetic, 

\(^5\) Mark McCrindle, *The ABC of XYZ* (Sydney: McCrindle Research, 2014), 42.

\(^6\) It is recognized that the original Australians, Aborigines, were not counted in surveys as people, let alone as Christians, though David Unaipon believed in an equivalence of traditional Aboriginal and Christian spirituality. (See http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/ unaipon-david-8898, accessed January 15, 2015.) There were many missions to the aboriginal people established in outback Australia, with varying success. Whilst Western influence was introduced to the first people of this nation through church missions, it was not readily welcomed, so for some indigenous people the Western invasion of 1778 was assigned to the work of the Church.
alongside spiritual subjects. Often children’s libraries were attached to the schools.\textsuperscript{7} The move away from organized religion and increasingly towards secularization was and is a trend occurring throughout the West.

While the percentage of those who identify with religions other than Christianity such as Buddhism, Hinduism and Islam is increasing, it does not necessarily mean that Australia is experiencing mass conversions to Eastern religions and Islam. The growth is mirroring demographical shifts in Australia associated with immigration patterns.\textsuperscript{8} Over the last century, there is strong evidence of a decentralization of the Church in society.

Erosion and Elimination of Christendom

Amidst the massive change drivers of demographic growth, increased cultural diversity, transitioning household structures, and shifting societal values is the Church, which has historically been a cornerstone to the social fabric and community engagement in Australia. Christianity continues to be the dominant religion in Australia. However, the trend line shows a gradual decrease of those stating that they are Christian. When asked in the 2011 National Census what their religion was, three in five Australians (61.1 percent) identified as Christian. However, this has gradually declined from 96 percent in 1911 and over the past decade this number has declined from 68 percent to 61 percent.\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{7} Sunday Schools abandoned the inclusion of secular subjects upon the introduction in 1880 of the \textit{Public Instruction Act}.

\textsuperscript{8} McCrindle, \textit{The ABC of XYZ}, 44.

Contrastingly, there has been an increase in those reporting an affiliation to non-Christian religions or stating they are not religious. The number of people reporting “no religion” has increased greatly over the last decade from 15 percent to 22 percent of the population. This is even more evident amongst younger people, with 28 percent of the fifteen to thirty-four year olds stating that they had no religious affiliation. These statistics are similar to the United States, where the rate of non-affiliation is 25 percent of young adults aged eighteen to twenty-nine.\textsuperscript{10} Almost one in three Australians (31.6 percent) identify as either “not religious” or chose to not state their religion, and 7.3 percent of Australians identify with a religion other than Christianity. Younger people make up a high proportion of those reporting no religion, around half who did so being less than thirty years old.\textsuperscript{11}

According to the data above and the experiences of other Western contexts, the age of Christendom in Australia has all but passed. The centrality of a local worshipping Christian faith community is no longer present, moving such communities towards the periphery of societal expressions. However, the contribution by Christian faith organizations and institutions to broader society continues to expand. Denominations continue to have significant influence in sectors including community welfare and service, health, aged care, employment, charity, and education.

\textsuperscript{10} McNeal, \textit{Missional Communities}, location 458.

\textsuperscript{11} Australian Bureau of Statistics 2011, Religious Affiliation.
Current Snapshot of Australia

The Australian Bureau of Statics is the National Census Collection agency for Australia. The most recent survey was conducted in 2011 and the results were available in 2012. Since the survey is conducted every five years, the next survey is scheduled for 2016 (with the results being available mid 2017). The demographic information represented in this portion of the paper is reflective of the 2011 data set.

Rudimentary Data

Australia presently has 23.5 million people with an annual average growth rate of approximately 2 percent (natural increase of approximately 160,000 and net overseas migration of 240,000). This rate is almost twice the world annual average population growth rate. There are almost nine million households, with an average of 2.6 people per household. Over the last twenty years, the average age of Australia has increased by seven years to thirty-seven.12

Local Congregation Participation

Australia has more churches (13,000) than schools (9,500), and more Australians regularly attend church (3.5 million) than the total populations of South Australia, Northern Territory, Tasmania, and the Australian Capital Territory combined. However in 1976, when Australia’s population was 13.9 million, there were 3.9 million regular church attendees. In 1960, two in five Australians (41 percent) attended church at least once per month. In 1990 this had declined to one in four (25 percent), and today it is approximately one in seven (15 percent). These trends suggest that whilst Australians still

12 Australian Bureau of Census Data, 2011.
associate with Christianity, there is an engagement deficit when it comes to church attendance and actively practicing their faith.

Church attendance analysis shows a clear demographic trend: there is an underrepresentation of younger Australians attending church. While the seventy-plus age group are strongly represented in church (comprising 12 percent of the population but 25 percent of all church attendees), the age groups under age fifty are underrepresented. This divide is increasingly evident with each younger generation. For example, the twenty to thirty-nine year olds make up 34 percent of the population but just 21 percent of church attendees.

Charity Engagement Data

In Australia at the most recent census, there is one charity for every twenty-eight homes. The not-for-profit sector in Australia, of which charities are a significant portion, is a greater contributor to gross domestic product than the mining sector.13 Australians culturally embrace the “battler,” who is striving to overcome adversity in their lives or of those around them. Since the majority of charities are conceived with the explicit intention of supporting the most vulnerable in society, Australians posses a favorable disposition towards the work of charities irrespective of the extent to which the charity is informed (either historically or presently) by Christian faith or values.14

In some respects, the Judeo-Christian ethic of the value of every human life is reflected in the attitude of many Australians who support charities. Despite perhaps more

---


formal indications in the most recent survey data of disinclination towards Christian faith, aspects of Christian faith are inherent within their lives. Australia was one of the largest per capita gifting nations to some recent national and international disasters. When others are struggling with unexpected circumstances, Australians are keen to assist. Some of the leaders who have participated in the Arrow Program serve in these charities, responding strategically to ongoing systemic societal issues as well as providing immediate responses in emergency situations.

Community Engagement Data

Whilst community engagement is not only faith oriented, it is helpful to understand how faith happens for Australians. When understanding the terms of a faith decision, not only are there age brackets where the decision is more likely and people who have significant influence, there are also significant activities that people are engaged with that affect the decision. For almost three in five church attendees (58.7 percent), church or mass were significant in helping them come to faith. This was followed by religious education/Scripture (17.9 percent) and youth group (16.9 percent), Sunday school (16.8 percent) and church camps (10.9 percent). In Australia, it is not just faith that informs behavior. Increasingly Australians are aligning with causes, some of which are faith inspired, but most often the community is a beneficiary. However, cause inspired community engagement has not been restricted to traditional community groups.

Many companies have attempted to create a culture that is more of a movement with a cause than a corporation focussed on profit. Large corporations support workplace giving programs and charitable work, provide personal development courses and life
coaches, and issue reports on their social charter and corporate citizenship. This renewed focus on holistic sustainability, in addition to the growing momentum of environmental sustainability, has created significant backlash against materialism. It has also energized movements that offer a greater social benefit, including church groups, charities, and groups that offer authentic community that go beyond mere followers or friends or the like offered by technology inspired pseudo community creators.\textsuperscript{15}

**Emerging Trends of the Australian Population**

The face of the Australian population has changed dramatically since Federation in 1901. There has been a move from family contexts that lived in one or perhaps two communities in their lifetime to families whose income earners over their working life will have more than seventeen employers, five different careers, and move homes to respond to employment opportunities. Another substantial move is from what was predominantly a monocultural society to a very strong multicultural society. A shift in technology has seen the population move from being digital immigrants to digital natives. Whilst the population of Australia is increasingly spiritual, there is a decrease in local congregation engagement. The context in which Arrow Leadership serves is dynamic and as such needs to respond to the contemporary issues in which the leaders are placed. These issues will now be explored.

**Increasingly Urban**

Two-thirds of Australia’s population resides in the capital cities of the states. Incorporating provincial cities, more the 80 percent of the population live in urban

\textsuperscript{15} McCrindle, *The ABC of XYZ*, 46.
contexts. This represents a shift in economic focus from primary industries to secondary and tertiary industries. Commensurate with this shift, smaller rural towns that support primary production are dying. Whilst the mining industry has been strong for the last two decades, a large portion of the mining industry workforce is fly in/fly out workers. Fewer workers are actually residing in the townships in which their mining employment is based.\textsuperscript{16}

Though unemployment has decreased over the last twenty years down to 5.7 percent, the population continues to be partially responsive to economic and employment opportunity, often unwilling to relocate as required to retain sustainable and meaningful employment. As a result, there is a labor shortage in rural and agricultural contexts where employment is unstable and seasonal. Therefore temporary visas are being issued to immigrants to ensure Australia can maintain its primary production demands both for internal use and for export.

Consistent with population trends around the world, Australia’s population is moving towards urban and suburban living. Increasing population density has a ripple effect on the nature and forms of community and community engagement. This in turn necessarily informs the manner by which the local church participates in shaping and responding to the community.

**Increasingly Multicultural**

Australia’s younger generations have grown up in an increasingly multicultural society. Their parents, grandparents and great-grandparents lived under the White

\textsuperscript{16} Australian Bureau of Census Data, 2011.
Australia policy which was finally abolished in 1973.\textsuperscript{17} In only a few short decades, Australia has gone from a largely European population to a mix of cultures, where more than one-quarter of Australians were born overseas.\textsuperscript{18} Australia’s older immigrants are from countries like Greece and Italy and the younger immigrants from countries like Afghanistan and Sudan. Post-World War II migration and construction boom, unrest in former Yugoslavia, the Vietnam War, civil unrest in Sri Lanka, the pre-Hong Kong handover and recent conflicts in Afghanistan and Sudan have all contributed to the shaping of Australia’s cultural mix across generations, as well as influencing religious shifts.

Australia is increasingly multicultural; for example, of parents living in Australia, one third of the couples were both born outside of the country. Twelve percent of this population are couples where one of the parents was not born in Australia. Australia’s cultural and linguistic diversity presents across all aspects of life, including Australia’s workforce, sporting affiliations and social activities and programs.

**Increasingly Technologically Oriented**

The current generation (Generation Zed, born between 1995 and 2009) has colloquially been termed “screenagers” with daily digital engagement being normative. Those in Generation Zed, as digital integrators, spend on average ten hours and nineteen minutes per day utilizing technology. Globally, this generation generates 5.1 billion

\textsuperscript{17} The “White Australia” policy describes Australia’s approach to immigration from Federation until the latter part of the twentieth century, which favored applicants from certain countries whilst excluding applicants from many Asian and Polynesian countries. “Fact Sheet 8 – Abolition of the ‘White Australia’ Policy,” https://www.immi.gov.au/media/fact-sheets/08abolition.htm (accessed April 3, 2015).

\textsuperscript{18} McCrindle, The ABC of XYZ, 36.
searches per day and four billion YouTube views per day, represents one billion Facebook users, and follows 5 billion tweets per day. There are more than one million applications available to download and incorporate into their daily lives. Technology becomes an enabler for learning, reflecting a transition in the nature and style of engagement from that which was normed by Baby Boomers and that which is now used by Generation Zeds, as seen in the table below:

Table 1. Differences between Boomers and Zeds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baby Boomers</th>
<th>Generation Zeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit and Listen</td>
<td>Try and See</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content (what)</td>
<td>Process (how)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Centric</td>
<td>Learner Centric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductive</td>
<td>Inductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed book worldview</td>
<td>Open book worldview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increasingly Spiritual and Decreasingly Local Congregation Oriented

The role of parents in shaping one’s faith is hugely significant, and therefore the trend of declining church attendance has had a noticeable impact on the younger generations who are less likely to have grown up going to church. When church attendees were asked who were the most significant people in showing them what faith was about, the overwhelming response was their mother (65.4 percent) followed by their father (46.6 percent).  

---

19 Ibid., 128.
20 Ibid., 17.
21 The results from the 2011 National Church Life Survey, which surveyed over 270,000 church attendees, provide insights into the current situation of the Australian church and the practices and priorities of attendees. Statistics quoted in this section are sourced from Mark McCrindle, *Social Shifts, Spiritual*
Parents clearly play an important role in the spiritual life of their children. Outside the home, the next most significant influence on one’s faith understanding was church ministers, pastors, or priests (significant for 30 percent of church attendees), followed by a religious education teacher or school chaplain (significant for 15 percent). This shows the importance of such outreach ministries in school communities, particularly in light of the data, which shows almost two in five church attendees (38 percent) make the decision to become a Christian during the school years.

Grandparents had a significant impact for 13 percent and spouses for 12.5 percent. However, spouses had a significant impact on 17 percent of males compared with 9 percent of females. Youth group leaders were significant for 10.8 percent of all church attendees, however this increases to 28 percent for current Generation Y and Generation Zeds ages 15 to 29. While peers were seen as significantly influential for one in ten church attendees (10.9 percent), this increases to almost 1 in 5 (19 percent) of current Generation Y and Generation Zeds ages 15 to 29. This is likely because in this stage of life, peer influence is significant and may have increased due to the social media networks that the emerging generations are frequent users of and heavily influenced by. The more engaged that someone was in regularly attending church and with their personal devotional practices, the more significant were the roles of church leaders, ministers, and youth leaders. Similarly, for those with a ministry or leadership role, the role of the church minister or youth leader was more likely to be significant.

While the complexity of life and the busyness of modern households have no doubt impacted church attendance numbers, this is not seen as the primary obstacle, with just 15 percent of Australians stating that they are too busy to attend. Nor is it an issue of belief, with just 14 percent putting their non-attendance down to doubts about Jesus and the Bible. Australians consistently attributed their reasons for non-attendance to the relevance of the Church, the application of its teaching in their lives, and the style of services.

The key objections were that it was “outdated” and “irrelevant” and they would more likely attend church if it was “modern,” “relevant” and “transparent.”\(^\text{22}\) While Australians have strong views of the Church, most have had little experience with church services as adults. Church leaders need to understand that Australians have not rejected the church but rather their perceptions of it. It is their imaginings of a church service that have been found wanting rather than the modern day reality. Perceptions are powerful, influence behavior, and ought not to be dismissed. Therefore the remedy to the relevance question is one of communication, interaction, and invitation.

The statistics highlight Australia’s engagement with Christianity. Whilst there was only a slight decline over the last five years of Australians who identify as Christians in the census (64 percent in 2006 to 61.1 percent in 2011), there is a significant engagement challenge for the church at large. This is particularly evident in reaching the emerging generations who are significantly underrepresented in the Church.

Whilst church attendance is in decline, Australians still see the value of church in communities. The church is well regarded for its education, health, and welfare legacy in forging this nation and for its ongoing efforts in community building to this day. In a study conducted by McCrindle Research, 91 percent of Australians stated that the church is beneficial for the community, and over half (56 percent) stated it is beneficial to them as an individual.\textsuperscript{23} When non-regular church attendees were asked this same question, close to nine in ten (88 percent) still believe churches are beneficial for their community, and 43 percent state that churches are beneficial for them personally, even though they do not attend regularly. This societal deficit highlights that Australians see the value of

\textsuperscript{23} McCrindle, \textit{The ABC of XYZ}, 44.
churches in their community but have reservations about the relevance of church to their own life.

Arrow Leadership in Australia is committed to the development of Christian leaders in local congregational contexts, not-for-profit contexts, educational contexts, and community services contexts. A leader of a local congregation influences people in his or relational network (his or her oikos) towards the kingdom of God, whether or not the people are active participants in a local congregation. With the shift away from engagement by the average Australian with the local congregation, the expression of the kingdom of God by Christian leaders in local communities and within spheres of influence is increasingly important.
CHAPTER 2
EXPLORING THE CONTEXT OF ARROW LEADERSHIP

The ministry of what is now known as Arrow Leadership has developed in the Australian context over the last twenty years. Initially inspired by Arrow Leadership in the United States (the precursor to which was Leighton Ford’s influence through Leighton Ford Ministries), Arrow Leadership has developed into a strong brand associated with quality leadership development, contemporary facilitation methodologies and, most importantly, transformative experiences for participants. This chapter examines the journey that has informed the present expression of Arrow Leadership in Australia.

Leighton Ford Ministries

Leighton Ford Ministries was founded in 1986 to identify, develop, and bring together international emerging leaders in evangelism. This initiative emanated from Leighton Ford’s desire to help emerging leaders around the world to lead more like Jesus and to lead more to Jesus. These phrases have been adopted to become the distinctive
tagline of Leighton Ford Ministries, with the later addition of “to be led more by Jesus,” and ultimately Arrow Leadership.¹

A speaking engagement at Duke University Divinity School caused Ford to consider a question about the changes he had observed in his brother in law, Billy Graham. In response he answered:

I think Billy Graham has been like an arrowhead. His mission and message are like the point of an arrow – sharp, and clear. Wherever he speaks, whatever the occasion, he is sure to make the gospel clear. At the same time he has grown broader like the base of an arrowhead. Across the years I have watched him grow in his understanding of the gospel – how the good news relates to racism, to concern for poverty, for cooperation among Christians, for peace between nations.²

With increasing percolation, the arrow metaphor grew in its relevance and applicability.

Ford realized that some leaders, as they age, grow broader but flatter. They are exposed to more and know more, but they lose the sharp, cutting edge of their vision. Others become very narrow. They have one theme or idea that is constantly repeated. From Ford’s perspective, the best leaders are like arrowheads: they keep that sharp edge of their vision and they grow broader. Like the shaft of an arrowhead, they go deeper.

God’s description of his servant as “a polished arrow” (Is 49:2) also became a formative image in Ford’s ongoing commitment to the development of emerging leaders, who needed to be polished like arrowheads. At the time when the book of Isaiah was written, arrowheads were not mass-produced, but rather hand shaped through personalized attention. The arrow also became a symbol of leadership development. Ford

¹ Leighton Ford, from International Arrow Alliance Conference, England, 2013, author’s notes.
² Ibid.
wanted to help young leaders sharpen their vision like the point of the arrow and to understand clearly God’s call to them.

**Arrow North America**

Based on this vision and these values, the Leighton Ford Ministries team established the Arrow Leadership Program, with the first pilot coming together in 1991 following research into leadership development. In 1998 and 1999 the United States board asked Carson Pue to assume overall leadership of Arrow North America following a difficult time in the leadership of Arrow. The ministry moved from Charlotte to Vancouver and Pue oversaw the development of programs in both Canada and the United States.

Steve Brown attended Arrow in 2000 and 2001 as a pastor in Ontario. In 2004 he took on the role of Director of Programming and moved to British Columbia. His first job was to design and start an executive program, beginning 2005, aimed at those working as executive officers in churches and Christian organizations. He also worked with a credit union in Los Angeles, where Scott Vandeventer was the chief operating officer, to establish a program for those from urban areas and of ethnic minority backgrounds. The first urban Arrow ran in 2004. In 2005 at an Arrow Alliance meeting, Pue was inspired to grow the work and over the next few years, Arrow North America entered a period of growth, running increasing numbers of programs.

The international expansion of Arrow has not operated on a duplication model; rather, it purposed leadership development around a core vision and values that characterize a leadership program as an Arrow Leadership Program. This has enabled
Arrow to be contextualized in each country, and has also meant rather than Arrow being controlled from the United States, it has developed organically and relationally in each place.

**Arrow Leadership Australia**

In 1991 the Australia Forum for Evangelism was held in Sydney. Ford was a keynote speaker along with Ravi Zaccharias. It was a significant gathering of evangelists. Ford asked to informally meet with younger leaders in the afternoons, and Peter Corney, Karl Faase, and Stephen Hale participated in these gatherings. Hale and Faase started a conversation about developing younger Australian leaders and convened another evangelism gathering in 1993.

Remembering Ford’s vision, Hale and Faase initiated discussions to commence something similar to Arrow in Australia. With Ford’s encouragement, Peter Corney was asked by Hale and Faase to take primary leadership of the program since they were young and wanted to participate in the program. The bulk of the program development work on shaping an indigenous Arrow Leadership Program for Australia was done in late 1993 and early 1994. Corney discovered a surplus from a crusade in the 1980s in which Ford had participated. When the board of Leighton Ford Ministries Australia was contacted, the board agreed the surplus could be used as seed money for the Emerging Leadership Program.

In 1994 Corney and John Mallison, acting as Director of Mentoring, recruited participants for the first program. In 2001 Faase assumed the role of director. He developed the program, and to make sense of the geography of Australia, identified state
directors to recruit future participants and be a part of the leadership team at the Residentials.

Following an Alliance meeting in 2005 at which Faase challenged Pue to expand the vision for Arrow in North America, Faase returned to his own board wondering about expansion in Australia. In 2006 the board engaged a consultant who reviewed activity and suggested a new program start every year. Faase recognized that as a pastor of a church he did not have the capacity for such development, and, as a result, the board agreed to appoint their first full-time director, Julian Dunham. Between 2006 and 2011 Program Director Dunham increased the number of residentials for each program from two to four, and started a new program each year.

Arrow Leadership

In 2012 Arrow Leadership Australia merged with another similarly focused Christian not-for-profit organization, Australian Marketplace Connections, to become Arrow Leadership.\(^3\) I was appointed as the executive director to facilitate the development of the expanded ministry. In 2013 the first Executive Leaders Program was launched alongside the twelfth Emerging Leaders cohort.

In 2014 the decision was made to expand to the Executive Leaders Program to have specific streams focusing on different sectors in Australia: not for profit, education, aged care, and health care. The stratified Executive Leaders Programs will be implemented by the end of 2017. Additionally, 2014 saw the multiplication of the Emerging Leaders Program to commencing two cohorts per year, totaling four cohorts

---

\(^3\) Information referenced in this section is the personal knowledge of the author.
participating in each calendar year. The broader vision for the ministry of Arrow Leadership, to empower Christian leaders for kingdom influence in the context in which God has placed them, is the essence of the oikos project. The health of relationships within an existing oikos can be established and enhanced, ultimately bringing transformation to communities in which these relationships exist.

**Strategic Profile of Arrow Leadership**

The board of Arrow Leadership established the Strategic Profile in 2013. This profile conveyed to ministry partners, participants and broader stakeholders the essence of Arrow Leadership. The Strategic Profile articulated what Arrow Leadership is and is becoming, represented through call, vision and values.\(^4\)

**Call**

The calling of Arrow Leadership is best expressed by the phrase “developing Christian leaders in faith, work and service.”\(^5\) In both internal and external engagements, Arrow Leadership is committed to express itself in an integrated manner, where Christian faith informs not only what is communicated and how it is communicated, but also the approach towards vocational responsibilities and service in the economy of God’s kingdom.\(^6\) The fusion of life, work, and faith epitomises the heart beat of Arrow: “Work willingly at whatever you do or say (whether at work, in the family home, at the mall, at a church event or on a sporting field), as a representative of and as though you are working

---

\(^4\) Strategic Profile of Arrow Leadership, approved by Board for Distribution in May 2013.

\(^5\) Ibid.

\(^6\) The tag line of Arrow Leadership is “integrating faith, work and service.”
for the Lord Jesus (rather than for people), giving thanks through him to God the Father” (paraphrase Col 3:17, 23).

Arrow Leadership is focused on developing Christians, whose values and belief systems are informed by the Scriptures and who can align themselves with the Lausanne Covenant. Arrow Leadership develops leaders of influence in the many sectors of society manifesting the coming of the kingdom of God. Arrow Leadership seeks to develop men and women of integrity, where their values inform leadership and influence every facet of their lives.

Vision

As a result of the faithful ministry of Arrow Leadership, Christian leaders will be influencing and transforming people, churches, organizations, and communities. God’s kingdom is not restricted to particular sectors of society. It authentically manifests where his people reflect the light of Christ in their lives (2 Cor 3:18, Eph 4:24).

Arrow Leadership is well recognised in Australia for the quality of its leadership development programs. However, the big picture for Arrow Leadership is not excellent Christian leadership development programs nor excellent leaders. The larger picture for Arrow Leadership is that a transformational influence is affected through Christian leaders in the many facets of society. Those who encounter Arrow Leadership will experience its ministry through the expression of Arrow’s values.

Values

Whilst training methodologies and curriculum priorities are important, the manner by which these considerations are experienced is critical. Values articulate what Arrow
Leadership hopes stakeholders encounter when engaging with any aspect of Arrow Leadership. The values expressed below are not merely words on paper. They are expressed three dimensionally with participants in their ministries.

Integrity is a critical value for most organizations, but especially Christian ministries. Within the context of Arrow, integrity means being authentic, where substance mirrors form. Accordingly, the behavior of participants and staff is consistent in principles and practices, whereby they lead through serving.

A key aspect of the methodological framework of Arrow’s leadership instruction is learning within and as a result of deep community. Naturally, therefore, collegiality is another value prioritised and embodied by stakeholders of Arrow Leadership. Beyond the formal times of facilitated community through program participation, Arrow encourages the ongoing development of leaders through intentional and incidental opportunities for networking, which leads to a profound experience of camaraderie.

In addition to integrity and collegiality, Arrow Leadership also values holistic living and learning. Arrow is committed to growing character to increase competency through life-long learning. Just as Christ grew in wisdom, stature, and favor of all the people (Lk 2:52), Arrow seeks to instil in participants, through modelling, a Christ-like life and understanding of and responding to the call of God.

Upholding God’s standard of excellence as the benchmark by which Arrow Leadership operates, innovation is embraced as a value. Arrow encourages relevance, innovation, entrepreneurship, and evaluation inspired by the Holy Spirit. As the Arrow

---

7 Values statement confirmed by the board in May 2013.
board, staff and participants epitomise wise innovation, God’s coming kingdom can be increasingly received.

Perhaps the greatest call for all followers of Jesus, discipleship is the last value, complementing and completing Arrow Leadership’s values set. As participants engage in the Arrow Leadership development experience, a trajectory of constant maturation in both attitude and actions, the capacity to trust and follow Jesus in all areas of life is established. Arrow leaders become disciple-making disciples and leader-making leaders. Arrow Leadership tests regularly to see whether these values are experienced by participants, partners and stakeholders. Participants who engage with Arrow Leadership’s expression of Christian leaders’ development consistently affirm the actualization of these values.

**Developing Christian Leaders**

Arrow Leadership seeks to develop leaders in a number of ways, depending upon the context in which the Christian leader serves and the capacity of the leader to engage in professional development. From an Arrow perspective, opportunities for the development of leaders are the Emerging Leaders Program and Executive Leaders Program. These programs are explored in turn below.

**Emerging Leaders Program**

The vision of the Emerging Leaders Program is to see Arrow graduates significantly represented throughout Australia in Church or para-church leadership. These graduates would be identified as admired and respected ambassadors of Christ in their vocations. As participants express their calling, they are making a transformational
contribution to the organizations they have been called to lead and the communities in which they serve.

The Emerging Leaders Program helps tomorrow’s Christian leaders to be led more by Jesus, to lead more like Jesus, and to lead more to Jesus. It assists leaders in developing their heart, gifts, and skills in the areas of leadership and evangelism. The program also enables participants to develop a network of leaders across the Australian church that support and encourage each other as leaders committed to evangelism.

Throughout the program, Arrow Emerging Leaders sharpen their vision, direction, and focus and clarify their values. Concurrently, Arrow leaders are reflecting on the changing cultural values of the Australian community. The reflection-action learning process is enhanced by participating in coaching relationships throughout the period of the program. The Arrow Emerging Leaders Program is a national, interdenominational program targeting a select group of emerging leaders primarily between the ages of 25 and 35 years old, creating a unique peer network for each participant with gifted leaders from other churches, para-church groups, and denominations. It allows participants to interact with outstanding Christian, business, and civic leaders and creative thinkers whilst providing a critical assessment of Australian culture and evangelism in that context.

Executive Leaders Program

In 2017, Arrow Leadership offers two specialist Executive Leaders Programs focused on the not-for-profit sector and the education sector. Each targets the next generation of leaders in their sector. Arrow Leadership Programs focus on two key areas:
character and capability. The goal is to develop Christian leaders who are able to respond to the challenges of modern organizational and professional life within the context of their growing Christian faith in light of the fact that their work is done in and through the name of Jesus.

Participants of the Executive Leaders Program possess a deep commitment to their sector and serve in a role that involves leadership of people and/or management of resources. As a result, men and women of Christian faith will be developed and equipped to serve as emerging senior executives. The development focus is on leadership, not their specific skill set for which they have been primarily engaged by their organization.

There is a three-fold component of Arrow Leadership development methodology which will be subsequently explored in greater detail. Summarily, however, the core curriculum of the Executive program are self leadership (incorporating understanding of self, the centrality of character, the danger of self-deception and the power of role modeling), leading others (incorporating leading teams, managing diversity, enabling high performance, dealing with difficulties and challenges), and leading and transforming organizations (incorporating developing and implementing strategy, managing risk, dealing with stakeholders, developing a healthy culture and building sustainability).

Each program employs case studies and scenarios relevant to its sector and uses presenters with a proven track record of effective leadership in that sector. Each participant is assigned a coach who guides and supports him or her throughout the program. Coaches are assigned thoughtfully according to the needs and location of each participant.
Impact of Developing Leaders

Arrow Leadership seeks to develop leaders in a number of ways, depending upon the context in which the Christian leader serves and the capacity of the leader to engage in professional development. At present, Arrow Leadership has identified opportunities for the development of leaders through the Emerging Leaders Program and Executive Leaders Program. These facilitated leadership development journeys focus on four critical aspects of being an effective, capable and humble leader: leading self, leading teams, leading organizations, and community context and transformation.

Leading Self

A distinctive characteristic of leadership development within the Arrow paradigm is the priority of leading self. Whilst participants may initially engage with Arrow Leadership with a view to enhance leadership capabilities, it becomes apparent that leadership character and the transformation thereof are the most crucial elements of sustainable and fruitful ministry. John writes, “Those who abide in me and I in them, bear much fruit, because apart from me you can do nothing” (Jn 15:5). As such, the first learning set focusing on leading self becomes foundational for the balance of the learning sets, with aspects of the content revisited in subsequent learning sets.

The understanding of leading self is a multifaceted approach whereby leaders obtain a high level of awareness of leadership effectiveness and personal strengths. This allows the development of a high quality leadership development plan. This plan is informed by feedback from the ministry context, assessment of behavioral and leadership style strengths, and one-on-one conversations with a leadership development consultant.
who is an Arrow Coach. Part of the process of discovery of leading self includes an enhanced understanding of biblical characteristics of leaders, exploration of the principles of Christ-centered leadership, the relationship between a leader’s character, call and capability, and, understandably, the role of the Holy Spirit and Scripture in exercising leadership.

The words of Jesus in John 14:16-26; 15:26 and 16:7 describe the Holy Spirit as the comforter or helper. The original text uses the term *parakletos* which is translated as called to one’s side, called to be an intercessor, called to be a mediator, and called to be an advocate. Consequently, one function of a spiritual leader as a spiritual influencer at the local church is to exercise influence by coming alongside those over whom God has given influence. Spiritual influence is necessarily expressed as one who comes alongside those who are being discipled. Arrow leaders, participants of Arrow Leadership’s programs, are encouraged to appreciate the significant influence they exercise when leading alongside those within their area of influence at the local church and to invest life-on-life discipling energies into those persons.8

Leading self contemplates the understanding and development of spiritual disciplines that contribute to spiritual health as a framework by which their relationship with God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit is developed. The practice of spiritual disciplines correlates to spiritual development, which is best effected through life-on-life development. Dallas Willard challenges, “The way to get as many people into heaven as
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8 Bill Easum and Dave Travis, *Beyond the Box* (Loveland, CO: Group Publishing, 2003), 126.
you can is to get heaven into as many people as you can: that is, to follow the path of
genuine spiritual transformation or full-throttle discipleship of Jesus Christ."9

Most leaders, either intentionally or incidentally, have engaged in some form of
spiritual discipline. It is likely that many have prayed, worshipped, studied, or spent time
alone in solitude without possibly associating the term *spiritual discipline* with the
activity in which they were engaged.10 There are many spiritual activities in which
apprentices of Jesus participate that come naturally to them. These natural, spiritually
oriented activities are usually ones that allow Christ followers to possess an abundant
awareness of the presence of God, an inspiring presence that is seemingly undeniable.
John Ortberg describes these as Spiritual Pathways, ways in which one can abide (Jn
15:5) in Christ.11 These pathways are reflective of spiritual disciplines that enable leaders
to readily encounter the presence of God and hear from him. This is crucial for any
person assuming a formal or informal leadership responsibility. The priority of Bible
reading, prayer, regular reflection, intercessory prayer, and other complementary spiritual
disciplines are encouraged in the life of a leader during the Leading Self module.

Additionally, effective work rhythms and strategies to manage stress, maintain
good health, and avoid burnout are reviewed. These practices are explored within the
context of identifying the factors that influence the use of time, understanding godly
priorities and practical means of prioritization, and acknowledging barriers to effective

---


10 “We need not be well advanced in matters of theology to practise the Disciplines.” Richard

11 John Ortberg, *The Life You’ve Always Wanted: Spiritual Disciplines for Ordinary
People* (Grand Rapids, CO: Zondervan Publishing House, 1997).
time management. All this is done with a focus on the development of strategies to overcome such barriers. The most important message within the first learning set of Leading Self is that the ability to lead in a sustaining manner is a function of character, indicative of a commitment to lifelong learning and teachability.

Leading Teams

Once leaders are aware of their strengths and development areas, the impact their strengths have on those around them, and how their character development impacts their capacity to lead with deep humility and fierce resolve, they then focus on leading teams. In the programs offered by Arrow Leadership, the importance of wisely leading those close to the leaders is recognized, with reading materials, conversations, and topics focusing upon this central aspect of leadership.

During the second learning set, enhanced understanding of biblical material on and models of leadership is provided, together with differentiation between secular and Christian leadership styles and motivations. Further, clarification of a godly call to Christian leadership is facilitated, which informs the defining of the roles and responsibilities of leaders. Certainty of the conceptual framework of leadership provides the foundation from which team leadership is explored.

Leading Teams examines team formation, growth, and development dynamics and seeks to apply them to the relevant ministry context. It considers the characteristics of effective teams and discusses how leadership approaches impact on team identity and cohesiveness. This learning set also explores concepts of and develops a method for
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effective delegation by discussing and evaluating a range of leadership models and case studies. The process also includes considering their application in Christian leadership. Leaders participating in the programs of Arrow Leadership consider during this second learning set how to become an empowering leader and learn the principles of multiplying leaders.

The principles of managing diverse people are considered through a coaching framework. Arrow leaders are supported to develop the ability to help a coachee to focus on strengths development and identify the crux of any problem, explore options for personal development and problem solving, and develop plans to achieve goals and overcome problems. From this the team is able to develop the ability to set and achieve personal and ministry development goals.

The bridge between Leading Teams and Leading Organizations is finally explored at the end of Learning Set 2. Leaders examine how to develop a specific strategy for communicating vision in their ministry context, understanding the essence of their organization and what makes it unique, and knowing how to communicate effectively to many generations. The purpose of defining a collective vision is discussed and assistance is provided in creating and clarifying a strategic profile including vision, mission, and values statement for the particular ministry context.

**Leading Organizations**

Having understood more deeply about the importance of leading self and the opportunities and challenges of leading teams well, the third learning set focuses on Leading Organizations. The term *organizations* is adopted to provide flexibility with the
context of participants, as not all participants are serving as leaders within the life of a church or emerging faith community. The challenge of leading organizations is connected with the reality that often frequent and regular personal interface with stakeholders is not possible. This necessitates that leaders lead organizations through culture and effect change by changing the culture of organizations.

Whilst principles of leading through culture and the telling of stories are provided, both technocratic and organic examples are used, serving as illustrations of how to best facilitate organizational growth, change, and impact. In this learning set, participants examine and apply a process of defining and implementing strategic and operational goals. Given the reality of constant and rapid change, participants survey a range of change management models and explore methods of engaging, supporting and leading team members through change. Participants then consider methods to maintain effective relationships and communication through a change process, explore reactions to change, discuss techniques to facilitate transition through change, and discuss the significance of culture in relation to change management. Role-playing effective communication for various situations (for example vision casting, small group discussions, formal meetings) is facilitated.

Ideal processes are identified and shared with participants concerning the supervision and empowerment of staff, incorporating recruitment and selection, performance management, providing constructive feedback, and managing a culturally and linguistically diverse staff whether volunteer or paid. Additionally, personal responsibility for and responses to conflict (and how to plan for healthy negotiations, including healthy conflict) and harnessing synergy which flows from diverse
communication styles within the team and organization is canvassed. The layering of understanding within each of these topics results in participants being empowered in their ability to appropriate the processes shared. The result of participants’ understanding the priority of leadership of self, teams, and organizations provides the requisite framework to explore how the participants influence within these threefold leadership realms expresses itself in the context of community transformation.

Community Transformation

Leadership sits in the context of purpose. With Arrow Leadership’s heritage in the Lausanne Movement, which has a primary focus on the evangelization of the world, the final and logical component of leadership development within Arrow Leadership is the impact upon community. both temporally and eternally. The Community Transformation learning module helps leaders situate their leadership expression with the priority of facilitating the demonstration and declaration of the gospel to the community in which God has placed them.

Starting with an analysis of the Australian context, with particular focus on the current trends of Christian faith and church participation by Australians, the module then explores the effectiveness and mission ability of the Australian church. Leaders review the biblical call to personal and corporate evangelism, which then informs the strategies used to mobilize individuals, congregations, and organizations into evangelism. Kingdom theology and culture is discussed in order to provide insight on how the community

---

culture interfaces with kingdom culture and what opportunities for growth and development are present.

Consideration is also given to the understanding that God is already at work in the lives of people within the community. The framework utilized for whole of life development, incorporating evangelistic expressions, is called Asset Based Community Development. It is predicated on celebrating and recognizing that within an existing community there are already people who can make a significant contribution towards kingdom values within the community, without the leaders having to assume a colonial or patriarchal disposition. Strategies of developing a whole of gospel presentation to the broader community are identified, using case studies and illustrations reflective of the participants’ contexts.

In 2013 a report was commissioned to measure the impact Arrow Leadership was having on communities through its leadership development program.\(^\text{14}\) The report confirmed that since exiting the Emerging Leaders Program, Arrow leaders who responded to the survey reported the following increases in engagement, support and ministry to groups of people in need by the organizations that they lead:

Table 2. Perceived Impact of Arrow on Ministries of Arrow leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Increase in ministry to these groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Parents</td>
<td>50 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of Single Parent Families</td>
<td>44 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>31 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless People</td>
<td>25 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Risk Young People</td>
<td>50 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addicts</td>
<td>31 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees / Asylum Seekers</td>
<td>31 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>31 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community development as an outcome is not merely aspirational for Arrow Leadership, but actualized through the lives of leaders as they bring kingdom of God influence to the organizations they lead.

Arrow Leadership hopes to prepare emerging and existing leaders for the challenges and opportunities associated with the task of leading various corporate expressions of Christian faith. Ultimately, the message of having a Christian mind to the task of leadership and expressing a Christian influence in the network of relationships in which God has placed Arrow leaders is crucial to the biblically mandated task of making disciples while going about their activities (Mt 28:18-20). The vision of Arrow Leadership is that Christian leaders are influencing and transforming people, churches, organizations, and ultimately communities throughout Australia. This influence and transformation flows from their godly mindset, words, and actions to have a palpable effect on their network of relationships. The difference will not merely be experienced by the organization in which the Arrow leader serves, but into the very ether of life of the Arrow leader.
PART TWO

THEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS
CHAPTER 3
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter initially examines some pertinent literature to provide insight into expressions of the kingdom of God in the biblical and contemporary context. The chapter then examines some literary contributions to the biblical understanding and use of the Greek word *oikos* and its derivations as well as contemporary expressions of *oikos* as a network through which influence and leadership is exercised. Additionally, this chapter incorporates reflections on the implications of *missio Dei* upon the missional impulse within an *oikos*.

**Expressions of the Kingdom of God**

The reality of the kingdom of God is a central element to the teachings of Jesus, permeating the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. Jesus encourages his disciples to share the good news of the kingdom of God (Lk 9:2, for example). Expressions of the kingdom of God are not merely the domain of events and activities organized by a local congregation in which believers participate, but manifest in the relational lives of every believer. Naturally, local congregation leaders are significant influencers of kingdom of God behavior or lack thereof in the lives of believers connected with a local
congregation. Whilst there are multiple texts that explore the kingdom of God which are suitable for consideration, the following contributions are examined below.

*The Gospel of the Kingdom*, Ladd

In *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, Ladd presents the kingdom as a present spiritual reality with immediate practical implications and popularized the “now not yet” paradoxical paradigm of the kingdom.¹ The kingdom of God means the redemptive activity and rule of God working among humanity and is the realm in which humanity experiences the blessings of his rule.² The kingdom of God is less like an earthly kingdom with physical borders and more like a declaration of relationship with the king as well as allegiance to the king and his ways.

The kingdom of God was at work among humanity not only in the person of Jesus but also through his disciples as they brought the work and the signs of the kingdom to the cities of the Galilee.³ Similarly, the kingdom of God is also at work among the future disciples for whom Jesus prayed in John 17. As Ladd writes, “The kingdom of God is entrusted to men (sic) and works through redeemed men (sic) who have given themselves to the rule of God through Christ.”⁴ Ladd points to present day expressions of the kingdom of God where members of an oikos, redeemed men and women of faith, are able to mediate the works that are associated with the coming of the kingdom of God. These
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² Ibid., 112.
³ Ibid., 115.
⁴ Ibid., 116.
multifaceted works collectively express the rule and reign of God, manifesting the *missio Dei*, God’s missional heart for humanity.

Ladd examines what it is to enter or receive (Mt 5:3; Lk 18:17) the kingdom and provides helpful application (now for the twenty-first century context), affirming that the kingdom is not a realm or a people but God’s reign.⁵ Ladd continues, “What is received is God’s rule. In order to enter the future realm of the kingdom, one must submit himself (sic) in perfect trust to God’s rule here and now. We must also ‘seek first his kingdom and his righteousness’ (Mt 6:33). What is the object of our quest? The Church? Heaven? No; we are to seek God’s righteousness—His sway, His rule, His reign in our lives.”⁶

The expression of the kingdom, whilst often corporate, is effected through the personal orientation and submission of a Jesus follower to God’s priority, purpose, and principles for life. Ladd writes, “The righteousness of God’s kingdom is the product of God’s reign in the human heart. God must reign in our lives now if we are to enter the kingdom tomorrow.”⁷ Personal expression of faith ripples throughout all aspects of the life of a disciple of Jesus, such that all those with whom that person relates are experiencing one or more aspects of the kingdom of God. A Christian leader will, because of her or his increased influence, have the potential of influencing more people towards the realities of the kingdom of God.

The now and not yet paradox of the kingdom of God necessarily means that his reign is a present continuous reality for disciples of Jesus. This reality is intrinsically

---

⁵ Ibid. Also, Jesus said that we must “receive the kingdom of God” as little children.

⁶ Ibid., 21.

⁷ Ibid., 83.
motivated and emanates from within, yet is authentically and simultaneously expressed through action. Kingdom living for a Christian leader is not merely in thought or word but is action oriented, for not “everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father who is in heaven” (Mt 7:21). Ladd’s framing of the kingdom of God provides readers with an accessible and tangible understanding of expressing the kingdom of God in the everyday which informs the manner by which Christian leaders manifest a kingdom reality.

_The Tangible Kingdom: Creating Incarnational Communities_, Halter and Smay

Halter and Smay, in _The Tangible Kingdom: Creating Incarnational Communities_, seek to provide a realistic picture of how the kingdom of God can become tangible here and now, in the contemporary context. In order to accomplish this purpose, they explain how the contemporary church can become increasingly incarnational and missional. As a guiding reference, Halter and Smay utilize the ancient faith communities in the book of Acts and throughout history.

The authors, after critiquing the current state of the church in America provide some helpful kingdom behaviors and practices of individual Christians and especially leaders or influencers. These include cultivating the practices of leaving (ch. 14), listening (ch. 15), living among non-Christians (ch. 16), loving without strings attached (ch. 17), and developing the habits of togetherness (ch. 19), oneness (ch. 20), and

---

8 Hugh Halter and Matt Smay, _The Tangible Kingdom: Creating Incarnational Community_ (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008), 42.

9 Whilst Halter and Smay focus on the church and society in America, Australia is culturally less Christocentric than America. (Australian missiologists Frost and Hirsch affirm this reality in _The Shaping of Things to Come_ explored later in this chapter). Accordingly, Halter and Smay’s observations and proposed expressions of the kingdom of God are relevant for the Australian context.
otherness (ch. 21). These practices give expressions to convictions, “we need to rally including life giving, community transformation, holistic personal growth, sacrifice, beauty, blessing and world renewal. Who wouldn’t want to be a part of a people committed to something that brings personal meaning and makes the world a better place?”

Whilst compellingly articulating the need to move away from current Christendom centric expressions of church, some may misinterpret Halter and Smay’s enthusiasm as misguidance in some areas. Ability to metabolize the message might be compromised for some because of the apparent definition of the good news, biblical measures of success of gospel community compared with other measures, and the fuzziness around the “point” of conversion. However, if “Christianity was only about finding a group of people to live life with, who shared openly their search for God and allowed anyone, regardless of behavior, to seek too, and who collectively lived by faith to make the world a little more like Heaven,” and this was expressed with increasing measure, the concerns of misguidance might be allayed.

Without directly referencing the kingdom of God, Halter and Smay’s implication is clear. They write, “What people want is an entirely new grid that encompasses every aspect of their lives. Values like meaning, sacrifice, simplicity, risk, adventure, benevolence and justice will sell. But they have to be modeled, not just talked about.”

---

10 Ibid., 115. The behaviors and practices articulated throughout Halter and Smay’s book, whilst primarily community or group oriented, give evidence to behaviors and practices in which one or two followers of Jesus can engage.

11 Ibid., 10.

12 Ibid., 75.
This grid reflects aspects of the coming reality of the kingdom of God. As Ladd suggested previously, living under God’s rule and reign as a kingdom citizen totally reorients priorities for all elements of life. The authors are seeking to move the kingdom of God from a theoretical, potentially theologically imprecise concept to that which can be experienced by participants within and observers to those loving and serving God in his kingdom.

Adopting that phrase which is often attributed to Francis of Assisi, “always be preaching the gospel, if necessary use words,” Halter and Smay specifically ask people “not to try to be ‘evangelistic.’ (They) suggest to them that if people aren’t asking about their lives, then (they) haven’t postured faith well enough or long enough.”13 The direction for the individual members of the incarnational missional community in which they are involved is to adopt a “loving, inclusive, non-judgmental attitude toward non-Christians that causes them to be attracted to the truth.”14 That is, living as Jesus followers where their salt and light (Mt 5:13-16) and yeast (Mt 13:33) can be observed and experienced. Church, in whatever form that takes, flows as a “natural response to people wanting to follow us, be with us, and be like us as we are following the way of Christ.”15

*The Tangible Kingdom* provides those wishing to pursue incarnational, missional living – living authentically as Christians and actively within their *oikos* – with helpful
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13 Ibid., 42.
14 Ibid., 41.
15 Ibid., 30.
and actionable expressions of the kingdom coming. The priority on infusing faith into the context of their everyday results in God’s work on earth being accomplished. “The more we do ‘together,’ the less individualistic we’ll be. The more we become ‘one’ with Christ, the less consumer oriented we’ll be. The more we do for ‘others,’ the less materialistic we’ll be.” These are all indications of kingdom living and can reframe the expression of the gospel in years to come.

_The Shaping of Things to Come_, Frost and Hirsch

Frost and Hirsch, prior to authoring _The Shaping of Things to Come_, deepened their relationship and common understanding as two of the first twenty-five participants in the Arrow Leadership Program in 1995. At that time, while they were being encouraged to focus on leading themselves and others well with a laser sharp focus on evangelism, neither had any idea that such profound books would be co-authored. _The Shaping of Things to Come_ offers incredible insight and reminders for the priority of what they call the “missional church,” which some more recent authors reference as missional communities (where oikos flourishes). _The Shaping of Things to Come_ seems to reflect a fusion of Ladd’s kingdom of God thesis and Halter and Smay’s gospel community orientation around incarnation and mission. _The Shaping of Things to Come_ provides a useful reference in the context of oikos discussion as it highlights important

---

16 It is this book and other literature considered in this chapter from which the questions were derived for inclusion in the oikos survey. The primary additional source is the questions and materials associated with the Natural Church Development framework. This is explored in further detail in chapter 5.

17 Ibid., 154.

elements of that which characterizes the church in both its gathered and scattered forms. The ability of a group of people (the church) to express itself as suggested by Frost and Hirsch is a function of the ability of individuals within the church to express themselves similarly within the context of relationships.

The three big ideas of this book are incarnational ecclesiology, messianic spirituality, and apostolic leadership. Frost and Hirsch bring priority to the nature of corporate faith engagement with others (highly relational, activistic and proximate) and the expression of faith to and with others (the apostolicity of God’s people, intentional and leadership infused – as an integrative expression of oikos). The authors suggest that that Christology shapes missiology and that, in turn, shapes ecclesiology, or the missional church. The missional church however does recognize that the church itself is an incomplete expression of the reign of God.

Frost and Hirsch write: “Essentially the early church was a missional movement to its core. It understood that personal conversion implied the embracing of the missio Dei” – the redemptive mission of God to the whole world through the work of his Messiah. Embracing the missio Dei is not merely mental assent or even deep understanding to God’s missional purpose. Missio Dei becomes the lens through which the world is seen in the eyes of a Jesus follower. Every conversation and action in some

---

19 Ibid., 11, 12. Incarnational expression of a community of faith is contrasted to the attractional expression, “Messianic”- describes the church’s spirituality and activity in that it acts in the same way Jesus acts, is essentially structured around the person of Jesus and actions are in some respect extended to the messianic kingdom. (That is, actions are directly redemptive and related to God’s activity in the world.) Messianic is contrasted with dualistic. Apostolic describes the mode and imperatives of the New Testament church – something of its energy, impulse, genius and leadership structures. Apostolic is contrasted with hierarchical modes of leadership. See Frost and Hirsch, The Shaping of Things to Come, 225-230.

20 Ibid., 209.

21 Ibid., 16.
way or another directs others towards a flourishing life in partnership with the forever loving God. Thus, together with other Jesus followers, “the missional church is a sent church. It is a going church, a movement of God through his people, sent to bring healing to a broken world. The existing church, which is invariably static, rooted in one place, institutionalised, needs to recover its *sent-ness* in order to become the missional church.”

By definition, God’s missional people and missional church are always outward looking and always changing. Missional people and a missional church shape themselves to fit their context in order to transform it for the sake of the kingdom of God and are always faithful to the word of God. In God’s economy, actions of women and men of faith have an eternal impact. In partnership with God, “(w)e extend the kingdom of God in daily affairs and activities and actions done in the name of Jesus.” The natural expression of faith, within the context of existing relationships and networks of relationships (an individual’s *oikos*), is predicated by Frost and Hirsch.

Frost and Hirsch articulate, in juxtaposing a traditional view of mission and ministry:

> But if a (Christian) businessman (sic) attempts to use his (sic) influence to develop ethical schemes through his (sic) business to serve the needy or create jobs for the unemployed, we traditionally don’t see this as mission. We don’t see the strong creation of friendships that parents make through the local school as

---

22 Ibid., 18. Connor puts it a little more strongly, writing that “The church exists for mission, not just for itself. Churches that focus on maintaining their tradition alone, without seeking to reach out to embrace the lost, will eventually become irrelevant and possibly extinct.” See Mark Connor, *Transforming Your Church* (Tonbridge: Sovereign World Ltd, 2000), 49, 50.


24 Ibid., 115. As indicated in section 3.3 of this paper, the writer would contend that humanity’s contribution to the kingdom of God is more passive (enter, receive) rather than proactive (build, grow, extend).
being anything to do with mission (unless they are inviting them to church). We can’t see the regular gathering of surfers at their local beach as part of the net that catches people into the kingdom of God.25

Their implicative message is clear. The natural oikos of men and women of faith are outlets, conduits, exemplars and authentic expressions of the gospel and the kingdom of God. The concept will continue to be examined through three additional texts.

**Nature and Reality of Oikos**

An analysis of literature that focuses on the early church, its authentic expression of God’s love for humanity, and the implications for contemporary expressions of the church will reference the nature and reality of oikos. The metaphorical blueprint by which God seeks reconciliation for humanity to each other, to themselves, and to the triune God is predicated on sustainable relational networks. This section explores three of the more helpful literary contributions to the discussion on the Christian expressions of oikos and the implications for contemporary church and mission.

**Paul’s Idea of Community**, Banks

Robert Banks in *Paul’s Idea of Community*26 explores the concept of biblical community as expressed through Pauline literature. For Paul, the very essence of oikos happens when Christian individuals, families, and small groups undertake and fulfil the kingdom responsibilities to the world around them.27 Banks identifies that traditionally there had been two main types of community with which people might associate.
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25 Ibid., 45.


27 Ibid., 2.
themselves: *politea*, the public life of the city or nation state to which people belonged, and *oikonomia*, the household order into which they were born or to which they were attached. The growth and development of Christian faith within networks of relationships was augmented by the exclusion from the *politea*, as that which people could not find in the wider community, they sought in the smaller community. Its breadth of membership and intimacy of relationship served as an accelerator of Christianity within community.

Most of the different aspects of Paul's idea of community are related in some way to his understanding of freedom. This means not only that Christ's actions impinge upon the lives of others and are decisive for them but that his very life enters into them enabling theirs to enter into his. They are free from the compulsion to sin and from the tendency to rely on their own moral and religious achievements. They are free from the obligation to regulate their lives by reference to an instinctive or external moral code, leading to a new freedom towards others including freedom from the fear of others’ judgments as well as from one's own attempts to manipulate them. Nevertheless, for Paul, the gospel bound believers to one another as well as to God. Acceptance by Christ necessitated acceptance of those whom he had already welcomed (Rom 15:7). Reconciliation with God included reconciliation with others who exhibited the character of gospel preaching (Phil 4:2-3) and union in the spirit with one another, for the spirit

---

28 Ibid., 6.

29 Ibid., 7.

30 Ibid., 16.

31 Ibid., 19.
was primarily a shared rather than individual experience.\textsuperscript{32} Naturally, through the work of Christ in one’s life, \textit{oikos} engagement increased as more people surrendered their lives to the lordship of Christ. Relational networks responded dynamically as changes in participation in \textit{oikos} were experienced.

Christians are in a common relationship with Christ not only when they meet together – nor, for that matter, only when they individually relate to him though prayer – but at all times, wherever they are and whatever they do.\textsuperscript{33} These scattered Christian groups expressed their unity not by fashioning a corporate organization through which they could be federated with one another, but rather in a range of organized personal contacts between people who regarded themselves as members of the same Christian family.\textsuperscript{34} This reality informs the framework of the \textit{oikos} project. Christian leaders, including those who have participated in the programs of Arrow Leadership, are expressing their faith in a variety of contexts through their personal contacts, whether familiarly, socially, or vocationally oriented.

Paul’s idea of \textit{ekklesia} “has its roots in, and takes some of the character of, the household unity (\textit{oikos}).”\textsuperscript{35} By his use of the quite ordinary term of assembling (\textit{ekklesia}) and by setting such gatherings in ordinary homes rather than cult-places, Paul shows that he does not wish to mark off gatherings from the ordinary meetings in which people were already engaged. Paul did not see his gatherings as more religious in character than any

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 26.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 41.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 42.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 44.
\end{itemize}
other activity in which Christians were involved.\textsuperscript{36} The Christian-ness of Christians permeated every expression of their lives and was not merely confined to particular gatherings for particular purposes. Every element of a Christ follower’s life was empowered by the work and power of the Holy Spirit.

In recent years Paul’s metaphors for community have been subjected to quite intense study, especially his description of it as a body. However, his application of “household” or “family” terminology has all too often been overlooked or only mentioned in passing. This presumably stems from the fact that terms like \textit{oikeioi}, translated household, occur so rarely in the Pauline writings.\textsuperscript{37}

Banks, in his thorough examination of Christian community through the lens of Paul’s writings, provides helpful commentary on the perspective on the subsistence of \textit{oikos}. \textit{Oikos} was the network through which the gospel was mediated in the first few centuries of expression of the Christian faith. Similarly, \textit{oikos} is the network through which the good news of the kingdom of God is mediated in the lives of twenty-first century leaders. Faith expressed relationally by men and women of influence necessarily permeates the network of relationships in which he or she lives – his or her \textit{oikos}. Banks’ writings provide a helpful framework for Gehring to explore the interconnectedness between \textit{oikos}, church and mission.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 49.
\end{flushright}
Gehring in *House Church and Mission*\(^{38}\) undertakes a comprehensive examination of the house church movement. His survey of the role of the house and household (*oikos*) in the New Testament is convincing in conveying their centrality in early Christianity, both ecclesiologically and missiologically. Within this examination he explores the nature and reality of *oikos* as it relates to and contributes towards the development of the spread of Christian faith and the establishment of the church throughout the ages. Gehring concludes, “In spite of the expectations that the coming of Christ was quite near, potentially long-lasting social forms emerged early on as a result of the integration of church life and *oikos* structures.”\(^{39}\) The *oikos* (the sphere of influence) was the framework by which the gospel spread and in many cases became the place where faith was expressed in a concerted, gathered way.

Scarcely anything defined daily life more than the *oikos* with its network of relationships. It was an all-encompassing social structure with legal, economic, and biological implications. By belonging to an *oikos*, each individual gained a sense of identity within society as a whole; it provided them an inside and an outside, not only a dwelling place but also a home. This small “*oikos* fellowship” provided a basic building block for the entire society as well. Gehring writes, “The significance of the *oikos* for the establishment and organization of the early Christian church life can hardly be overemphasized.”\(^{40}\)

---


\(^{39}\) Ibid., 230.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 17.
Christians may not have had anywhere else to meet. But just possibly the practical necessity for their use blended with a further, theologically based consideration. For given the family character of the Christian community, the homes of its members provided the most conducive atmosphere in which they could give expression to the bond they had in common.\(^{41}\) Because of the connectedness between each \textit{oikos} member, Christian worship was situated within the \textit{oikos} gatherings, irrespective of the size of the physical space available.\(^{42}\)

The integration of \textit{oikos} structures also had a positive consequence in the relationship between church and public. With the decision to adopt \textit{oikos} structures, the house churches corresponded closely with the ancient society around them. The ancient \textit{oikos} reflected the social order of that time including status, station, rank, position class, and profession and therefore composed of almost all the different social strata. As a result, the composition of the early Christian movement was not limited to specific groups in the population. Christians were therefore positioned to reach all levels of society with the gospel, indicative of the inherent missiological nature of Christian faith expressed within and beyond the \textit{oikos}.\(^{43}\) Another benefit of the ancient \textit{oikos} for mission is that the early Christian houses and house churches were places where Christian


\(^{42}\) “Whether they were homeowners like Gaius or Phoebe, with relatively large homes, or like Aquila and Prisca, with their small (rented?) house with workshop, or not, our texts reveal to us that Christians met for worship in their \textit{oikos}, whatever kind it was.” Ibid., 171.

\(^{43}\) Ibid., 292.
hospitality was practiced by and for Christians and non-Christians alike in a very concrete way.\textsuperscript{44}

Whilst the use of \textit{oikos} structures were predominantly positive, the nature of social influence could result in undesirable outcomes for the gospel. An unredemptive, enthusiastic integration of the social order of the \textit{oikos} into the house church sometimes led to social problems. Because of the strong social position of the head of house, it was possible for unhealthy relationships to develop. Pagan \textit{oikos} structures could continue to exist, masked under the Christian banner.\textsuperscript{45}

Moreover, there existed the danger that an overly dependent relationship could develop with individual leaders who had powerful, charismatic personalities.\textsuperscript{46} Like today, just because someone was wealthy and educated did not guarantee his or her positive theological and spiritual development. Influencers within household structures who fell into error were often capable of dragging their entire house church down with them, which could lead to tension and conflict within the local church as a whole at that location.\textsuperscript{47} The reality of influence in the early development of Christian faith is no different to the reality of influence in the twenty-first century. Today a poor testimony of the gospel brought by a person of influence can have a damaging impact upon the understanding of the richness of the Christian faith and Christian community by those in his or her network. Nonetheless, despite this possibility, it was an exceptional occurrence

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 293.

\textsuperscript{45} For example, the client system.

\textsuperscript{46} Is the twenty-first century network of relationships (churches, organizations or otherwise) any different from the first century \textit{oikos} structures?

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 294.
in the first and second centuries, and hopefully today, and the positive channels of gospel influence created through redeemed, healthy oikos structures enabled the flourishing of Christian faith in the pre-basilica days of gatherings.

Neither Paul nor the churches in Colossae and in Ephesus had the freedom to choose other social structures in the place of marriage and family. The concept of church as the family of God became the social model and affected the way Christians related to each other. For this reason the Pauline churches attributed such great significance to the oikos as the seminal cell of the church, and it is why they did not hesitate to adopt and adapt the contemporary patriarchal household order into Christian form. Gehring’s exemplary work on the house church (which includes oikos) provides an exhaustive exposition of the house church movement, in both its infancy and development throughout the ages. McNeal, in *Missional Communities*, provides contemporary expressions of oikos to Gehring’s survey.

*Missional Communities*, McNeal

Reggie McNeal seeks, in *Missional Communities*, to draw readers’ attention back to the biblical notion that the church is a gathering of Jesus people, a “who,” not an “it” or “place.” He writes that “Biblical teaching on the church sees the church as the ongoing incarnation of Jesus in the world, an organic life form vitally connected to
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48 Ibid., 293.
49 Ibid., 250.
50 McNeal, *Missional Communities*.
51 “Seeing church as a who, however, means that wherever the body of Christ is, the church is present. Missional followers of Jesus think of church more as a verb than as a noun. Church is not just an activity, it is a way of being in the world.” Ibid., Chapter 2, Location 708.
him.” Arguing that the twenty-first century culture is post-congregational, a strategy of engaging people where they live, work, play, and go to school is required. The twenty-first century church is incarnational. “It lets them (Jesus followers) live more intentionally, learning to love God and their neighbors more, making a contribution to their community, all with people they know and are known by (their sphere of influence). This is a recipe for a new church life form – missional communities.”

McNeal argues that deeper consideration and expression of the relational space that people inhabit is required. This priority is framed on Hall’s understanding of proxemics, especially regarding interaction with others as distinguished from the physical space in which people meet. In Hall’s framework of proxemics, there are four distinct spaces in which people interact and communicate: intimate distance (zero to eighteen inches, where people share the deepest and most personal thoughts and emotions); personal distance (eighteen inches to four feet, where people are at arms’ length, prepared to move toward one other or alternately, be pushed away); social distance (four feet to ten feet, where interaction is limited to visual and audio queues); and public distance (ten feet and beyond, where there is limited interaction between those gathered as they are primarily receiving something from the front).

Missional communities play an important role in restoring and transforming social space in the church. This is the arena that up to several dozen people can inhabit, such as an extended family or oikos, where they experience community life, practice their shared
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52 Ibid., Chapter 1, Location 402.

53 Ibid., Chapter 1, Location 539.

values, debrief their personal experiences, and establish identity. In this oikos the members of the oikos are able to engage the world on intentional mission with the gospel (a common distinctive between church small groups and missionalized oikos).\footnote{55}

In the balance of his book, McNeal and Breen provide a number of different examples from around the world of oikos expressed through a variety of Christian faith expressions that they refer to as missional communities.\footnote{56} There are a number of enduring themes common to the missional communities identified by the authors, three of which will be considered. The first is intentionality. This theme relates to most aspects of the communities including developing leaders at all levels, fostering intimate and accountable relationships with people within the community and beyond the community, and serving a specific group of people within the society in which the community is established.\footnote{57}

The second theme of missional communities relates to managing the paradox between strong powerful leadership and empowering leadership. Missional communities must be led by missional leaders who model what it is to live as a missional disciple, providing strategic direction and vision for community members.\footnote{58} At the same time, a missional leader diffuses power throughout the missional community, so that resourcing

\footnote{55} The capacity to be intentionally missional “separates the missional community from being just a small-group experience because most small-group experiences focus on the in and up dimensions, not the out dimension.” McNeal, Missional Communities, chapter 3, location 1059.

\footnote{56} Ibid., chapter 3, location 945 referring to Breen, Leading Missional Communities, Kindle Edition.

\footnote{57} Ibid., chapter 3, location 1276.

\footnote{58} Ibid., chapter 3, location 1172.
and energizing people is prioritized.\textsuperscript{59} The third theme is connected to prioritizing discipleship above almost everything else. In missional communities, effective leadership is measured by the extent of the development of people and of the competencies that are required to be an effective coach for life issues and soul nurturing.\textsuperscript{60}

It is not surprising therefore that the missional success connected with missional communities is a reflection of the community’s willingness to authentically wrestle with life and faith, in the ebb and flow of people who are still discovering love and truth in Jesus. McNeal’s exposé of missional communities is timely. \textit{Missional Communities} reflects the reality of \textit{oikos} for a life of faith in the contemporary context.

In light of the literature examined above, there are multiple levels of influence which impact the life of a disciple of Jesus. A man or woman of Christian faith will ideally have a connection with a local congregation. Perhaps idealistically, such a disciple of Jesus will also be connected with a small group within the life of the church. Influence within these two relational contexts will vary depending upon a variety of factors.

The third level of influence is that of \textit{oikos}, which could incorporate church members and small group members. It is certain, however, that influence within his or her \textit{oikos} will exist, and as such can profoundly impact the way the gospel is perceived by the members or participants of the \textit{oikos}. The person of influence within the \textit{oikos} will to varying degrees demonstrate and declare elements of the kingdom of God to those in his or her \textit{oikos} as articulated by McNeal, Halter and Smay, and Frost and Hirsch. These

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., chapter 3, location 1189.

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., chapter 3, location 815.
elements are captured in the questions which form the basis of the survey connected with the research project.
CHAPTER 4
THEOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

In light of the preceding chapter, this chapter first explores the theological framework for the kingdom of God, reflecting on the relational reality of the kingdom of God and the fact that those in a relational network experience the kingdom of God through words and actions. This chapter then delves into the relationship between oikos and the kingdom of God, the local congregation and society. Finally, it examines the use and meaning of the term oikos within a biblical context including the household of God. Chapters 3 and 4 provide the framework for chapter 5 which articulates the survey structure and questions connected with this project.

Kingdom of God

The kingdom of God is not a new idea in the New Testament. It has grounding in the Old Testament and is to be understood in that context.¹ The books of Samuel play out a drama where Israel rejects Yahweh as king (1 Sm 8:7) and asks Samuel for a human king. After the failure of Saul in executing his mandate (1 Sm 13:13), David is installed

as king, one who is under God and is “after his (God’s) own heart” (1 Sm 13:14). David becomes the model for all future kings and Isaiah prophesies that a new king will come from the “root of Jesse” (Is 11). Isaiah acknowledges Yahweh as the true king (Is 6:5), a view shared by other prophets (Jer 8:19). The prophets also continually indict Israel for her failure to practice justice (Is 1:10-13, 58:1-3, 5-10; Am 5:21-24; Mi 3) and look forward to Yahweh’s new covenant, where God will rule and bring justice (Is 61). Nonetheless, the idea of kingdom of God goes beyond a geopolitical regime, conceptually beyond what was ever contemplated by the Israelite kings.

Within the context of the New Testament, the kingdom of God is central in Jesus’ ministry. Throughout the Gospels, it is a frequent theme, with Luke’s Gospel using the Greek noun βασιλεία (kingdom) or one of its derivatives forty-six times. The kingdom was Jesus’ stated purpose for the incarnation (Lk 4:43). It is also the subject of his proclamation, κήρυγμα, (Lk 8:1), the topic of many of his parables (Lk 13:18-21), and the reason he performed many healings. In using this term in his ministry, Jesus is deliberately inviting his hearers to recall the story of Israel as well as transforming that

---

2 In the absence of Samuel, Saul performed the priestly sacrifices thus enlarging his kingly office further than God had allowed.

3 Steve Corbett and Brian Fikkert, When Helping Hurts: How to Alleviate Poverty Without Hurting the Poor ...and Yourself (Chicago: Moody, 2012), 38.


6 “(H)is (Jesus’) preaching and his miraculous healing are signs of the kingdom,” Ronald J. Sider, One Sided Christianity (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993), 51.
story to reach a new climax with God as king who will set the whole world right.⁷ These kingdom oriented priorities, as the missio Dei itself, are present and encouraged in and through an oikos.

The timing of this kingdom is a complicated concept in the New Testament, with many seemingly contradictory verses about it that need to be held in tension.⁸ There is much biblical evidence in Luke that God has already become king and is setting the world right. For example, in Luke 11:20 Jesus declares, “If I by the finger of God cast out demons, the kingdom of God has come upon you,” and then in 17:20, “the kingdom of God is in your midst.”⁹ However, in Luke 19:11 Jesus tells the parable of the minas, because “the people thought that the kingdom of God was going to appear at once.” Also, it is apparent from the reality of the world today that the restoration of all things is most certainly a future event. Thus, a consensus among scholars is that the kingdom of God is to be understood as “Now and Not Yet.”¹⁰

Likewise, the meaning of the kingdom of God also requires some theological reflection. Rather than being equated with the church or something purely spiritual, Ladd’s phrase “rule and reign of God” reflects Chilton’s idea of God’s activity in the

---

⁷ N. T. Wright, Jesus and the Victory of God (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 201, 228.


⁹ Green, Kingdom of God/Heaven, 478. ἐντός, as identified further in this chapter, is to be correctly understood as “among” rather than “within” due to the context. See discussion later in this chapter.

world and Wright’s explanation of the sovereign rule of God. This reign manifests itself both in the future and in the present; God’s future eschatological healing and rescue of his creation breaks into the present. Like a trailer provides a hint of the full length movie and hopefully stirs within the viewer a desire to experience the movie, so too the reign of God in his kingdom as experienced now is a foretaste of relationships, creation, and justice that will be thoroughly renewed when Jesus returns again.

As the reign is theocentric, God is the primary actor in its implementation. However there are a number of ways in which people engage with the kingdom. The kingdom is a gift (Lk 12:32) and is to be received (Lk 18:17; 23:51) and entered into (Lk 18:17; 18:24; 18:25). Indeed, its existence invites and even demands a response from those who have heard it proclaimed and seen it in action. The invitation is given for people to enter into this kingdom by placing their lives under the rule and reign of God. In other language, they become Christians who are disciples of Jesus and part of his Church.

---


13 Wright, *Hope*, 201.

14 Wesley S. Chaing, “To What Extent Does Jesus’ Teaching about the Kingdom of God Provide a Helpful Basis for Christian Socio-political Thinking Today?” *Evangelical Quarterly* 83.4 (October 2011), 309.

15 Christian, *God of the Empty-Handed*, 183. For more ways in which people can interact with the kingdom, see Green, *Kingdom of God/Heaven*, 468.

Relational Reality: Luke 17:21

This section seeks to articulate the relational reality of the kingdom of God. A later section explores oikos as an equally relational construct, thereby verifying that oikos is an authentic expression of the kingdom of God. Luke 17:21 provides helpful insight into this element of the kingdom of God.

When Jesus was asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God would come, he answered, “The kingdom of God does not come with observation; nor will they say, ‘See here!’ or ‘See there!’ For indeed, the kingdom of God is within you,” (Lk 17:20-21). The response of Jesus effectively transposes the question, moving it from a temporally framed question to a proximally framed question. In effect, Jesus indicates that they should ask about where the kingdom is rather than when it is to appear. The answer Jesus then provides is “the kingdom of God is within you.” Jesus’ answer to the Pharisees moves the focus away from timeline thinking about the future and puts the focus on the presence of the kingdom right now (Lk 17:20-21).

In the words that follow (Lk 17:22-37), Jesus speaks directly to his disciples. Jesus refers to the future and how to be ready for his return. But disciples cannot be ready for Jesus’ return and the fuller manifestation of God’s kingdom unless there exists a response in faith to the kingdom that is already present. Though it is apparent the question in Luke 17:20 comes from some Pharisees, the motivation behind the question is unknown. In Luke 17:20 it is possible to assume that at least part of the motivation was that they simply wanted to know about when the kingdom would come.

First Jesus says, “The kingdom of God does not come with observation” (Lk 17:20). The kingdom more than likely had different meanings for Jesus and the Pharisees.
The Pharisees were seeking a political redemption, restoring the people of Israel to their position of rule and political power. The kingdom expression the Pharisees were seeking (and expecting) was more akin to a revolution or coup d’état than a reengineering of society and relationships. Jesus, however, was conceiving his kingdom somewhat differently, where social, emotional, and relational restoration occurs. In this kingdom, reconciliation between humans is the default, God’s beauty is manifest, social justice is prevalent, and people are made whole again.\(^{17}\)

A simple working definition of the kingdom of God might be the rule and reign of God or the purposes of God being fulfilled by his power in and through citizens of the kingdom.\(^{18}\) With that as a short definition of God’s kingdom, an examination is necessary of the word observation. The Greek word translated as “observation” is \textit{paratērēsis}. This is the only place it occurs in the Bible, but it occurs sufficiently in secular usage of ancient times to give confidence about its meaning. The known secular usage also fits into this one biblical context. \textit{Paratērēsis} means “careful looking” or “watching.” Secular use of \textit{paratērēsis} sometimes involved careful watching of signs in the heavens, or astrology. It could also be used for careful watching or surveillance of earthly persons or events.

This sense of observation as careful watching is supported by the continuation of Jesus’ answer in Luke 17:21: “nor will they say, ‘See here!’ or ‘See there!’” Jesus refers to the way one looks for clues or signs to find what is being sought, whether it is the kingdom of God or simply fulfillment of personal desires or wishes. In Luke 17:21 and

\(^{17}\) Mike Frost, \textit{The Road to Missional} (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2011), 101-120.

\(^{18}\) For example, David J. Bosch, \textit{Transforming Mission}, 70-73.
23, as well as in Matthew 24:23-26, Jesus warns against false clues and false instructions about where to find him or the kingdom. After warning them not to be taken in by false clues (“See here! See there!”), Jesus advises the hearers of his message, Pharisees, disciples, and by implication twenty first century Jesus followers, where to look instead: “For indeed, the kingdom of God is within you” (Lk 17:21).

It is unlikely Jesus is saying, “Don’t go looking for the kingdom out there somewhere. The kingdom is inside you.” That is grammatically possible, but it is not a sustainable interpretation in this context. The two Greek words entos humōn are translated as “within you.” Entos is a preposition meaning “within” or “among.” It can be used for “inside” (Mt 23:26), but that is not the best rendering for Luke 17:21. The better translation here is “within” or “among,” especially in view of the word humōn. Humōn as a plural form of you might best be conveyed through the phrases, “You as a people” or “you as a group.”19 Noting that humōn is plural gives more support to translating entos as among or within in the sense of “in your midst” (NASB). It is contended that Jesus is not asserting that the Pharisees look inside themselves to find God’s kingdom. Instead, Jesus is telling the hearers and readers that the kingdom is present right in front of them, in your midst or among you (New Living Translation).

The presence of Jesus predicates the presence of the kingdom because he is the king in the kingdom of God. The Pharisees’ search for a temporal indicator to know when the kingdom of God would come is displaced by Jesus’ response. The response by Jesus moves the query to a relational dynamic. If the Pharisees know who Jesus is, then they

19 It is understood that in the southern areas of the USA the idiomatic expression “all you all” (or “all y’all”) would translate humōn perfectly.
become consciously and subconsciously aware of the reality of the kingdom of God. They need to recognize that the kingdom of God is present in their midst in the person and the patterns and practices of Jesus (see also Mt 12:28).

The gathering of and engagement between people, who by their words, thoughts and actions demonstrate and declare a present reality of the principles of the kingdom of God, embodies the kingdom. Increasingly holy relationships become the framework for the presence of the kingdom of God. Mike Frost declares, “the idea of shalom (peace) is central to the reign of God. Shalom suggests a restoration of relationships between all peoples, as well as a reconciliation between humanity and God.”

By Your Fruit You Will Be Known: Luke 6:43-45

Jesus’ words in Luke 6:43-45 (Mt 7:16-20; 12:33-37) capture the reality that Christian faith is a personal decision expressed in the public domain. Behavior of individuals betrays where their allegiances lie. Actions necessarily align with beliefs (Jas 2:14-26). The fruit of lives will be observable by others through behaviors and words. Hence Jesus’ words in verse 44, “for each tree is known by its own fruit,” indicates that the integrity of humanity will reveal true motives, priorities, and that which is stored in one’s heart. A disintegration between heart and fruit is not possible.

Jesus used these words in verse 45: “The good person out of the good treasure of the heart produces good, and the evil person out of evil treasure produces evil.” It is noteworthy that the Greek word used to capture Jesus saying “good” in verse 43, kalos

---

20 Mike Frost, The Road to Missional, 104.

21 Occasions arise when articulated or aspirational beliefs conflict with behavior. In these moments, there is a temporarily malignment of beliefs and priorities, where articulated or aspirational beliefs are displaced by human preferences and priorities.
(καλός), is different from the alternate Greek word used similarly in verse 45, agathos (ἀγαθός). Kalos refers to an object whose appearance has a certain harmonious perfection, whereas agathos refers to that which is inherently upright or honorable. Kalos is to agathos what the phenomenal is to the essence. Life works (fruit) of a person that are phenomenologically good must emanate from a person who is in substance good.

Verse 45 contrasts two sorts of people, the “good” person and the “evil” person. The former is like trees of righteousness (Is 61:3) which being planted by the river of the love of God (Ps 1:3), rooted in Christ (Col 2:7), and filled with the fruits of righteousness by him (Phil 1:11), do not produce evil in their everyday conduct. By way of juxtaposition, “evil” people or hypocrites who pretend in religion are compared to corrupt trees (sapros, meaning bad, rotten, corrupt or putrid). These trees do not produce good fruit nor perform authentic works of righteousness, but merely have the appearance of good works which are not properly so.

A Christian leader who declares Jesus as Lord living, loving, and serving within their oikos will have a ripple effect within their oikos and to those beyond their oikos. The fruit of righteousness will be experienced by those who possess a relational proximate connection with such a Christian (Prv 11:30; Am 6:12; Ja 3:18; Heb 12:11). The kingdom of God will therefore be manifest through these relationships. It is the ripple effect which is seeking to be measured by the survey associated with this project (see Chapter 5).

24 Ibid.
The kingdom of God is not a theoretical concept or creed which is disconnected
from the reality of humanity. The kingdom of God is a manifest reality, aspects of which
are experienced by groups of people. This experience can be irrespective of their stated
faith position, as all are created in the image of the creator (Gn 1:26), eternity is placed
on the hearts of all humanity (Eccl 3:11), and God is not far from anyone (Acts 17:26-
27). A person whose heart is aligned with the rule and reign of God will manifest this
priority in the network of relationships in which he or she lives.

The kingdom of God and its Matthean equivalent, the kingdom of Heaven,
referred throughout Luke and Matthew is entered into and received (see for example,
Lk 18:17). Biblically, the kingdom of God can only be something that we enter or we
receive as a gift (Mt 5:20; 7:21; 18:3-9; 19:17-24; Mk 10:15; Mk 10:23-25; Lk 18:17; Jn
3:5), as opposed to something built, grown, or expanded. As Guder writes, “The reign of
God is given. God’s gift and God’s welcome are its most striking and critical features.
The call to receive warns against the consequence of rejecting the gift.”

God’s reign in the kingdom increases in its prevalence as kingdom participants
enter into relationship with King Jesus and other kingdom citizens. Similarly, as kingdom
participants receive the gift of life from King Jesus and other kingdom citizens, the
kingdom of God is realized. Thus within kingdom infused oikos, members will enter into
and receive a new a fresh understanding of life as relationships develop in a kingdom of
God informed, infused, and inspired way.

The kingdom fruit would not merely look good, but would be emanating from a “good” kingdom participant who remains connected to the vine, producing fruit that will last (Jn 15:5). The only things that continue into Heaven are relationships. They are worthy of investment, creating vessels that can contain the unfailing treasures of heaven, where no thief comes and no moth destroys (Lk 12:33). The whole core of biblical history is the story of the calling of a visible, life giving community to be God’s own people, His royal priesthood on earth, and the bearer of his light to the nations.26 God’s people gather in the local congregation.

**Oikos and the Local Congregation**

Breen considers *oikos* as something the Spirit of God is doing in this time to restore the church’s ability to function fruitfully in discipleship and mission the way the early church did, by publicly living out faith in the various neighborhoods and relational networks of cities. As has been observed by writers considered in the literary review of this project, including McNeal, Frost, Gerhing, and Banks, there is a renewed interest in the expression of the gathered church within an *oikos* construct. Breen suggests strongly, “we firmly believe this is the make-or-break issue for the Western church. We simply will not see God’s dream for the world come true unless we learn how to function as extended families on mission.”27

The local congregation is constitutive of the *oikos*, through which relationships are initiated, fostered, and extended. The size of a local congregation can distract from

---


27 Breen, *Leading Missional Communities*, 5.
the pertinent reality that relationships create a functional *oikos*. That is, within a local congregation, which expresses itself in various forms throughout the week and incorporates a form of gathered worship, usually on Sunday, there could be multiple *oikoi* (plural of *oikos*). The local congregation of God is equally the proper title for a small group meeting in a house and for the whole world wide family.28

Even though *oikos* appears 112 times and *oikia* appears ninety-four times in the New Testament, *oikos* is connected only four times with ἐκκλησία (Rom 16:5; 1 Cor 16:19; Phlm 2; Col 4:15). Nevertheless, it appears as if Paul uses the terms interchangeably, as evidenced by 1 Corinthians. The two terms appear in six places: *oikos* in 1 Corinthians 1:16; 11:34; 14:35; 16:19 and *oikia* in 1 Corinthians 11:22; 16:15.29

The operative word in the kingdom of God is *theou* (God). There are many past and present kingdoms of location and political persuasion. The situation is similar with regard to the word *ecclesia*. The operative word is *theou* or *Christou*. It is the church or congregation that God is gathering in every place. It is God’s Church and its whole character derives from that fact.30 The people of the local congregation (their *oikos*) will necessarily, in faithfully glorifying God with their words and actions, have an impact on their society.


Oikos and Society

As explored in greater detail in the next section, the oikos described included servants, servant's families, friends, and even business associates. An oikos was one's sphere of influence, a social system composed of those related to each other through common kinship ties, tasks, and territory.\textsuperscript{31} The “small ‘oikos fellowship’ provided a basic building block for the entire society as well.”\textsuperscript{32} In the contemporary context, oikos consists of those with whom we have common kinship (larger family), common community (friends, neighbors), and common interests (associates, work relationships, recreation).\textsuperscript{33}

The current focus on corporate culture in managerial theory, on character development in business ethics, and on the work/family relationship in family studies calls for integration to help us explore the relationship of work, family, and fundamental values. The concept of oikos provides a framework for understanding the variety of emotional expressions and faith values underlying ethics in organizational life. Consequentially, oikos also provides a framework for understanding the broader society where oikos includes influencing family, friends, and other social structures.


\textsuperscript{32} Roger W. Gehring. \textit{House Church and Mission} (Massachusett: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), 17.

Oikos

The term *oikos* (*οἶκος*) is a Greek word used in the New Testament to refer to “households.” These common households were essentially extended families, including non-biological family members operating and living within the familial relationships, that functioned together with a common purpose. In the early church, discipleship and mission always centered around and flourished in the *oikos*. Living as *oikos* has been the norm for almost every culture for most of human history. Family was a wider community, sharing life, work, celebration, and commerce together. The meaning, use, and implications of *oikos* as the household of God is explored below.

**Meaning**

Like most words in New Testament Greek, *oikos* is used in various contexts with various meanings and emphases. It is used in the New Testament on one hundred and twenty occasions. However, there are three main denotations: a house, members of a household, or familial descendants.

---

34 “*Oikos* facilitated the relational dynamic that allowed the church to thrive in the midst of persecution and hardship for hundreds of years.” Mike Breen, *Leading Missional Communities* (3 Dimension Ministries: Paweleys Island, SC, 2013), 4, 5.

35 Peter B. Hammond, former professor of anthropology at Indiana University, observes that "in most cultures the social systems of greatest importance are based on kinship. Human beings everywhere are born into some sort of family. In most cultures the kin group plays an even more important role [than in America], lasting throughout life as the principal source of the individual's emotional, economic, social-and frequently supernatural-support, and providing the basis for community organization.” Peter Hammond, *Cultural and Social Anthropology* (New York: MacMillan, 1964), 45-46.

36 An *oikos* theological framework has been developed. This framework suggests that the biblical traditions of God’s house are usable today and challenging boldness in the practice of equity, equality, sharing, cancellation of debt, freeing of slaves, healing of the sick, and the rediscovery of abundance, as the first Christians were.
In the most frequent context, *oikos* is translated as a physical structure or house, including an inhabited home; a specific building including a palace, the house of God or the tabernacle; or any dwelling place.\(^{37}\) The dwelling place reference incorporates the human body as an abode of demons that posses it; tents, huts, lairs, stalls, or nests of animals; and the place where one has a fixed residence, one's settled abode or domicile. The main focus is premised on the indwelling of something or someone within the structure. It is the animation of the structure by its inhabitants that brings a distinct perspective to the understanding and use of *oikos*.

*Oikos* is also used in the New Testament to describe the residents of a house, all the persons forming one family, or members of a household. The emphasis is on the actual residents themselves of a house and includes not only biological family members but also all those connected to the master of the household.\(^{38}\) This context is also broad enough to include the family of God, the indwellers or members of the Christian Church.

The final context in which *oikos* is used in the New Testament relates to stock, family, descendants of one family, or lineage. In this sense it has less to do with present structures or inhabitants of those structures are more to do with how generations past inform the present expression of the home. This paper is focusing primarily on the second context in which the word *oikos* is used, which relates to the network or social web of relationships that exists within a sphere of influence.

---


\(^{38}\) Breen, *Leading Missional Communities*, 6. “Those of us who follow Christ have the remarkable opportunity to literally rebuild society by re-forming “extended family” oikos communities centered not on blood or ancestry, but on Jesus.”
The female noun form of *oikos, oikia*, seems to denote meanings similar to *oikos.* Although occasionally the words appear at times to be used with some discrimination in the New Testament (for example, Lk 6:5,6,7; Acts 16:31,32,34), other passages seem to show that the meaning is indistinguishable (for example, Mt 12:25; Jn 4:53; 1 Cor 16:15; Phil 4:22). In the sense of family, *oikos* and *oikia* are similarly employed.

**Use**

*Oikos* is a social system composed of those that relate to each other through relationships, common ties, and tasks. *Oikos* members often but not always lived together. However, members usually sensed a close association with each other, though not everyone within the *oikos* necessarily knew all other members of the *oikos.*

With particular focus on the use of and reference to *oikos*, a survey of the Gospels reveals that Jesus utilized existing relationships (*oikos*) to serve as bridges to spread his message. In Mark 5:19 and Luke 8:39 the healed demoniac is told to go back to his *oikos* to tell of the Lord’s work in his life. In the case of both Levi (Mk 2:15-17) and Zacchaeus (Lk 19:9) it appears they orchestrate a gathering of their *oikos* (sinners like themselves) to experience Jesus. John 4 has two examples with the Samaritan woman telling her friends

---

39 Under the old Attic law, *oikos* was the whole estate, while oikia was the physical dwelling only. However, that precise distinction was lost in later Greek. Thomas Wolf, *Oikos Evangelism*, http://gracefamilyinfo.org/attachments/OikosEvangelism.pdf (accessed November 1, 2015). See also Thomas Wolf, “Oikos Evangelism: Key to the Future,” in *Future Church*, ed. Ralph W. Neighbour, Jr. (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1980), 153-176.


41 Although Jesus’ *oikos* (or sphere of influence) was significant, it appears from the gospels that those who were part of the *oikos* of Jesus did not necessarily know everyone else within the *oikos.*
about Jesus (Jn 4:39) and after the healing of the official’s son his whole household believes. The first chapter of John provides an excellent illustration of the powerful effect of the way an idea is transferred within an existing oikos, showing the natural and pre-existing connections as Andrew brings his brother Peter to Jesus (Jn 1:41) and Philip brings Nathaniel (Jn 1:45). As Jesus sends his disciples out to proclaim the kingdom of God he instructs them specifically in an oikos based methodology. They are to find the “worthy man” (Mt 10:11) or the “son of peace” (Lk 10:6) and use that home as a base from which their ministry in the community operates.42

Acts continues to reference engagement with oikos. In Acts 5:42 and 20:20 references are found to preaching and teaching house to house and to meeting in the home of Tituis Justus (Acts 18:7). The message of the kingdom of God is received in the households of Cornelius (Acts 10:2, 22, 30; 11:14), Lydia (Acts 16:15), the jailer (Acts 16:31-32), and Crispus (Acts 18:8)). As Paul shares the gospel (Acts 16:11-15), Lydia responds to the message (vs. 14). In the space of one verse, there is a quick transition that takes place in the continuing narrative of Paul’s missionary work. In Acts 16:15 Paul baptizes Lydia’s entire household. This is replicated again with the jailer in Acts 16:25-34. In one instance Paul is talking with the jailer in Acts 16:31 and in the next instance he is sharing with the entire household in Acts 16:32. Then in verse 33 he conducts a household baptism. Similarly, in the Epistles there is a reference to Paul baptizing the household of Stephanas (1 Cor 1:16) and the rest concern churches which meet in houses (Rom 16:5, 1 Cor 16:19, Col 4:15, and Phil 2). From a methodological perspective, for the early church, oikos was a significant factor in the spread of the gospel. Further,

---

biblical evidence suggests that the Christian church \textit{oikos} became synonymous with the family or household of God ($\text{oǐκος τοῦ \thetaεοῦ}$) (1 Tm 3:15; 1 Pet 4:17).

Household of God

The Bible has reverence for the house as the dwelling place of a family. Although the patriarchs of the Torah are sojourners, their temporary residences are not inconsequential. The patriarchal scriptures recount in detail the welcoming of guests into the dwelling space that accompanied the moral obligation of protecting guests. A system of etiquette and honor is based on the house. The house can be life consoling or desolating.

The household of God was an integral part of God’s salvific work from the beginning of the Bible, not just the New Testament.\textsuperscript{43} Noah and his \textit{oikos} are saved by entering the ark, Abraham and his household are saved through faithfulness to the covenant, and David and his household are promised the kingdom. The Hebrew word used in the Old Testament is \textit{bayit}, which means “house,” "household, "home," "place," "temple," and "family." The word \textit{bayit} is frequently used to denote a dwelling or habitation. It is also applied to a household or family. The wife, children, servants, and resident aliens are all included in the house in the Old Testament. The word household adopts the expanded description of Deuteronomy 12:12 incorporating “sons and daughters, menservants and maidservants” (Dt 14:26).

\textsuperscript{43} The archetypal idea of "home" points in two directions at once. It points backward toward an original hint and taste for union. Humanity came from some kind of home in God that plants a foundational seed of a possible and ideal paradise. The archetype of home also points forward, urging toward the realization that this hint and taste of union might actually be true. It guides like an inner compass or a homing device. Humanity comes from God, returns to God and in the interim the establishment of home (\textit{oikos}) is pursued. Richard Rohr, \textit{Falling Upward: A Spirituality for the Two Halves of Life} (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011), 88-89.
The Septuagint not surprisingly uses *oikos* for *bayit*. Abraham was to "command his children and household (*oikos*)" (Gn 18:19). David’s household (*oikos*) (2 Sm 15:16) moved with David in his travels and Joshua’s house (*oikia*) was pledged to serve the Lord (Jo 24:15). As Harris writes, "In the Old Testament there is a solidarity between a man and his house (Jo 2:12; 6:22; 7:1-5; 1 Kgs 7:15)."44 Where there were rebels in Israel’s camp, the "households" shared their fate (Nm 16:31-33; Dt 11:6). Dosker explains that "Human life is not a conglomerate of individuals; the family is its center and unit."45 The *oikos* of the Lord of Israel was the chosen place for His presence (Jgs 18:31; 2 Sm 12:20), though there were continual reminders that the Lord of all the earth does not dwell in buildings made by man (1 Kgs 8:12-21, 27-30; Is 66:1,2; Jer 7:1-11; Acts 7:46-50).

Jesus spoke of His Father's *oikos* in differing lights, on occasion as the earthly temple (Jn 2:16) and other times as the heavenly dwelling (Jn 14:2). Spiritually, the human body becomes the real *oikos* or dwelling place of God (1 Cor 3:16; 2 Cor 6:16). 1 Timothy 3:15 makes it clear that the *oikos* of God "is the church of the living God, the pillar and support of the truth." The household unit of the first century became the nuclei for the early life of the church. Examples include the house of Priscilla and Aquila at Rome (Rom 16:5), the house of Stephanus (1 Cor 16:15) and the house of Onesiphorus (2 Tm 1:16). It is “no wonder that the early church made so much of the family life. And in the midst of all our modern, rampant individualism, the family is still the throbbing heart

---


of the church.\textsuperscript{46} It is usual for many oikos structures to exist within one church because of the size or geographic dispersion of those connected with the local faith community. Oikos presents as church for more contemporary expressions as captured by McNeal in Missional Communities, where a member of the oikos might not perceive a distinction between this network of relationships and church.

It is apparent, in light of the above, a person’s oikos is a relational construct that does not necessarily have any physical or structural boundaries. That is to say, it is not limited to persons who are associated with each other through a formal structure, but could also include relational connections between people when a healthy level of interdependence exists within the oikos. Indicia might include mutuality in learning, serving, knowing, and or loving, similar to the nature of relationships within a family. Further, it is possible within this construct that not every person within the oikos would know each other at the same depth. Consequently, the shape of every oikos is unique and could include a multiplicity of relationships developed over decades.\textsuperscript{47} It is this relational reality of the kingdom of God that is considered by this project.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotes}
\item[46] Ibid.
\item[47] My oikos includes immediate family members, some members from the local congregation with whom I serve, members of my connect group, staff members, some who were connected with the local congregation in which we previously served, my siblings, and close friends.
\end{footnotes}
\end{footnotesize}
CHAPTER 5
SURVEY FRAMEWORK

The survey framework on which the data in this project is based has been developed in conjunction with Natural Church Development Australia (NCD Australia) and primarily by Adam Johnstone, the Managing Director of NCD Australia. Johnstone’s conceptual framework of measuring the health of oikos is an integral element of the survey process and is reflective of his international contribution to the development of measuring the health of churches through the Natural Church Development process. Johnstone’s work has significantly expanded the ability to establish a measure of the health of relationships whether within a church through the Natural Church Development framework or within the myoikos\(^1\) framework.

Additionally, this project is but a small element of a broader project which seeks to empower men and women of faith, in all aspects of life, to understand and develop the health of their oikos. Johnstone continues to develop the infrastructure required to not only enable myoikos participants to undertake this assessment but to create a community of people committed to seeing the kingdom of God flourish in their networks of

\(^1\) myoikos is a term that Johnstone has applied to the framework of measuring, developing, and sustaining the health of an oikos of a person.
relationships. It is anticipated that any subsequent data gathering and analysis of the impact of the ministry of Arrow Leadership will be mediated through the myoikos portal.

This chapter, in light of the material exposed in the previous chapters, suggests some questions suitable for inclusion in the survey. This chapter first examines the statistical process by examining strategy, sampling, and data analysis. It then identifies statistical variants that may be significant upon collection and analysis of data. Finally, questions are developed around the themes of faith, relationships, and service that reflect a measure of the health of the kingdom of God in the context of a person’s oikos.

**Statistical Process**

There are two surveys connected with this project. The first survey is completed by the leader. It identifies basic biographical data of the person who is the center of their oikos (the Arrow leader or non-Arrow leader). This survey also includes thirty-six questions,\(^2\) which are addressed in greater detail in a subsequent section, seeking to measure the relative quality of expressions of the reality of the kingdom of God experienced by this person. The answering of these questions by both groups of leaders will enable ready comparison between the groups of relative strength and weakness of expressions of the kingdom of God.

The second survey is completed by those who are in the oikos of the leader. As identified throughout the previous chapter, there is a relational impact of a disciple of Jesus upon those within their sphere of influence (their oikos). As a result, it is anticipated that the life of a leader will be influencing those with who they are in

\(^2\) See Appendix 1.
relationship. This survey includes the same thirty-six questions that are included in the leader’s survey. Like the leader’s survey, these thirty-six questions seek to measure the relative health of expressions of the reality of the kingdom of God experienced by the person (hereafter referred to as the member) who are in the oikos of the leader. This survey also measures the perceived nature of the leader’s influence in the life the person in their oikos and the perceived strength of connection between the leader and the member of the oikos.

The average health of leaders who have completed Arrow is compared with the average health of leaders of who not completed Arrow. Similarly, the average health of the members of the leader’s oikos who have completed Arrow is compared to the average health of the members of the leader’s oikos who have not completed Arrow. The strength and nature of connection between leaders and their members is contrasted between those leaders who have completed Arrow and those leaders who have not. Finally, the perceived strength of the leader’s oikos (the number of members who the leader perceives is in his or her oikos measured by those who have been requested to complete the survey) will be contrasted to the actual strength of the leader’s oikos (measured by the number of people who actually complete the survey pursuant to the leader’s request).

The very nature of this survey process is not to merely ask Arrow leaders about their perceptions of strengths and weaknesses of the Arrow Leadership programs. Training and development programs have a number of levels of measuring success or
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3 The term “member” is used as it reflects the term that is often associated with a person who is part of a home or household. That is, “household member” is equivalent to “oikos member.”

4 The term used to describe this measure will be the quality of the leader’s oikos.

5 The term used to describe this measure – the element of connectedness - is influence.
impact. The first level is experiential and measures the leader’s enjoyment of the process. The second level is cognitive, determining if the participant gained new insight or understanding. The third level is behavioral, evaluated by seeing if the participant behaves differently as a result of program engagement. The fourth level is consequential and measures if the program not only changed the behavior of the participant but those with whom the participant works, serves, or does life. The oikos survey seeks to measure this fourth level by evaluating any changes in the leader’s oikos. Having Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders complete the survey provides an ability to contrast the quality of oikos of an Arrow leader against a non-Arrow leader.

Strategy

Potential survey participants were invited to participate in the survey over a two week period. Survey participants (leaders) were asked to complete the survey which included identifying those who they considered to be in their sphere of influence. The members of the leaders’ oikos were contacted, being invited to complete a survey that primarily focused on how they are experiencing aspects of the reality of the kingdom of God. Additionally, the members were also asked to describe the nature and strength of the connection between themselves and the leader within the oikos.

Participants were asked to respond on a seven point scale, with responses ranging from strongly disagree (1) to neutral (4) to strongly agree (7), which enables survey respondents to have some degree of iteration in describing their responses. Participants were also encouraged not to select neutral (4) unless this score authentically represented
their response to the comment posed. This encouragement identifies tendencies in participant’s responses rather than having non-committal responses.

Thirty-six questions were asked of all participants (leaders and members). These questions are grouped into three categories: faith, relationships, and service. These questions and categories will be discussed later in this chapter. Additional questions were asked of members to describe how that member connects to the leader within the oikos.

The leader responded to additional questions that explored basic biographical data such as gender, age bracket, and marital status; data concerning home like the number of people in the home, number of homes in which the leader has lived, and number of years in current home; employment data including whether employed, when first employed, number of employers, and length of current employment; data concerning faith such as greatest faith and denominational influence, participation in services, and responsibilities in local church; and Arrow engagement data like where, when, and which program, ongoing connection with Arrow leaders, and impact of Arrow. The gathering of biographical and associated data allows contrasts to be discerned between sub-groups within the pool of leader respondents concerning the relative health of their oikos.

**Sampling**

The sample of thirty-nine leaders is indicative of the population as the sample includes Arrow leaders from each of the programs that were conducted over the specified period. There is a representative balance between participants in the Executive Leaders
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6 This construct perhaps mirrors Newbigin’s understanding of mission, where faith reflects word or gospel, relationships reflects body, and service reflects mission into the world. See Leslie Newbigin, *One Body, One Gospel, One World* (Evanston: International Missionary Council, 1958).
Program and the Emerging Leaders Program. Thus within the given parameters we can be confident the answers provided are indicative of the population under consideration. We can therefore make informed decisions based upon the survey data. For more detail in regards to sampling, please see Appendix 4.

Statistical Analysis

The survey data will be analyzed with the assumption that it is a normal distribution. Whilst a normal distribution may not exactly match the population, it is close enough that it allows prediction of relationships and causality within a reasonable range. A normal distribution is also used because it is statistically convenient. It is represented by the average and the variance or standard deviation, two parameters that are arguably the most basic statistics.

Because the sample data is normalized, it will be possible to estimate the percentage of the sample indicative of the population that is distinctly different from the average. The strength of the distinction will be measured by standard deviation, hence it will convey with confidence the extent to which Arrow leaders are distinctly different from the population sample. Whilst raw averages will be compared, the difference between the Arrow leaders set and the balance leaders set will be measured by using a normal distribution curve. The greater the variation from the mean, the more exceptional the results will appear.

Statistical Variants

Whilst the main focus of the survey was to measure the health of oikos in Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders, data was also collected around other statistical variants
that were perceived to have an impact upon the health of an oikos. These variants included denomination, the recency of Arrow participation, age, occupation, and their current time in their role. Additionally, data was also collected concerning the home life of Arrow and non-Arrow leaders. The additional data was collected to determine whether there is any statistical significant correlation between the health of the oikos and these other datasets. For greater detail, please see Appendix 5.

**Measures**

The final element of this chapter will focus on the questions that are used to measure the health of a survey respondent’s oikos. The three themes that will be used to explore the measures of the health of an oikos are faith, relationships, and service. Further, the influence of the leader’s oikos, the quality of the leader’s oikos, and the size of the leader’s oikos will also be explored. The interconnection between faith, relationships, and service directly inform the quality of the oikos. The size of the oikos was standardized, enabling an additional measure of the member’s influence to be considered in the final element of this chapter.

The thirty-six questions and three themes are based upon questions developed through the Natural Church Development (NCD) paradigm. This paradigm is utilized in over eighty countries to assist churches in becoming increasingly healthier. This survey process has been independently statistically verified as an accurate measure of church life and health, with over 100,000 churches having participated in the survey process.
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7 Appendix 1 contains the full list of questions associated with the measure of the expressions of the kingdom of God. See also Christian Schwarz, *Color Your World with Natural Church Development* (Redbank Plains, QLD: NCD Australia, 2005).
Additional discipleship material has also been produced, seeking to assist individual disciples of Jesus to increasingly express an integrated Christian faith.\(^8\) The survey methodology and framework utilized by the Myoikos Project mirrors the survey methodology and framework utilized by the Natural Church Development paradigm, especially the church health survey and the 3 Colors of Leadership empowerment survey.\(^9\) The myoikos survey utilizes the strength of survey design and process of Natural Church Development.

The thirty-six myoikos questions were developed utilizing a process similar to that which is used by NCD in developing its surveys, relying upon the expertise of Johnstone from NCD Australia. Questions utilized by the NCD church health survey that relate directly to experiences of a gathered worship context of Christians were removed as they are not pertinent to the measure of health of an oikos. Thereafter, the remaining questions were reframed to remove references to the local church and move towards a relational construct epitomized by the oikos concept.

The remaining questions were subsequently redrafted so that a person with a reading capability of a year six student or higher could comprehend and respond to the questions. Multiple rounds of testing were undertaken to remove questions that evinced similar weighting or contribution to the overall result. The questions were again tested to

\(^8\) Schwarz’s additional materials include: 3 Colors of Love, 3 Colors of Minsistry, 3 Colors of Community, 3 Colors of Spirituality and 3 Colors of Leadership, (toolshed.ncd-australia.org.au, NCD Australia, 2017), accessed 1 June 2017.

\(^9\) The Church Health Survey uses a framework of sixty-four questions to assess three aspects of church life (faith, fellowship, and service). See Schwarz, Color Your World with NCD. The Empowerment Test utilises a multi-rater system, whereby individuals provide observation of their experiences or impact of the leader providing leadership. See Christian Schwarz, 3 Colors of Leadership (Redbank Plains, QLD: NCD Australia, 2012). The fusion of these two methodologies provided the framework for the development of the myoikos survey and project.
ensure that a person, irrespective of their faith position, could respond genuinely to the questions posed. Throughout the process, the questions were identified as relating to the theme of faith, relationships, or service.

Finally, the questions were filtered through the theological and literary framework explored in Chapters 3 and 4 to ensure biblical veracity and alignment with contemporary considerations on expressions of the kingdom of God. The agreed thirty-six questions included in the myoikos survey best reflect readily accessible concepts and ideas of the expressions of the kingdom of God. As identified in the theological review, because people are created in the image of the creator, eternity is embedded within their design (Eccl 3:11). The result is that some people demonstrate realities of the kingdom of God without an impetus sourced from a declared Christian faith position. The ultimate goal of the Myoikos Project is to assist people in becoming more human, where they possess a growing concern for humanity, the earth, and the resources over which they have responsibility.

As previously indicated, the Myoikos Project is designed for broad application. However, for the purposes of this thesis, the questions are being utilized to measure expressions of the kingdom of God by leaders and their impact upon those around them. The focus of this project will therefore be upon the extent to which Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders experience and express the realities of the kingdom of God and the impact upon those within their oikos.
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10 Johnstone has developed the measure of oikos health, which is a function of quality, quantity, and influence. This measure is considered in chapter 7.
Faith

By faith it is understood that the world was prepared by the word of God. Faith is not just localized to a person’s relationship with a theistic entity or person, but includes faith in self and faith in fellow humanity. Just as everyone participates in an oikos, everyone within a network of relationships irrespective of whether they declare Jesus to be Lord has an element of faith expression in their lives and therefore in those around them.

David Bosch writes, “Mission is more indifferent from recruitment to our brand of religion; it is the alerting of people to the universal reign of God through Christ.”¹¹ God’s reign, his kingdom, is coming. His kingdom is manifest in all aspects and all manners of life. Ephesians 1, Colossians 1, 1 John, and John 1 all identify Christ as the initiator of all things, as the sustainer, the one who continues to create in all things. The universality of God’s reign means that hallmarks of himself are reflected in creation, both in nature and humanity. The faith God has in humanity pulsates throughout humanity.

Every individual expresses faith in some form. The faith of an individual in humanity is cultivated by being inspired through relationships, either with themselves or with a higher power. Within a Christian world view this higher power is God, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit. The Trinitarian God is coequal in power and in glory. The relationships within fellow humanity are equally important where God’s creative attributes pulses through his creation since people are created in the image of the creator (Gn 1:27).

Faith within the context of a network of relationships means a safe community in which the exploration of the unknown and the new can be pursued safely. Faith in the context of a healthy *oikos* means feedback can shared and received without fear of condemnation. Faith in the context of a healthy *oikos* means there is an ability to be inspired by others and inspired by the dreams God places on the hearts of *oikos* members to achieve his purposes in the world with their support, despite circumstances legislating against these purposes being realized.

Faith in the context of a healthy *oikos* means the words and actions of others in our *oikos* can be relied upon, where their yes is yes and their no is no (Mt 5:37; Jas 5:12). Faith in the context of a healthy *oikos* means when mistakes are made or others are offended, peace and forgiveness is offered and received (Rom 12:18). Whilst it is God’s design for his people that these expressions of faith are increasingly reflective of the way the people of God relate (the Epistles exhort and encourage these behaviors), it is also the manner by which a person of faith should engage with a person not of faith and the manner by which a person not of faith engages with someone also not of faith. The question design seeks to enable anyone pursuing an increasingly flourishing life to respond to and interact with the questions. Accordingly, questions around this element of a healthy *oikos* – faith – have been identified and are documented in Appendix 1.

**Relationships**

As previously stated, relationships are the fabric of the kingdom of God, creating patterns of seen and unseen interconnectedness amongst humanity. Naturally, therefore,
relationships also are constitutive to the Body of Christ and to oikos. A richness of relationship in a faith community (Acts 2:42-47) is God’s desire and design.

However, there are some who are part of an association of people including the church who experience relational dislocation within that association. It is possible therefore within this oikos construct for someone to leave a church but it is not possible for someone to leave their oikos. The relational or social nature of oikos necessarily means participation in an oikos by almost everyone. That is, oikos does not exist without the connection of relationships. Oikos is described in previous chapters as the network of relationships or the sphere of relationships with a particular person. Chapter 4 explores and confirms the reality that relationships are the currency of the kingdom of God.

The Bible encourages us to invest our time into the things that will be passing into eternity. Only relationships continue into eternity. In John 17, Jesus taught his disciples to pray for a sweetness of relationships between the disciples of the disciples (Jn 17:22). The sweetness of our relationships will be a positive influence to those around us. John 13:33-34 says, “By this all men will know that you are my disciples, that you love one another.” Mike Frost in his book The Five Habits of Highly Missional People suggests that we are to live questionable lives as men and women of faith. Frost suggests, “Nothing would be more questionable in the 1st century than a slave who loved his master or a self-controlled young man or an old woman who didn’t engage in slander. In other
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words, this was Paul’s recipe for a questionable life in his time. Our challenge is to find what similarly questionable lives look like in the 21st century.”

The habits that Frost identifies are designed to help shape the expression of the values and beliefs of a Christian. All of the suggested habits are relationally oriented. Frost identifies these habits as bless, eat, listen, learn, and sent. As these habits are expressed through the lives of men and women who are disciples after the ways of the Lord, the message of Christian faith will be mediated through relationships. Those who are yet to understand the love of Christ will experience in action the kingdom of God, not merely espoused truths.

The questions that concern relationships must therefore be relationally oriented and the questions must seek to identify healthy aspects of relationships, not just any poor relationship. Thus elements of a healthy oikos are reflective in relationships where, for example, there is joy and laughter between one another; where there is openness and transparency, and where members of the relational network can share with one another. A healthy oikos exists where each member of the oikos can share their grievances they might have with one another, as well as their affection they may have for one another, and where members of the oikos can share how they are feeling.

A healthy oikos is an environment where members of the oikos can learn from one another and where one is not superior to all, but all adopt the posture of learners. Within the context of a healthy oikos, members of the oikos look to affirm one another when they see another member of the oikos doing something better than themselves. Relationships
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13 Ibid., 13.

14 Ibid., 17.
therefore are an integral part of a healthy *oikos* and questions that relate to relationships are captured in Appendix 1.

**Service**

The final element in this *oikos* construct is service. If faith describes the aspirational element of the *oikos* and relationships describe the emotional element, then service describes the practical aspect. Service is the orientation of one member of the *oikos* toward others of the *oikos* whereby they are seeking to make a practical difference and as a result, hopefully, an eternal difference, in the lives of *oikos* members and those beyond the *oikos*.

Ultimately, as some members of the *oikos* increasingly reflect the realities of the kingdom of God, the *missio Dei* will flow through the relationships within the *oikos*. Since faith in Jesus is not a requirement to participate in an *oikos*, some in the *oikos* will actively participate in the *missio Dei*, whilst others within the *oikos* might not even be aware of God’s purpose of *missio Dei* for his people. In this sense, some within the *oikos* will perceive themselves as actively engaging in mission within their *oikos*, whilst others will merely engage with and participate in an *oikos* because life is better when part of an *oikos*.

The aspect of service within the *oikos* construct seeks to understand the depths of the capability and giftedness of the member of the *oikos* and how that capability can be utilized for the betterment of those within and beyond the *oikos*. The apostle James states, “(s)how me your faith without deeds and I will show you my faith by my deeds” (Jas
2:18). The service of a person within the oikos is an expression of their world view of their faith position and of their relationships.

The early Christians devoted themselves to sacrificial acts of service. They loved their enemies and forgave their persecutors. They cared for the poor and fed the hungry. Paul writes in the letter to the Colossians 4:5-6, “Be wise in the way you act toward outsiders. Make the most of every opportunity. God’s desire is for humanity to serve one another in love.” As a result, “the Lord added daily to the number those who were being saved” (Acts 2:47). In Acts, God’s people lived a life after Jesus, which caused people to come to salvation through faith in Christ. Often, the salvific work of Christ flowed through and was as a result of service within a context of relationships.

Luke 22 records an interchange between the disciples and Jesus regarding who will be the greatest. Luke 22:26 captures these words of Christ, “The greatest among you must become like the youngest and the leader like the one who serves. For who is greater, the one who is at the table or the one who serves? Is it not the one at the table? But I am among you as one who serves.” Our service is not merely motivated by God’s love for us, but is motivated by the example provided by Christ. Within a healthy oikos, service is a natural expression of relationship.

Questions therefore that relate to the health of the element of service within an oikos center on the awareness the members of the oikos have of themselves and of each other, intentionality in developing the capabilities of themselves and others, seeking to go beyond serving those within the oikos to those beyond the oikos, experiencing the reciprocated benefits of serving one another in love, and looking for ways to be a blessing to others. Frost says blessing one another “is to build them up, to fill them with the
encouragement and to increase in strength and prosperity.” Members of the oikos can serve one another through words of affirmation, acts of kindness, and giving of resources and property. As a result, members of the oikos will enable others in the oikos to experience a flourishing life. The questions relating to service are identified in Appendix 1. The averaging of the results from the questions focused on relationships, from the questions focused on faith and the questions focused on service will produce a health measure for the oikos.

**Influence, Quality, Quantity**

The final elements of the statistical measures for the health of the oikos are influence, quality, and quantity. The methodology used to calculate these scores will be explored now. The influence of the leader of an oikos is measured in two ways. Firstly, it is measured by the response rate of those within his or her oikos to the invitation to complete the flourishing life survey. The greater response rate, the greater level of influence the leader of the oikos has over her or his members.

The second way influence is measured is by the relative response of the members of the oikos to the questions surrounding connectedness. Members were asked to provide a relative response on whether there is proactivity on the leader’s behalf to connect with the member, whether there is proactivity on the member’s behalf to connect with the leader, and whether the leader and member connect because both parties happen to be in the same physical space at the same time. The next three questions relate to how the leader influences the member. The member was asked to provide a relative response to
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how the leader influences how the member thinks, how the leader influences what the member does, and how the leader influences how the member feels about daily life.

The quality of health of an oikos is measured by averaging the scores of all responses to the questions by both the owners and the members. The higher the average score, the higher the health quality of the oikos. Conversely, the lower the average score of both the leader and his or her members, the lower the health quality of the oikos. In summary, the average of the faith, relationships, and service scores forms the overall health score of the oikos.

The last element to be considered in this section relates to quantity, that is, the size of the oikos. The size of the oikos is measured by the number of members identified by the leader of the oikos. The larger the number of people asked to participate in the survey, the larger the size of the oikos, and therefore the greater the quantity. The average size of the oikos will be identified and deviations against the average will be measured, thus the relative size of the oikos will be established for both Arrow leader participants and non-Arrow leader participants.

The results will therefore reveal measures for faith, relationship, and service influence in quality and quantity of the health of an oikos for both Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders. These results will be correlated to the denomination of the owners of oikos, the recency of Arrow participation of the owners of the oikos, the age of the owners of the oikos, the form of service or occupation of the leader of the oikos, and finally, correlated against time spent in current residence and the length of employment with past and present employers.
PART THREE

MINISTRY STRATEGY
CHAPTER 6
SURVEY RESULTS

The previous chapter outlined survey participation rates of Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders. This chapter highlights the results of the survey data, with great detailed contained in Appendix 3. Initial demographic observations are made about the sample of the population. Commentary is then provided about the measures of the health of oikos for past participants of Arrow Leadership, including faith, relationships, and service as well as the strength of influence, quality, and size of oikos. Pertinent observations are identified and propositions are made, reflective of the verifiable correlations and peculiarities.

General Observations

As indicated in the previous chapter, two surveys were conducted. The first survey asked both Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders to provide biographical data and data related to their perception of the realities of the kingdom of God. Fifty-six respondents participated in this survey.

The subsequent survey connected with this research project focused on the experiences of the realities of the kingdom of God by those in the social network or the
oikos of the leaders who participated in the initial survey. In total there were 276
respondents in this survey. The data is significant, enabling some pertinent observations
to be made about the impact of Arrow upon the lives of leaders and their oikos. On
average, Arrow leaders perceive that they are experiencing the realities of the kingdom of
God in a healthier manner than non-Arrow leaders. Forty-seven percent of the
respondents were male and 53 percent were female.

Denomination

The denominations from which the leaders who completed the survey included
Anglican Church (14 percent), Australian Christian Churches (11 percent), Baptist (30
percent), Churches of Christ (18 percent), Independent (2 percent), Presbyterian (2
percent), Salvation Army (13 percent), and other (11 percent). Within the other category,
churches included Closed Brethren, Full Gospel Church, Vineyard, and Fellowship of
Independent Evangelical Church. Two respondents indicated that there was no one
significant denomination which influenced their faith.

Arrow Participation

Seventy percent of the leaders were Arrow leaders, therefore 30 percent of
respondents were non-Arrow leaders. Amongst the Arrow leaders, 87 percent were
married, 5 percent were separated, and 8 percent were never married. Within the non-
Arrow leaders, 94 percent were married, zero percent were separated, and 6 percent were
never married.¹

¹ Biographical data was not collected from the survey participants who were members of an oikos
(and not leaders).
Age

There was a representative spread of ages of leader participants. It is noteworthy that the number of Arrow leaders ages thirty to thirty-nine is twice the amount of leaders who have not participated in Arrow. That is, more than 60 percent of Arrow leaders who completed the survey are under forty years old. Conversely, the percentage of leaders who have not completed Arrow between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-nine is twice that of the percentage of leaders between twenty-one and twenty-nine who have completed the Arrow program.

Occupation

A variety of different occupations were provided from which survey respondents could choose (see Appendix 2). Whilst there were only fifty-six survey respondents, 224 roles were identified by the fifty-six respondents, giving an average of almost four roles per respondent. The median number of roles, however, was two. The highest number of roles identified by any one respondent was fourteen.

Location and Time in Role

Of the respondents to this survey, 41 percent indicate that they attend a church service more than once per week, 52 percent indicate at least once a week, and 5 percent said they go once or twice per month. Clearly, the vast majority of respondents to the survey attend a worship service at least once a week. At least two-thirds of the respondents have four or five people living in their home. The data for Arrow leaders is similar with 71 percent of Arrow leaders having four or five people in their home.
The majority of leader respondents indicated they have lived in between five and nine homes as an adult. Similarly, the majority of leader respondents indicated that they have been living in their current home for three years or less. The vast majority of leader respondents also indicated that they have had less than ten employers during their adult life. Finally, over 40 percent of leader respondents indicated that they have been with their current employer for three years or less. This is a reflection of the highly mobile workforce in which the survey respondents live and work.

**Measures**

The previous section supplies demographic data connected with the survey respondents. This section explores the three measures that inform overall *oikos* quality: faith, relationships, and service. This section also explores the measure connected to influence, the quality of the *oikos*, and the size or quantity of the *oikos*. There is half a standard deviation differential between the quality of the *oikos* of someone who has participated in the Arrow Leadership course and a leader who has not. Within each of the three main elements of the *oikos* quality (faith, relationships, and service), Arrow leader respondents had higher quality than non-Arrow leaders.

**Faith**

Twelve questions connect with each of the elements of faith, relationships, and service. In regard to faith, there are a number of questions that were significantly different in response from Arrow leaders as opposed to non-Arrow leaders. The response of non-Arrow leaders was average for the question “I am willing to try new things, even if I might fail.” However, Arrow leaders were in the top one-third of responses in this
question. A similar distinctive relates to the question “My dreams for the future greatly motivate me.” Again, Arrow leaders’ responses sit within the top one-third of responses in regards to this question, whereas the responses of non-Arrow leaders sits at the top 42 percent, creating an 8 percent differential. A 9 percent differential is also noted in regards to the question “I find it easy to be joyful even in very challenging circumstances.”

Another interesting, notable positive differential (14 percent) relates to the question “I face each day without fear of other people (what they may say, what they may do, seeing, hearing from or speaking to particular people etc.).” This may be a reflection of the intentional resilience strategies that are developed within the lives of Arrow leaders. Another significant differential was noted in the question “I live daily life free of worry” where Arrow leaders were 19 percent healthier in their responses to this question than non-Arrow leaders. A similar differential was noted in the question “Even when faced with big challenges I rarely give up.” The sense of purposefulness and call that is engendered within an Arrow leader as they participate in an Arrow Leadership course is reflected in these results.

Relationships

Relationship is the second element of oikos quality. As previously indicated, Arrow leaders have a higher quality oikos by 5 percent compared to non-Arrow leaders. There is a significant and notable difference between the groups in response to the question “If I have a disagreement or difference of opinion with someone I do whatever I
can to understand his or her point of view.” Arrow leaders are almost 50 percent more likely than non-Arrow leaders to be intentional about resolving conflict.²

Arrow leaders responded 9 percent more favorably to the question “My lifestyle makes it easy to grow deeper relationships with my friends and family.” Another significant difference that was noted in the survey results is in regards to the question “I often tell others what I see in them that is better than in myself.” There was an 18 percent differential between Arrow leaders who indicated a more favorable response to this question than non-Arrow leaders.

Significant time is spent within the Arrow Leadership course on the importance of team and how working together with others who complement the leaders’ personality, giftedness, energies, and capacities enables great accomplishments. This differential is a reflection of the intentional training included in the Arrow Leadership development program. Again, Arrow leaders responded 9 percent more favorably to the question “I enjoy inviting people who are not my closest friends or family to a meal/to have a drink.” There is an intentional missional and outward focused culture that exists within the Emerging Leaders program where almost two days is spent on the priority and importance of personal evangelism in both words and actions.

²This is more than likely a reflection of the intentional inclusion of a conflict resolution training day incorporated into the Arrow Leadership development program. This training day enables and empowers leaders to have systems and processes to address conflict they may experience.
Service

The final element of *oikos* quality is service. As with the other elements, there are twelve questions that inform the overall result of this element of *oikos* quality. It is noteworthy that of the three elements, relationships, faith, and service, service had the biggest differential between Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders at 9 percent.

There was a 5 percent more positive response from Arrow leaders to the question “I know what I am better at than the people I spend most of my time with.” This is interesting to note because in an earlier question regarding the affirmation of those who are able to contribute in a unique and different way, the Arrow leader was not as well-developed as the non-Arrow leader. A similar differential was also noted to the question “I get to serve other people by doing what I’m best at.” Encouragingly, the expression of love in the form of faithfulness is well-developed for Arrow leaders at a rate of 6 percent over and above non-Arrow leaders and is reflected in the question “I follow through and do what I say I’m going to do.”

To the question “I often look for ways to share my money, possessions and property to benefit other people” Arrow leaders were 7 percent more developed than non-Arrow leaders. At a similarly positive differential, Arrow leaders responded favorably to the question “I look for chances to help others learn how to do what I can do well.” This is a reflection of the strength of the Arrow leader since the leader desires to help others grow and develop. There is a significant difference between Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders in their response to the question “I look for ways to improve my skills.” Arrow leaders are 25 percent more developed than non-Arrow leaders in regards to proactive growth and development of their skill set. A surprising and encouraging
significant differential between answers from Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders is in
regards to the question “I find it easy to stay focused on the most important thing at any
given time.” Arrow leaders answered this question with a 22 percent healthier response
than non-Arrow leaders. These results were encouraging and are generally a reflection of
the positive impact the Arrow Leadership programs have made to the participants over
the last twenty-two years.

**Statistical Analysis, Correlations, and Peculiarities**

As data has been collected from both Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders
concerning the quality of the *oikos* and demographic data, it is possible to explore links
between demographics of Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders and the quality of an
*oikos*. This section of the project explores observable trends connected with varying
demographic information. Particularly this section of the project looks at links between
denomination and quality of *oikos*, Arrow participation and quality of *oikos*, age and
quality of *oikos*, occupation, location, and time in the role and quality of *oikos*. Other
observations are also made in this section.

**Denomination**

The two healthiest denominations as measured by the leader respondents to the
survey are The Salvation Army at 59 percent and the Anglican Church at 58 percent. The
denomination that received the lowest measure of *oikos* quality was the Baptist Church.
Within each theme of the *oikos* quality measure, The Salvation Army had the healthiest
*oikos* element of service at 64 percent and faith at 65 percent. Surprisingly, with an
almost 15 percent differential, the second-lowest score for the quality of the theme of
relationships within an *oikos* was 48 percent for The Salvation Army. The lowest score in regards to relationships was the Baptist Church.

**Arrow Participation**

Survey participants were asked to respond to the statement “I have hope for the future of my local church in its present form.” The majority of leaders were very positive in this regard. However, Arrow leaders who participated in the survey had a higher quality *oikos* than the average leader who responded “agree,” “slightly agree” or “strongly agree.”

**Age**

Age seems to significantly impact the quality of an *oikos*. It would appear that the healthiest *oikos* sits within the age bracket of fifty to fifty-nine. This aligns with Robert Clinton’s book *The Making of a Leader: Recognising the Lessons and Stages of Leadership Development* where he indicates having moved through the prior phases of leadership development from sovereign foundations to inner life growth to ministry maturing to life maturing, to a phase of leadership development which he calls convergence.³ Clinton suggests that God opens a distinct role for leaders that showcases the best of what they have to offer. There is a clear fit between the needs of the ministry and the gifts of the leader. By this phase leaders are unencumbered by a need to please everyone at all times. Leaders in this phase do not feel pressured to do things that they are
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simply not gifted to do. This phase is the culmination of the previous four phases. Many leaders fail to reach this phase because of an inability to move beyond the earlier stages.

However, an Arrow leader’s oikos is higher quality in the age brackets thirty to thirty-nine, forty to forty-nine, fifty to fifty-nine, and over sixty compared to non-Arrow leaders. The Arrow Leadership development program is a confluence of capability, calling, and character. The development of a leader’s character prepares him or her for the future work to which God has called that leader.

**Occupation**

Given that 40 percent of survey respondents are involved in some form of pastoral ministry, it is appropriate to examine the correlations between pastoral ministry and the quality of oikos. Of the three pastoral ministry roles from which respondents could choose, the senior pastor role possessed the highest quality of oikos at 57 percent, followed very closely by the executive pastor role at 56 percent. Interestingly, for those serving in associate pastoral roles, the quality of oikos was less than 50 percent at 48 percent. Within the three elements of relationships, service, and faith, the element of faith for the senior pastor role had the highest oikos quality at 64 percent. The lowest element of oikos quality was for associate pastors at 46 percent was in regards to the faith element.

**Location and Time in Role**

There are some interesting observations to be made as we examine the quality of an oikos and contrast it to the number of people in one’s home. There is a direct correlation between quality of oikos and the number of people with whom you live.
Intuitively, this is not surprising. If there is an ability to function well within the home then there is an ability to function well and have a healthy *oikos* with those beyond one’s home. The results were encouraging in regards to the natural training environment that exists within a home environment for family members to live and promote a healthy *oikos* which naturally includes the persons with whom the leader lives, assuming that the family environment is healthy.

Like the average leader, Arrow leaders with six people in their home have the highest quality of *oikos* for the element of service at 76 percent. The lowest is for the Arrow leader with one person in their household for the element of relationship at 42 percent. Another element of research was to explore the relationship, if any, between the number of homes in which the survey respondents lived and the quality of their *oikos*. The hypothesis is that the less transitory you are in your life, the easier and deeper relationships will be, therefore the higher quality the *oikos*. Whilst there is not a clear indirect relationship between the number of homes in which respondents have lived in their adult life and the health of the *oikos*, there is a very close indirect relationship between these two elements. In other words, the less number of homes in an adult has lived, the higher quality the *oikos*.

Another interesting relationship was between the number of years in current home and quality of *oikos*. It was assumed there would be a direct relationship between the number of years one has been at the present home and the quality of the *oikos*. That is, the lower the number of years one has been at the home, the lower the *oikos* quality; the higher the number of years one has been at the home, the higher the *oikos* quality. However, the statistics did not bear this out. There was an almost parabolic relationship.
The respondents who had been in their home for six to nine years had the highest quality *oikos* and those who had been in their home for less or more than six to nine years had lower quality in their *oikos*. The relationship between number of years in current home and quality of *oikos* was even more erratic for Arrow leaders, where those who had been in the home for two to three years or six to nine years or more than twenty years all had approximately the same quality of *oikos*.

A relationship was also explored between the number of employers that respondents had and their level of *oikos* quality. There was quite a strong indirect relationship between the number of employers respondents had and *oikos* quality. That is, the smaller the number of employers, the greater level of *oikos* quality. This was true for all leaders and even more so for Arrow leaders. However, it needs to be noted that for Arrow leaders who have had ten or more employers in their life, their *oikos* quality was significantly less than the average leader surveyed through this project.

The last connection that was hypothesized was between the number of years with the current employer and the level of *oikos* quality. The idea was that the greater the number of years with the current employer, the greater level of *oikos* quality. This direct relationship was in fact revealed through the data collected. There was almost a direct relationship between the number of years with current employer and the *oikos* quality. For both Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders, there was a distinct differential of at least 10 percent between those who had been with their current employer for ten to fourteen years and those who had been with their current employer for fifteen years or more, suggesting there is something unique around being faithful to employers which increases
*oikos* quality. This reality intersecting with an increasingly mobile workforce would be worthy of further exploration.

It is apparent from the summary data conveyed in this chapter and the detailed data in Appendix 3 that overall, an Arrow leader’s *oikos* is greater in quality than a non-Arrow leader’s *oikos*. Additionally, the data suggests that the longer a leader stays in one context, or a small number of contexts, which contains a larger number of relationships, the higher quality their *oikos*. The implications of these findings are explored in chapter 7.
CHAPTER 7
OIKOS HEALTH DEVELOPMENT

The previous chapter provides headline data concerning survey participation rates of Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders. This chapter focuses on identifying and developing strategies for oikos health development for Arrow leaders. It examines the relative influence of an oikos of a past Arrow Leadership program participant, the size of their oikos, and the quality of their oikos measured through a threefold paradigm of faith, relationships, and service. This chapter then proposes possible enhancements to the Arrow Leadership Program, incorporating recruitment, delivery, and post program participation. Finally this chapter explores the effects of an increase in health of an oikos for the communities in which the Arrow Leadership participant serves.

Oikos Health

For the purposes of this thesis, the overall measure of oikos health is a function of influence (the strength of a leader’s influences within his or her oikos), quantity or size (how many people are part of the leader’s oikos), and quality (the relative development of faith, relationships and service within the oikos). The fusion of these three measures creates an ability to provide a standardized measure by which is compare oikos. The data
confirms that Arrow leaders have a healthier oikos than non-Arrow leaders. Each element will be explored in turn.

Oikos Influence

For the purposes of this project, oikos influence has been measured in two ways.\(^1\) The first measure is the strength of response from those perceived to be in the leaders’ oikos and those members who actually responded to the request to complete the survey. This measure is premised on the concept that if the oikos leader has strong influence over the members of his or her oikos, a request to do the survey would be responded to favorably. If however the influence is minimal or weak, then the response rate would be less. That is, the oikos leader perceives he or she has more influence over more people than he or she actually possesses.

The results flowing from this first measure of influence reveal that the average response rate for both Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders is very similar. This suggests that the perception carried by all leaders concerning the size of their influence within their oikos is approximately the same. There are a number of interesting observations.

For Arrow leaders who perceive their oikos has more than ten people in it, their average influence rate is 56 percent. However, for non-Arrow leaders, the equivalent average influence rate is 48 percent. This suggests that for larger oikos, Arrow leaders have greater levels of influence. Conversely, for Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders

---

\(^1\) Johnstone, NCD Australia, and the author have developed the relative measures for oikos influence, quantity, and quality. These measures mirror the metrics used to assess church health within the Natural Church Development paradigm. As all data was standardized. Deviations from the mean are key measurements.
who perceive their oikos has less than ten people in it, their average influence rate is the same at 60 percent.

The second measure is determined by oikos members’ responses to the series of questions about how they relate to the leader within their oikos. Survey respondents were asked to describe the circumstances in which they connect with the oikos leader and the extent to which the oikos leader influences the way the member thinks, feels, and acts in daily life. The average measure of influence is almost identical both sets of leaders.

An Arrow leader is more likely to initiate engagement with an oikos member than a non-Arrow leader. Similarly, an oikos member of an oikos of an Arrow leader is more likely to initiate contact with the Arrow leader than an oikos member of a non-Arrow leader. The final question relating to the circumstances by which an oikos leader and oikos member connect suggests that the difference between an Arrow leader and non-Arrow leader connecting with their oikos member is marginal. There is a greater desire on both the Arrow leader and his or her oikos member to initiate contact with each other than non-Arrow leaders and their oikos members.

The second set of questions relates to the way a leader in an oikos influences an oikos member. An Arrow leader is less likely to influence the way an oikos member thinks about things in daily life than a non-Arrow leader. Similarly, an Arrow leader is less likely to influence the way an oikos member feels in daily life than a non-Arrow. This suggests that non-Arrow leaders influence the feelings of oikos members more significantly than Arrow leaders.

The final question in this set relates to how an oikos members acts in daily life. An oikos member of an oikos of an Arrow leader is more likely to be influenced in the
way the *oikos* member acts in daily life by the Arrow leader than an *oikos* member of a non-Arrow leader. Interestingly, whilst an Arrow leader influences less the way an *oikos* member thinks or feels, an Arrow leader influences more than a non-Arrow leader the way the *oikos* member acts in daily life. These results will inform possible changes to the Arrow Program.

*Oikos Quantity*

The average perceived size of an *oikos* of an Arrow leader is 8.3 people. The non-Arrow leader equivalent is ten people. Similarly, the actual response rate by *oikos* members of an Arrow leader is 4.8 people. This compares to a non-Arrow leader equivalent of 5.2 people. This means that a non-Arrow leader perceives his or her *oikos* to be larger than an Arrow leader and the actual size measured by response of an *oikos* of a non-Arrow leader is larger than that of an Arrow leader. As indicated earlier, however, the response or influence rate is higher for Arrow leaders. This suggests that there is a slightly inverted relationship between the size of *oikos* and the influence rate. That is, the smaller the *oikos*, the higher influence rate.

It is also noted that the quality of the *oikos* of an Arrow leader is higher than that of a non-Arrow leader. It is suggested therefore that the reality of the kingdom of God expressed through the *oikos* of an Arrow leader should be exposed to more people. The non-Arrow leader has a larger perceived and actual *oikos*, though the quality of their *oikos* is less. Accordingly, the Arrow leader could choose to be more deliberate to express the realities of the kingdom of God with more people, allowing more people to experience healthier expressions of the kingdom of God than their non-Arrow
counterparts. Greater consideration will now be given to oikos quality and the impact upon the Arrow Program.

Oikos Quality

As indicated in the previous chapter, the overall health of an oikos of an average Arrow leader is stronger than that of a non-Arrow leader. At a question level, the differences between an Arrow leader and non-Arrow leader vary by as much as 34 percent across each of the three main elements of faith, relationships, and service. However, Arrow leaders were on average consistently healthier than their non-Arrow leader peers. These three elements will now be examined in detail. The subsequent section of this paper then proposes, in light of this information, potential enhancements to the Arrow Leadership Development Program.

Faith

In regard to the element of faith, the average quality of the oikos of Arrow leaders is higher than the oikos of a non-Arrow leader and of an average oikos member. Given the specific focus of the Arrow Leadership Program is on being led more by Jesus, these results are not surprising. However, the results of individual questions provide helpful information.

The question that forms part of the faith element of an oikos that was the highest quality for an Arrow leader contrasted to that of a non-Arrow leader was, “I live daily life free of worry.” A similar differential is noted to the responses to the question, “Even when faced with big challenges, I rarely give up.” The strength of these contrasts points towards the unwavering belief an Arrow leader has in their call (expressed within the
Arrow Program as a personal vision statement), in their assignment (the current vocational expression of that calling), and in the enduring provision of Jehovah in their life (Gn 22:14; Ps 23:1-6; Phil 4:19), which is a reflection of the capability content of the program.

Positive contrasts between individual questions that inform the faith element of the quality measure of oikos of the average Arrow leader and the average oikos member also exist. For example, a one standard deviation differential exists between an Arrow leader and the average oikos member regarding the question, “My dreams for the future greatly motivate me.” A similar differential was noted regarding the question, “I am more than willing to try new things even if I might fail.” The results are indicative of a faith infused and informed future encouraged throughout the participants’ time in the Arrow Leadership Program.

Relationships

In regards to the element of relationships, the average quality of the oikos of Arrow leaders is higher than the oikos of a non-Arrow leader by a small margin and by an even smaller margin than an average oikos member. The difference of the relational element of oikos quality is the smallest of all three elements. Nonetheless, Arrow leaders still experience a higher quality oikos. Differences in specific questions provide greater insight.

The question that forms part of the relationships element of an oikos which was the highest quality for an Arrow leader contrasted to that of a non-Arrow leader was, “If I have a disagreement or difference of opinion with someone, I do whatever I can to
understand his or her point of view.” The difference was one standard deviation. Similarly, in regards to the responses to the question, “I often tell others what I see in them that is better than in myself,” Arrow leader respondents are similarly more developed in \( oikos \) quality than that of a non-Arrow leader respondent. The strength of these contrasts points towards the intentional inclusion of a conflict resolution module within the program (Rom 12:18; Heb 12:14) and of team work modules within the program (Eph 4:1-16).\(^2\)

Positive contrasts between individual questions that inform the relationships element of the quality measure of \( oikos \) of the average Arrow leader and the average \( oikos \) member also exist. For example, strong differential exists regarding the question, “I enjoy inviting people, who are not my closest friends or family, to a meal or to have a drink.” This result reflects an intentional desire of an Arrow leader to be personally evangelistic, embracing the final aspect of the Arrow International Alliance, “to lead more to Jesus.” It is also indicative of the intentional inclusion of a module on personal evangelism within the program.

Similarly, the Arrow leader was more developed than the average member of an \( oikos \) regarding the question, “I actively look for what I can learn from those around me.” This result points toward an intentional focus within the Arrow Program on living a life as a disciple (in Greek \( mathétés \), “learner”) and on working within a collaborative team context to facilitate leadership of a church or organization. The final theme of \( oikos \) quality, service, is considered next.

\(^2\) The teamwork framework used is the material contained in James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner, \textit{The Leadership Challenge} (San Francisco: Wiley, 2013).
Service

For the element of service, the average quality of the oikos of Arrow leaders is higher than the oikos of an average non-Arrow leader and an average oikos member. Clearly, in regards to the service theme of the measure of the quality of an oikos, Arrow leaders experience a higher quality oikos than both groups. Nonetheless, some interesting observations can be made as individual questions are examined.

The question that forms part of the service element of an oikos that was the highest quality for an Arrow leader contrasted to that of a non-Arrow leader by one standard deviation differential was, “I find it easy to stay focused on the most important thing at a given time.” A critical skill of a leader is the ability to discern between good, better, and best decisions concerning the allocation of time. Within the Emerging Leaders Program, there are modules that focus on the strategic use and allocation of time and on understanding the leader’s unique contribution to the church in which her or she serves. Such a significant difference is therefore not surprising.

A slightly smaller differential was noted in regards to the responses to the question, “I look for ways to improve my skills.” A similar differential is noted between an Arrow leader and the average oikos member. The strength of these contrasts is reflective of the priority given to life-long learning for Arrow leaders. Woven throughout the whole program is the priority for a leader of ongoing development and growth (Rom 12:2; 2 Cor 3:16-18; Gal 4:19).
Arrow Leaders Program Enhancements

The responses to the majority of questions measuring the quality of an oikos were more favorable for Arrow leaders than both non-Arrow leaders and oikos members. Given the focus Arrow Leadership has on the development of leaders, naturally a focus on development also exists at an organizational and programmatic level. Accordingly, the questions for which non-Arrow leaders and oikos members responded more favorably than Arrow leaders will inform program enhancements.

There were a number of questions in which Arrow leader respondents scored an oikos quality score lower than a non-Arrow leader respondent and an oikos member respondent concerning the faith theme of oikos health. For the questions, “I feel at peace and forgiven for the things I’ve done wrong to others during my life” and “I look for honest feedback about my life and what I do,” there were negative differentials associated with the Arrow and non-Arrow leader contrast. Similarly, the question “I face each day without fear of other people (e.g. what they may do or say; seeing, hearing from or speaking to particular people, etc)” also returned a small negative differential when contrasting an Arrow leader and the average oikos member health.

Similarly, in regards to the relationships theme of oikos quality, there were a number of questions in which Arrow leader respondents scored an oikos health score lower than a non-Arrow leader or an oikos member respondent. “Even when others do things wrong, I am patient and give them time to learn and grow,” and “(m)y lifestyle makes it easy to grow deeper relationships with my friends and family,” were the questions with the largest negative differentials between an Arrow and non-Arrow leader and between an Arrow leader and oikos member respectively. Smaller negative
differentials also existed for Arrow leaders contrasted to *oikos* members for the questions, “In practical ways, I show care for the living things that enrich my life (e.g. plants, animals, waterways, land, etc.)” and “When I see that someone has done something well or improved in some way, I make sure I tell them.”

There were two questions associated with the service theme of *oikos* quality for which the average non-Arrow leaders and *oikos* member scored marginally higher than the average Arrow leader. There was a marginal negative differential for the question “I discipline my body as much as physically possible (e.g. physical activity, eating well, getting enough sleep, etc.)” between both non-Arrow leaders and *oikos* members. A similarly small negative differential existed between an Arrow leader and a non-Arrow leader for the question, “I always ask for help with things that, for whatever reason, I am less able to do.” Both questions will inform potential changes to the program.

**Changes to Identifying Potential Participants for the Program**

The results identified in the preceding material regarding quality of *oikos* and age suggest that the focus that the Emerging Leaders Program has on leaders between the ages of twenty-five and forty is an appropriate age bracket. Helping leaders navigate this significant period of transition in leadership (from being directly involved in ministry to effecting ministry vicariously through the empowerment of others within a church context) is constitutive of the Emerging Leaders Program. The result of such supportive navigation is healthier *oikos* in their latter ministry years.

Developing leaders who live in a home with more than two people possess a healthier *oikos*. Arguably, when selecting program participants, a preference might be
given to those potential participants who are living in the context of community than those who are living by themselves or with only one other person. It could also be contended that a preference should be given to potential participants who have had less employers during their working life and who have been with their current employer for a longer period of time. Choosing participants who reflect these targets may result in a stronger kingdom influence in the context of their relationships.

Changes to Structure and Context of the Program

The results of the oikos project did not directly address the structure or the context of the program. It is arguable that the structure of the Arrow program be maintained given that the methodology is reflective of an imbued high quality oikos. That is, the residential and non-residential elements of the Arrow Program foster healthy peer relationships between leaders who are culturally, linguistically, and geographically diverse and who represent a variety of Christian traditions and denominations.

In light of some of the negative differentials in questions identified above, it could also be argued that an intentional structure around exercise and food consumption be integrated into the structure of the residential weeks. This might take the form of pre-plated dining (rather than a buffet style offering) and intentional exercise breaks for program participants. Naturally such changes would need to be complemented by changes to the content of the program, as described below.

Changes to the Content of the Program

Given the number of specific areas where non-Arrow leaders and oikos members have a greater level of oikos health than Arrow leaders, there are some proposed content
changes. These curriculum changes are focused on achieving a different outcome than that which is presently being achieved within the curriculum design. The proposed changes are reflective of growth opportunities for Arrow leaders where their oikos health level is less than that of others who participated in the survey.

The first and most significant outcome change needs to be around the survey question “I feel at peace and forgiven for the things I’ve done wrong to others during my life.” Program participants should experientially comprehend the freedom that is conveyed through Christ’s work on the cross from past wrongs (Jn 8:36; Rom 8:1; Heb 12:1). Arrow leaders serving in the church context need to express confidence in the redemptive power of salvation for past, present, and future sins. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to do so with integrity if he or she has not experienced this reality personally. Some suggested programmatic changes include incorporating some of the teaching on freedom from past sins, hurts, and wrongs such as Cleansing Streams, Twelve Step Recovery Program, or Cycle of Grace/Grief. The ability of an Arrow leader to pass on to others within his or her oikos the freedom connected to God’s love is a function of him or her first experiencing this freedom (1 Jn 4:7-21).

The next survey question that shows a need for program improvement is “I look for honest feedback about my life and what I do.” Feedback is critical for any form of development, especially for leaders. Arrow leaders show a strong propensity to proactively improve their skills. However, the identification of what to develop or improve seems to be identified by the leader him or herself rather than providing an

---

opportunity for input from others whom the Arrow leader leads. A suggested change is to incorporate into the “Leadership Development Plan” module a process whereby feedback is proactively solicited from those they lead, so that such feedback becomes normative, not exceptional.

Sometimes a leader can be frustrated in their service when activities are not executed by those within the church with the precision and timeliness expected, as evidenced by Arrow leaders’ responses to “Even when others do things wrong, I am patient and give them time to learn and grow.” However, one of the roles of the leader is to create structures and environments where disciples can flourish in their development. Patience, as a fruit of the Spirit, is a character developmental issue for the leader and something that needs to be reflected in the Arrow materials (Gal 5:22). Suggested changes include some teaching on 3 Colors of Love or modification of the material connected to Disciple Making (Residential Two).4

Another area to address in the program is revealed by Arrow leaders’ answers to “My lifestyle makes it easy to grow deeper relationships with my friends and family.” Work life balance is a critical issue for a leader wanting to live a flourishing life. Managing the tension between working heartily as if for the Lord and investing in family, friends, and social pursuits is a constant priority (Col 3:23). Sadly, it seems as if the lifestyle of Arrow leaders legislates against the easy development of relationships with family and friends. Suggested changes could be to introduce a new module on healthy relationships, work life balance or amend the existing module on strategic allocation of time.

4 Christian Schwarz, 3 Colors of Love (St Charles: ChurchSmart Resources, 2004).
Arrow leaders also scored on average lower (compared to oikos members) on the survey question “In practical ways, I show care for the living things that enrich my life (e.g. plants, animals, waterways, land, etc.).” Teaching on ecology, creation care and stewardship of natural resources does not form part of the curriculum of the Arrow Leadership Development Program. Given the limited time in residential, it would be difficult to identify what module to displace in order to accommodate something on creation care. However, suggested changes could be to include biblical teaching on creation care for one of the residential, post- or pre-residential reading and assignment work, or an optional activity during free time that focuses on ecology.

Changes also need to be made based on the answers to “When I see that someone has done something well or improved in some way, I make sure I tell them.” The authority leaders possess is one to build people up and not tear them down (2 Cor 10:8, 13:10). Arrow leaders need additional encouragement to purposefully and intentionally identify and express appreciation and encouragement to those they lead. Suggested changes could be to emphasize the “Encourage the Heart” aspect of the Team Leadership module and spend time intentionally encouraging one another during one or more residential.5

Whilst the differential was small for the question “I feel a strong connection with my neighbourhood and the people who live there,” Arrow leaders feel less of a connection with their neighborhood than non-Arrow leaders. Further investigation into this reality would need to be undertaken to understand the driving forces behind this

5 The teamwork framework used is the material contained in James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner, The Leadership Challenge (San Francisco: Wiley, 2013).
response. It might be that Arrow leaders feel as if they are working on or for their neighbors rather than working with or amongst their neighbors. Until greater insight into the driver for this collective response is acquired, no recommendation regarding changes to the program will be made.

Non-Arrow leaders are more inclined to ask for help than Arrow leaders when confronted with a task that they are less able to do according to the responses to the question “I always ask for help with things that, for whatever reason, I am less able to do.” This question in some way relates to the question concerning affirming or encouraging those around them. It might be that the Arrow leader is struggling to acutely discern unique or distinctive contributions by those with whom he or she works. Proposed changes could include greater emphasis during the team module on the importance of team members’ complimentary skills. Additionally the program could ask Arrow leaders to describe practically how they will or have changed their team leadership style to embrace the differences that exist within their team.

“I discipline my body as much as physically possible (e.g. physical activity, eating well, getting enough sleep, etc.).” As indicated in the previous section, a change in the structure of the program might assist in the development of this aspect of the expression of the kingdom of God by an Arrow leader. Training could be provided on the importance of health, diet, exercise, and physical training. Training could be affected by material that needs to be accessed prior to the residential or a new module could be included during the residential that focuses on this particular element.
Changes to Ongoing Engagement with Past Participants

As previously indicated, training and development has a number of different levels of impact. Initially, it relates to the participant’s experience of the training and development sessions and whether or not the participant enjoys that time. The next level of impact is connected to change of understanding or knowledge when the participant acquires new information. The related subsequent level of impact is change in behavior, where the new information acquired results in behavioral change of the participant. The fourth level of impact is change in behavior of those being led by the participant, that is, the team connected with the participant behaves and functions differently. Finally, the last level of impact is organizational change wherein the impact upon the participant was so significant there were intentional efforts to transfer the knowledge and practices of the participant to those within the broader organization.

Participant feedback regarding experience has been very high. Cognitive and behavioral change has been researched, affirmed, and documented. Nonetheless, catalyzing ongoing development is critical. Past participants of Arrow Leadership engage with each other and Arrow Leadership in different ways. Some cohorts and state groups connect on their own initiative after their formal participation in the Arrow Leadership Program. To date, engagement by Arrow Leadership has generally been reactive rather than proactive.

However, with the appointment of the Arrow Community Director last year, intentional efforts are being made to connect with Arrow leaders to affirm in them the
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knowledge acquired during Arrow participation and to confirm change in life and ministry practice as a result. Additionally, the Arrow Community Director is facilitating connection between Arrow leaders from different cohorts and different expressions of the Arrow Leadership program. Engagement by the Arrow leaders with their oikos will now be explored.

**Oikos Community Engagement**

The average quality of an oikos of an Arrow leader is more developed than the average health of an oikos of a non-Arrow leader in thirty of the thirty-six aspects of the kingdom of God which were measured as part of this project. As a result, the ability of the Arrow leader to express naturally and intentionally these kingdom realities with those in his or her oikos will result in more people experiencing the good news of the kingdom of God. Developing oikos engagement will now be explored.

**Existing Oikos**

Whilst the average Arrow leader has thirty aspects of the kingdom of God well developed as compared to other leaders, every individual Arrow leader will have their own aspects more and less developed. Though the strategy for oikos engagement and development will be similar for Arrow leaders, the specific aspects of development will differ. Any person wishing to develop the health of their oikos will be encouraged to engage with people, with a view to permanently including them as part of their oikos, who are more developed in particular aspects of the realities of the kingdom of God than that leader.
One way an Arrow leader could grow the quality of his or her oikos is by inviting the whole or part of his or her oikos to engage with people who are better developed at the identified areas in which the oikos of the Arrow leader wishes to develop. Alternately, the whole or part of the oikos could engage in practices and behaviors that readily reflect identified areas of the kingdom of God which the oikos of the Arrow leader wishes to develop. Further the oikos could participate in a formalized program or training that focuses on the area in which the Arrow leader is hoping to develop. The natural result of an oikos participating in these practices is an expanding oikos.

Expanding Oikos

An oikos will naturally and organically grow as people observe or experience flourishing lives and want to engage with these practices themselves. That said, an oikos can also be intentionally stewarded as something which God has graciously extended to an Arrow leader. Consideration needs to be given to balancing between these two extremes of the same continuum.

The biblical evidence suggests that many people were attracted to the life and ministry of Jesus, as Jesus himself epitomized the reality of living under the rule and reign of God. Jesus was both incarnational and attractional. His words, “let your good deeds shine out for all to see, so that everyone will praise your heavenly Father” (Mt 4:14-16) confirm that the good deeds – deeds reflective of the kingdom of God – will be seen by others and cause praise to be offered to God in heaven. The life of Jesus alerted to those around him that the kingdom of God was now amongst them. Christ’s behaviors and practices were indicative of the coming kingdom.
A healthy oikos will be attractive and incarnational, as it reflects the practices and behaviors of a group of people who choose to live a life under God’s rule and reign. An oikos therefore is something that experiences growth and ultimately multiplication as new nodes of influence are developed within an existing oikos. As two and perhaps more nodes of influence develop, each new oikos will adopt its own health and culture, reflective in some ways of the kingdom of God.

At the same time, a stewardship reality arises when an Arrow leader recognizes God’s grace toward him or her to experience a kingdom and godly influence. To whom much is given, much is expected (Lk 12:48). According to our faith, talents are given to God’s people to be used for kingdom purposes (Mt 25:14-30). Therefore an intentional strategy in expanding an oikos could also be deployed whereby different oikos members strategically place themselves in the context of new relationships to be metaphorical salt, light and yeast (Lk 10:1, Mt 5:13-16 and 13:33). An Arrow leader can exercise his or her kingdom influence to point people towards the rule and reign of God by demonstrating and declaring the realities of the kingdom. An oikos is not a bounded set, which means all with whom the Arrow leader comes in contact can experience, in some form, the coming of the kingdom.

Technology to Enhance Oikos

Technology continues to develop, which can act as an enabler, enhancer, or accelerator of oikos development both within the oikos and beyond it. Social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat, and Instagram enable the development of oikos beyond physical proximate relationships. There is, however, a limit to which the
kingdom of God can be encountered because of the very tactile, kinesthetic nature of the good news of the kingdom.\footnote{It is noted that the opportunity for Christians to experience the enriching benefits of living, loving, and serving together in community is a grace granted by God and is something that is not experienced by all Christians around the world. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, \textit{Life Together: The Classic Exploration of Faith in Community} (San Francisco: Harper, 1978), 20.}

As mentioned earlier, the realities of the kingdom of God can be mediated through existing common social media platforms. There are also many apps for smart phones that create pathways for connection, collaboration, and sharing which may have been more difficult than that previously experienced. For example, the You Version Bible App developed by Life Church enables users to read then easily share their biblical revelations with people within their social network (\textit{oikos}). Similarly, the platform Slack enables geographically disparate people (members of an \textit{oikos}) to plan, collaborate, and schedule activities and ideas. Not surprisingly, there are many technologically based options that enable \textit{oikos} members to connect. Perhaps Arrow leaders could have their own app which would allow them to easily stay connected beyond the program.

An app for Arrow leaders would provide a place to share contemporary thoughts on leadership, sharing of resources, new ideas, and suggestions for evangelism and ministry as well as suggesting books, articles, or blogs that are relevant for the practice of Christian leadership in Australia. It would also provide integration with an electronic calendar system whereby activities can be scheduled within the calendar. It would support Arrow leaders in intentionally developing their \textit{oikos}. This idea is being explored with the current Arrow Community from which project costs and implementation time lines can be established. Technology is not the driver of the motivation to grow \textit{oikos}, but it enables the motivation to grow an \textit{oikos} to be implemented with greater ease.
priority is on technology being the servant not the master in the development of anything, but especially oikos.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The *oikos* project was initiated with the intent to explore the extent by which the realities of the kingdom of God are expressed in the lives of Arrow leaders and those in their network of relationships or sphere of influence (the health of their *oikos*). The average health results of Arrow leaders were contrasted with the average health results of leaders who have not undertaken the Arrow Leadership program as well as with other men and women of faith (non-leaders). The hypothesis was that, as a result of participation in the Arrow Leadership programs, Arrow leaders would have higher health levels of expressions of the kingdom of God and a healthier *oikos*. The outcomes confirmed the hypothesis and provided other compelling insights.

As indicated in previous chapters, the *oikos* of an Arrow leader was on average healthier than that of non-Arrow leader, as assessed by the synthesis of measures for the relative influence of a leader in their *oikos*, the relative quantity or size of the leader’s *oikos*, and the relative quality of the leader’s *oikos*. The average expressions of the kingdom of God by an Arrow leader are healthier than the average expressions of the kingdom of God by a non-Arrow leader. However, for some individual questions reflecting expressions of the kingdom of God, the average response from an Arrow leader was not as well developed as responses from non-Arrow leaders.

The data points to a number of insights which have been previously identified, including the direct relationship between the health of an *oikos* and the number of people who live in the same household as the leader; the indirect relationship between the number of years of service with a current employer and the health of an *oikos*; and the
indirect relationship between the number of homes in which a leader has lived as an adult and the health of an oikos.

There are a number of next steps that may be appropriate after the completion of this project. One such step relates to expanding the number of data sets. It would beneficial to expand the data sets collected from Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders, both within Australia and in other countries in which Arrow Leadership operates. This would enable ready comparison of the ministry of Arrow Leadership in different countries, boost understanding of leadership traits, and benefit more leaders. A larger data set would potentially reduce the margin for error and increase the confidence level accordingly.

The Myoikos Project upon which Johnstone is presently working could be finalized. This technology would allow greater accessibility to the myoikos survey and connectivity with others who are similarly minded. Additionally, individual reports for leaders could be produced, helping each leader to identify a strategy to celebrate the aspects in which they represent the kingdom of God well and to develop those aspects in which they are yet to fully express the kingdom of God.

The results of the surveys utilized in connection with this thesis were very encouraging for the quality of the transformative effect of the Arrow Leadership Program upon participants. However, the results also pointed towards opportunities for development of the program. Whilst some suggestions on how to effect improvements to these areas through the Arrow Leadership Program have been identified in the previous
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chapter, a more collaborative approach will be adopted before acting upon any suggested changes.

These development areas will be discussed with the Arrow staff team and volunteer coordinators with a view to modifying the curriculum, content, structure, or methodology of the program. These discussions will be facilitated in a workshop style format so as to solicit a variety of perspectives on the best modifications from the key stakeholders of the program. It is anticipated that the modifications, upon implementation, will enhance the realities of the kingdom of God in the lives of leader participants, as well as the people in their oikos.

There were thirty-six questions reflective of the kingdom of God under consideration in the survey process. Of the thirty-six questions, six questions were at a greater level of development in the lives of a non-Arrow leader than that of Arrow leaders. The most significantly different aspects were, “Even when others do things wrong, I am patient and give them time to learn and grow,” “I look for honest feedback about my life and what I do,” and “I always ask for help with things that, for whatever reason, I am less able to do.”

Like any system, changes effected in one aspect of the program may have unintended adverse consequences on other priorities within the program. Wisdom and discretion will be required when determining what changes to introduce to bring focus to the underdeveloped areas. Despite the necessity to exercise discretion, some changes will be required, as making no changes would result in less growth in those leaders Arrow Leadership is seeking to serve as well as in the program itself. This relative adverse change will make the program less relevant than it is presently.
There are a number of implications not merely for Christian leaders and other Christian leadership development organizations, but also for Christian men and women who seek to demonstrate the realities of the kingdom of God. The nature of the survey process enables participation by any person who has a desire to better reflect the reality of the principles of the kingdom of God. It not constrained to those only in a formal leadership capacity.

Christian leaders have an opportunity to assess the significance and health of their kingdom influence beyond their organizational or positional roles through the *oikos* survey. As relational dynamics are not organizationally bound, the nature of leadership influence extends to all aspects of life in which a Christian leader might be involved as spouse, parent, adult, child, neighbour, team member, community organization member, employer, employee, or co-worker. By undertaking the *oikos* survey, they would be able to readily appropriate their relative areas of strengths and weaknesses in leadership and kingdom of God influence. Therefore a leadership development plan might be more encompassing and pervasive, touching every aspect of the life of a leader. Ripples of kingdom influence will resonate longer and deeper as a result.

Christian leadership development organizations might also be beneficiaries of this project, whereby its view of leadership development is enhanced and expanded to recognize the flow of influence naturally occurring in relationships in a given network (*oikos*) or sphere of influence. This expanded view might positively impact the leaders in the organizations they are seeking to serve, and perhaps the stakeholders of the organizations in which the leaders serve. This can only lead to better expressions of the kingdom in more places.
Finally, Christian men and women in general could benefit from this project. The Myoikos Project survey is designed for any person who wishes to understand how they naturally express the realities of kingdom of God within their oikos and what steps could be taken to better reflect the realities of the kingdom of God within their oikos. This would only be possible if the Myoikos Project referred to earlier is finalized as a web based, multilingual resource. The impact of this initial project, therefore, would be significantly amplified. It could potentially change not only individuals, families, oikos, churches, communities, cities, or states but just possibly nations and the world. Through relational influences, transformation could take place, right before the eyes of humanity - one relationship at a time.
APPENDIX 1

Measured Aspects, Expressions, Practices and or Behaviors of the Kingdom of God

Relationships

1. I have a lot of fun and often laugh with the people I spend most of my time with.
4. Even when others do things wrong, I am patient and give them time to learn and grow.
7. I can share my feelings and problems with those I spend most of my time with.
10. In various ways, I regularly show my affection for my loved ones.
13. I feel a strong connection with my neighbourhood and the people who live there.
16. If I have a disagreement or difference of opinion with someone, I do whatever I can to understand his or her point of view.
19. My lifestyle makes it easy to grow deeper relationships with my friends and family.
22. I actively look for what I can learn from those around me.
25. I often tell others what I see in them that is better than in myself.
28. I enjoy inviting people, who are not my closest friends or family, to a meal or to have a drink.
31. When I see that someone has done something well or improved in some way, I make sure I tell them.
34. In practical ways, I show care for the living things that enrich my life (e.g. plants, animals, waterways, land, etc.).
Service

2.   I know what I am better at than the people I spend most of my time with.

5.   I keep looking for ways to help those who are, in some way, less fortunate than myself.

8.   I benefit from working as part of some kind of team in daily life.

11.  I get to serve other people by doing what I’m best at.

14.  I follow through and do what I say I'm going to do.

17.  I discipline my body as much as physically possible (e.g. physical activity, eating well, getting enough sleep, etc.).

20.  I always ask for help with things that, for whatever reason, I am less able to do.

23.  I often look for ways to share my money, possessions and property to benefit other people.

26.  I look for chances to help others learn how to do what I can do well.

29.  I have all I need to do what I’m best at (e.g. opportunity, money, tools, equipment, property, certification, etc.).

32.  I look for ways to improve my skills.

35.  I find it easy to stay focused on the most important thing at a given time.

Faith

3.   I am more than willing to try new things even if I might fail.

6.   I look for honest feedback about my life and what I do.

9.   My dreams for the future greatly motivate me.

12.  I find it easy to be joyful, even in very challenging circumstances.
15. I face each day without fear of other people (e.g. what they may do or say; seeing, hearing from or speaking to particular people, etc.).

18. I can rely on the people I spend most of my time with in daily life.

21. I feel at peace and forgiven for the things I’ve done wrong to others during my life.

24. I live daily life free of worry.

27. Even when faced with big challenges, I rarely give up.

30. I don't tend to worry about being able to provide for the needs of my loved ones or myself.

33. I enjoy exploring my creativity in new and different ways.

36. I regularly connect with others who inspire me to hope for greater things in life.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Ministry Area</th>
<th>Other Ministry Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor (Senior)</td>
<td>Adults' ministry</td>
<td>Outreach/missions/evangelism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor (Executive)</td>
<td>Older adults’ ministry</td>
<td>gelism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor (Other)</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Prayer ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>Camps/retreats</td>
<td>Preaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deacon</td>
<td>Community care</td>
<td>Social justice ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>Discipleship</td>
<td>Special events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team leader</td>
<td>Earth care</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group leader</td>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>Teacher/lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group</td>
<td>Health (church)</td>
<td>Welcoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apprentice/co-leader</td>
<td>Health (human)</td>
<td>Women’s ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s ministry</td>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>Worship ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth ministry</td>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adults' ministry</td>
<td>Men’s ministry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families ministry</td>
<td>Multi-cultural ministry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Age

The ages of the respondents to the *Healthy Relationships in the Kingdom* survey are as follows: 14 percent between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-nine, 43 percent between thirty and thirty-nine, 30 percent between forty and forty-nine, 9 percent between fifty and fifty-nine, and 4 percent over the age of sixty. Within Arrow leaders the age breakdown is as follows: twenty-one to twenty-nine years old, 10 percent; thirty to thirty-nine, 51 percent; forty to forty-nine, 28 percent; fifty to fifty-nine, 8 percent; and over age sixty, 3 percent. Within the non-Arrow leaders the age breakdown is as follows: twenty-one to twenty-nine years old, 24 percent; thirty to thirty-nine, 24 percent; forty to forty-nine, 35 percent; fifty to fifty-nine, 12 percent; and over age sixty, 6 percent. It is noteworthy that the number of Arrow leaders between the ages of thirty and thirty-nine is twice as many as the leaders who have not participated in Arrow. That is, more than 60 percent of Arrow leaders who completed the survey are under 40. Conversely, the percentage of leaders who have not completed Arrow between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-nine is twice that of the percentage of leaders aged between twenty-one and twenty-nine who have completed the Arrow program.

Role and Responsibilities

The most popular role is that of team leader (with 29 percent of respondents indicating a service team leader), followed by 25 percent of respondents saying they serve as small group leader, and 25 percent of respondents indicating they serve in a preaching capacity. Twenty-one percent of respondents indicate they are involved in a
discipleship role, whilst 20 percent indicate they serve in a role connected with outreach and mission. Eleven percent indicate that they serve in a role as senior pastor, 9 percent indicate they serve in a role of executive pastor, and 20 percent indicate they serve in a role of other pastoral staff. Thus, 40 percent of respondents of the survey indicate they are serving in a pastoral capacity. The majority of all respondents indicate they have at least two roles in which they serve.

Location and Time in Role

Of the respondents to this survey, 41 percent indicate that they attend a church service more than once per week, 52 percent indicate at least once a week, and 5 percent say once or twice per month. Clearly the vast majority of respondents to the survey attend a worship service at least once a week. In regards to the number of people the survey respondents have in their home, the data reveals that 2 percent have one person living in the home, 14 percent have two, 14 percent have three, 36 percent have four, 29 percent have five, and 5 percent have six people living in the home. Thus, at least two-thirds of the respondents have four or five living in their home. The data for Arrow leaders is similar with 71 percent of Arrow leaders having four or five people in their home.

The respondents were also asked to indicate how many homes they have lived in as an adult. The data shows that 21 percent of respondents have lived in four homes or fewer, 54 percent have lived in between five and nine homes, 18 percent have lived in between ten and fourteen homes, and 7 percent of respondents have lived in fifteen homes or more. The respondents also were asked how many years they have been living in their current home. The data confirms that 27 percent of respondents have lived in their
current home for less than two years, 36 percent of respondents have lived in their current home for two or three years, 11 percent for four or five years, 13 percent for six to nine years, 9 percent for ten to nineteen years, and 5 percent for twenty years or more.

The next section of the survey explored the way in which the survey respondent has engaged in employment. The data reveals that 14 percent of respondents have had two or three employers, 38 percent of respondents have had between four and five employers, 25 percent have had between six and nine, 16 percent had between ten and fourteen, and only 7 percent had fifteen or more. The vast majority of respondents have had less than ten employers during their adult life.

This part of the survey also explored the number of years the survey respondents have been with their current employer. The data reveals the following: 16 percent of respondents have been with their current employer for less than two years, 25 percent between two and three years, 20 percent between four and five years, 23 percent between six and nine years, 9 percent between ten and fourteen years, and 7 percent of respondents have been with their employers for more than fifteen years. This means that over 40 percent of respondents have been with their current employer for three years or less. This is a reflection of the highly mobile workforce in which the survey respondents live and work.

Denomination

The link between denominational participation and health of oikos is interesting. The results point towards the Presbyterian Church having the healthiest oikos of all the denominations which influenced respondents most in their faith journey. This result is
distinctly different, almost 20 percent above the second-highest denomination. However
given the limited number of the respondents who indicated that the Presbyterian
denomination had the biggest influence upon their life, caution should be exercised in
reading anything too significant into this data. Interestingly, the next two healthiest
denominations are The Salvation Army at 58.7 percent and the Anglican Church at 58.2
percent. The denomination that receives the lowest measure of oikos health was the
Baptist Church.

Within each theme of the oikos health measure apart from the Presbyterian
denominational score, The Salvation Army has the healthiest oikos theme of service at
63.7 percent and faith at 64.3 percent. Surprisingly and with an almost 15 percent
differential, the second-lowest score for the health of the element of relationships within
an oikos is 47.7 percent for The Salvation Army. The lowest score in regards to
relationships is the Baptist Church.

At an individual question level there are some surprising and interesting
observations. For example, there is an almost 30 percent difference between the
responses of one denomination and another denomination to the question “I know what I
am better at than the people I spend most of my time with.” The Salvation Army had a
score of 70.4 percent as opposed to the Anglican Church that had 31.6 percent. A similar
differential exists for the question “I keep looking for ways to help those who are in some
way less fortunate than myself” with The Salvation Army and Anglican Church scoring
similarly (71.6 percent and 71.1 percent, respectively) and the Baptist Church scoring
44.4 percent. Even larger differential results arise for the question “I look for honest
feedback about my life and what I do” where the Australian Christian Churches scored
29.6 percent compared to 75.4 percent by The Salvation Army. This difference is almost 55 percent.

The Baptist Church scores 72.5 percent for the question “I benefit from working as part of some kind of team in daily life.” This compares to 40.7 percent by The Salvation Army; again, a difference of over 30 percent. The Anglican Church scored 79.3 percent on the question “I feel a strong connection with my neighbourhood and the people who live there” compared to a score of 42 percent for Baptists and, interestingly, a score of 59.5 percent for The Salvation Army. In response to the question “I feel at peace and forgiven for the things I’ve done wrong to others during my daily life,” Churches of Christ respond at a rate of 71.5 percent compared to 52.4 percent for The Salvation Army.

Across all denominations represented in the survey, those who have participated in Arrow Leadership courses score higher compared to those who have not. While the difference sometimes is only two or three percent, the numbers still point toward a generally healthier state of leadership for participants who have engaged with Arrow Leadership Development programs. For example, the Churches of Christ survey respondents who have participated in Arrow scored 64 percent for the element of faith compared to 53.5 percent for all leaders from the Churches of Christ.

The responses within one denomination can vary dramatically. For example, within the Arrow leader Anglican Church responses for the question “I am more than willing to try new things even if I might fail,” the Anglican Arrow leader respondents are in the top 18 percent of the overall survey. This contrasts to results for the same respondents from the Anglican Church Arrow leaders who scored in the bottom 18
percent for the question “My lifestyle makes it easy to grow deeper relationships with my friends and family.” It appears that Anglican Church Arrow leaders are willing to try anything new in order to grow deeper with their family and friends, unless it involves changing their lifestyle.

Similarly, Australian Christian Churches are in the bottom 30 percent of respondents to the question “I look for honest feedback about my life and what I do” and the same respondents scored in the top 25 percent of respondents for the question “I enjoy inviting people who are not my closest friends or family to a meal or to have a drink.” It seems that for leaders from Australian Christian Churches, there is a readiness to have a conversation over a meal or drink with someone who does not know the leader so as to avoid the conversation providing honest feedback to the leader.

The Baptist Church leaders are in the top 27 percent of responses for the question “I benefit from working as part of some kind of team in my daily life.” This is contrasted with the same Arrow Baptist leaders, who at a score of 33.9 percent, say “I discipline my body as much as physically possible.” Perhaps it could be suggested that Baptists are willing to work as a team provided it does not involve physical activity.

At a score of 79.2 percent, Churches of Christ Arrow leaders are in the top 21 percent of responses for the question “I am more than willing to try new things even if I might fail.” The same respondents are in the lowest 30 percent of respondents for the question “I find it easy to stay focused on the most important things at a given time.” Such leaders might have difficulty focussing on the implementation of an important, new venture.
Finally, with probably the biggest differential in a group of Arrow leaders from one denomination, The Salvation Army which scored 80.8 percent (in the top 20 percent of responses), for the question “I keep looking for ways to help those who are in some way less fortunate than myself.” Surprisingly, they are also in the lowest 15 percent of respondents who said “I get to serve other people by doing what I’m best at.” So The Salvation Army Arrow respondents are looking for ways to respond to the last, lost, and least, but find themselves doing it in a way that does not fit with the way God has designed them.

Age

It would appear from the data that age significantly impacts the health of an oikos. It would appear that the healthiest oikos sits within the age bracket fifty to fifty-nine. This aligns with Robert Clinton’s book The Making of a Leader: Recognising the Lessons and Stages of Leadership Development where he indicates that leaders this age have moved through the prior phases of leadership development, from sovereign foundations to inner life growth, then to ministry maturing and life maturing, and finally to a phase of leadership development which he calls convergence.¹ Clinton suggests that God opens a distinct role for leaders that showcases the best of what they have to offer. There is a clear fit between the needs of the ministry and the gifts of the leader. By this phase, leaders are unencumbered by a need to please everyone at all times. Leaders in this phase do not feel pressured to do things that they are simply not gifted to do. This phase is the

culmination of the previous four phases. Many leaders fail to reach this phase because of an inability to move beyond the earlier stages.

However, an Arrow leader’s oikos is healthier than non-Arrow leaders in all of the age brackets of thirty to thirty-nine, forty to forty-nine, fifty to fifty-nine, and over sixty. The Arrow Leadership development program is a confluence of capability, calling, and character. The development of a leader’s character places his or her leadership ready for the future work to which God has called that leader. The healthiest expression of an element of oikos health is faith by those over age sixty. That which is least developed is relationships, not surprisingly, for those between the ages of twenty and twenty-nine, where the score is 27.3 percent. Faith is also particularly strong as an element of a healthy oikos for those in the age bracket fifty to fifty-nine where the score was 71.3 percent.

The question that has the highest level of health was the question “I keep looking for ways to help those who are in some way less fortunate than myself” and this is scored by respondents over the age of sixty. The question which has the least healthy response is for those respondents ages twenty to twenty-nine. The question is “I feel a strong connection with my neighbourhood and the people who live there.” Within the twenty to twenty-nine age bracket, the highest scoring question is “I benefit from working as part of some kind of team in daily life.”

For the age bracket thirty to thirty-nine, the question that scored in the bottom 38.5 percent of respondents is “My lifestyle makes it easy to grow deep relationships with my family and friends.” Perhaps this is a season of life when leaders have young families to care for, which may compromise the leaders’ ability to connect as they had previously when single. The same group of respondents ages thirty to thirty-nine are in
the top 30 percent of respondents to the question “I enjoy inviting people who are not my closest friends or family to a meal or to have a drink.” There exists a strange tension for this age bracket. They want to be evangelistic and outward-focused, however, their lifestyle predicates this work. For Arrow leaders ages forty to forty-nine, the question with the highest response rate is “I look for ways to improve my skills.” This is contrasted to Arrow leaders in the same age bracket who are in the bottom 37 percent of responses for the question “I have a lot of fun and often laugh with the people I spend most of my time with.”

For those respondents in the fifty to fifty-nine age bracket who are Arrow leaders, the question which is in the top 14 percent of responses is “I find it easy to stay focused on the most important things at a given time.” By way of extreme contrast, at almost 60 percent less and in the bottom 28 percent of responses for those Arrow leaders ages fifty to fifty-nine is the question “I discipline my body as much as physically possible.” So the observation is that an Arrow leader ages fifty to fifty-nine is able to be extremely focused on the most important things at any given time, provided it does not relate to taking care of their body or physical health.

Occupation

Given that 40 percent of survey respondents are involved in some form of pastoral ministry, it is appropriate to examine the correlations between pastoral ministry and the health of *oikos*. Of the three pastoral ministry roles from which respondents could choose, the senior pastor role possessed the highest health of *oikos* at 57 percent, followed very closely by the executive pastor role at 56 percent. Interestingly, for those
serving in associate pastoral roles, the health of oikos was less than 50 percent, at 48 percent. Within the three elements of relationships, service, and faith, the element of faith for the senior pastor role had the highest oikos health at 64 percent. The lowest element of oikos health at 46 percent is for the faith element for the associate pastor role.

After the pastoral roles, there are a few other church related roles in which a large number of respondents were serving. These include team leader, small group leader, discipleship leader, and outreach/mission leader. Of these four roles, outreach/mission leader have the highest level of oikos health at 59 percent (interestingly, this is actually higher than the oikos health of the senior pastor). The lowest level of oikos health for participants with a role within the local church is for discipleship leaders at 44 percent.

Within the elements that make up the overall health of oikos, the relationships element associated with the discipleship leader have the lowest level of health at 40 percent. The faith element of oikos is the highest for the outreach/mission leader at 60 percent. The service elements for the team leader role, small group leader, and discipleship leader are healthier than the elements of relationship and faith within the overall oikos structure.

Location and Time in Role

There are some interesting observations to be made while examining the health of an oikos and contrast it to the number of people in one’s home. But for the only respondent who is single in his or her own house, there is a direct correlation between health of oikos and the number of people with whom you live. Intuitively, this is not a surprising result. If there is an ability to function well within the home, then there is an
ability to function well and have a healthy oikos with those outside of the home. The results were encouraging in regards to the natural training environment that exists within a home environment for family members to live and promote a healthy oikos, which naturally includes the persons with whom the leader lives, assuming of course that the family environment is healthy.

Those with six people in their home have the healthiest oikos at 64 percent. Those survey respondents with two in their home have the least healthy oikos at 50 percent. The service element of oikos health for those who have six in their home is the highest at 71 percent and, perhaps unsurprisingly, the element of relationships for the person who have one in their household is lowest at 41.9 percent.

Additional observations can be made when comparing and contrasting the individual questions associated with the respondents who have the same number of people in their household. Again, perhaps not surprisingly, those survey respondents with six in their household have the healthiest score for the question “I always ask for help with things that for whatever reason I am less able to do” at 87.3 percent. Almost at the other end of the scale, with 60 percentage points less, is the question “In practical ways I show care for the living things that enrich my life.” It is posited that, with such focus on the large number of people within the household, there is insufficient discretionary time to show care for things like animals and the environment.

The individual scores connected with those survey respondents who have five people in their household are not as starkly different as for those with six people in the house, but they are still noteworthy. The question for which these respondents have the healthiest oikos score was “My dreams for the future greatly motivate me” at 72 percent.
Thirty-six percent less, or half that score, is the question “I have a lot of fun and often laugh with the people I spend most of my time with.” Perhaps those with a family of five are dreaming of a better future, believing for better times, and desiring increased fun with those in their home.

For those survey respondents with four in their home, the healthiest score of 67.7 percent relates to the question “I find it easy to be joyful even in very challenging circumstances.” Despite their joy, survey respondents with four in their home indicate that their lifestyle does not make it easy to grow deeper relationships with friends and family, demonstrated by the lowest score of 29.2 percent. This result is 37 percent less than the question with the maximum result in this group. Despite lifestyle circumstances that prevent deepening relationships, those survey respondents with four people in their household maintain a joyful spirit.

Like the average leader, Arrow leaders with six people in their home have the highest health of oikos for the element of service at 75.7 percent. The lowest is for the Arrow leader with one person in their household for the element of relationship at 41.9 percent. For the Arrow leader, in the element of relationships within the overall oikos measure, those families with two and five people in their household score at least 5 percent more than the average leader with the same number in their household. In regards to service, the Arrow leader respondents with six people in their household are healthier by 5 percent than the average leader. There are some distinct areas in regards to the element of faith for oikos health as well. The Arrow leader is not as healthy in regards to faith for households in which there are two people, but is 6 percent less than an average
leader. By contrast however, in regards to faith, Arrow leaders with six people in their household are 6 percent healthier than the average leader.

Another goal of this research was to explore the relationship, if any, between the number of homes in which the survey respondents had lived and the health of their oikos. The hypothesis is that the less transitory a leader is, the easier and deeper relationships will be and therefore the healthier the oikos. Whilst there is not a clear indirect relationship between the number of homes in which respondents have lived in their adult life and the health of the oikos, there is a very close indirect relationship between these two elements. To say it another way, the less number of homes in an adult has lived, the healthier the oikos.

For respondents who have lived in five to nine homes in their adult life, their oikos health is at 57.2 percent. For those who have lived in ten to fourteen homes, their oikos health is at 53.4 percent and for those who have lived in fifteen or more homes, their oikos health is another 10 percent less at 44.2 percent. Interestingly, however, if the respondents have lived in four or fewer homes in their adult life, their oikos health is not as strong as those who have lived in five to nine. This might be because those who have lived in four or fewer homes have not developed the requisite skills to connect with those around them, have become too familiar with those close to them, or have not worked to extend their connectedness with others.

The relationship between the number of homes respondents have lived in in their adult life and the health of the oikos is the same for Arrow and non-Arrow leaders, except again the health of the oikos of Arrow leaders is marginally healthier. Unsurprisingly, the lowest element scored for the health of the oikos is relationships and it is lowest for those
who have lived in fifteen or more homes as an adult, at 35.5 percent. The highest scoring result is faith at 60.2 percent for those who have lived in ten to fourteen homes during their adult life.

Examining the differential between individual questions of households with the same number of homes over a lifetime, those Arrow leaders who responded to the survey who had lived in fifteen or more homes during their adult life had a oikos health percentage of 5 percent for the question “In practical ways I show care for the living things that enrich my life.” To reiterate, this question scored in the lowest 5 percent of all responses. It is not surprising that this scored so low given that they have moved and lived in fifteen or more homes during their adult life.

The oikos health level for the question “I know what I am better at than the people I spend most of my time with” created the biggest contrast in the survey data that has been explored so far. At a health oikos level of 91.5 percent, a difference of 86 percent exists. That is, the last question is scored at the top 9.5 percent of respondents and the first question concerning care for living things scores at the bottom 5 percent of respondents. Perhaps the ecological expression of an oikos decreases with number of homes in which people live. This might be a reflection of perceiving the house as a utilitarian asset, something that has little meaning to the family itself. This would be similar to the perspective that the church is the people, not the building in which the people meet. However, something of who the people are and are becoming is conveyed through the building in which the church meets. A similar perspective could be adopted regarding the family home.
Whilst the contrasts are not that dramatic for those respondents who have lived in ten to fourteen homes in their adult life, there was a significant difference of almost 50 percent between the highest and lowest scores. This differential exists between the two questions “I live daily life free of worry” and “Even when others do things wrong I am patient and give them time to learn and grow.” With the rapidity of moving homes, there might not be sufficient bandwidth to be patient to help others grow.

Another interesting relationship is between the number of years in the current home and the health of the oikos. It was assumed there would be a direct relationship between the number of years a leader has been at their home and the health of their oikos. That is, the lower the number of years a leader has been at the home, the lower the oikos health; the higher the number of years he or she has been at the home, the higher the oikos health. However, the statistics did not bear this out. There is an almost parabolic relationship where those respondents who have been in their home for six to nine years have the healthiest oikos and those who had been in their home for fewer or more had decreasing health in their oikos. The relationship between number of years in current home and health of oikos is even more erratic for Arrow leaders, where those who had been in the home for two to three years, six to nine years, or more than twenty years all had approximately the same level of health of oikos.

A relationship can also be explored between the number of employers that respondents have had and their level of oikos health. There is quite a strong indirect relationship between the number of employers respondents have had and the level of health. That is, the smaller the number of employers, the greater the level of oikos health. This was true for all leaders and even more so for Arrow leaders. However, for Arrow
leaders who have had ten or more employers in their life, their *oikos* health was significantly less than the average leader surveyed through this project.

The last connection that is suggested by the results is between the number of years with the current employer and the level of *oikos* health, with the implication that the greater the number of years with the current employer, the greater level of *oikos* health. This direct relationship was found through the data collected where there is almost a direct relationship between the number of years with current employer and the *oikos* health level. For both Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders, there is a distinct differential of at least 10 percent between those who have been with their current employer for ten to fourteen years and those who have been with their employer for fifteen years or more, suggesting there is something unique around being faithful to employers to increase *oikos* health. How this interacts with the reality of an increasingly mobile workforce is an interesting question, worthy of further exploration.
Survey participants were chosen from the group of Arrow leaders who had completed their Arrow Leadership program in the last five years (2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015). The total population of Arrow leaders is 180. We received thirty-nine responses from the population, meaning that over 21 percent of the population were involved in the survey. Their responses were then able to benchmarked against 275 responses from other people in their network. Additionally, another seventeen responses were acquired from non-Arrow leaders, those men and women of influence who are serving in Christian ministry who would provide a benchmark by which to compare the results of Arrow leaders. Thus the total participant pool was 330 respondents.

The confidence level was set at 95 percent. Put simply, the confidence level confirms how sure of the results one can be. It is expressed as a percentage and represents how often the true percentage of the population who will pick an answer that lies within the confidence interval. Logically, the 95 percent confidence level means that one can be 95 percent certain of the survey results.

The confidence interval, also called margin of error, is a plus or minus figure usually quoted when reporting statistics. However, the confidence interval is also impacted by the percentage of the sample that picks a particular answer. If, for example, 99 percent of the sample said yes to a particular question and 1 percent said no, the chances of error are remote irrespective of sample size. However, if the percentages are 51 percent yes and 49 percent no, the chances of error are much greater. Naturally,

---

1 For example, if a confidence interval of 4 percent is used and 47 percent of the sample selects an answer, one can be sure that if the question was asked of the entire relevant population, between 43 percent and 51 percent would have picked that answer.
therefore, it is easier to be confident of extreme answers than of average answers. The confidence level set for this sample of the population is 10 percent.
APPENDIX 5

Denomination

An element of expression of Christian faith by Arrow leaders and non-Arrow leaders in Australia is the denomination which has most influenced them. Whilst there is a variety of distinctions between denominations in Australia, there has been no measure yet of the sense of connectedness or health of relationships in each denomination. The data collected will provide the opportunity for some preliminary analysis to be undertaken.

Respondents were asked to indicate which of the following denominations had the greatest influence in their life: Anglican, Apostolic, Australian Christian Churches, Baptist, Catholic, C3 (Christian City Church), Churches of Christ, INC (International Network of Churches), Independent, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Salvation Army, or Uniting. The respondents could also write in an answer using a free text box (categorized as “other” in the results). Respondents were also asked to indicate their frequency of engagement with worship services in their particular denomination and explain their primary responsibilities within the local church. The final question asked of respondents about their denomination was what hopes they have for their local church in its present form. The correlation between these datasets and the health of oikos provides greater understanding of the potential impact denominational influence has upon the health of oikos.
Arrow Participation

A key aspect of this research project relates to the impact Arrow Leadership has upon the health of an Arrow leaders’ *oikos* compared to the health of an *oikos* of a non-Arrow leader. Consequently, a key question around Arrow participation categorizes the respondents’ answers. However, it is not just a binary issue of whether or not the survey respondent has participated in the leadership development program of Arrow Leadership. The question also asks from the survey respondent information how recently they have participated in an Arrow Leadership experience. The strength of the correlation, if any, between the timeframe of their Arrow Leadership experience and the health of their *oikos* can be measured.

Data was also collected around which Arrow Leadership development program the survey respondent participated. The data collected will reveal whether there is a statistically significant correlation between the type of program and the health of the survey respondent’s *oikos*. The survey respondent was also asked to identify whether or not he or she has ongoing connections with other Arrow leaders from their Arrow Leadership cohort. Again, correlation or otherwise could be identified between the extent of connectedness between Arrow leaders in the one cohort and the health of their *oikos*. Finally, a general question was asked for the respondent to describe the biggest change to their leadership as a result of participating in the Arrow Leadership program.

**Age**

Data was also collected from the survey respondents regarding their age, gender, and marital status. Again, the collection of this data will allow the determination of
whether there is a correlation between the health of an *oikos* and the age of the leader of the *oikos*. It will also show whether marital status or gender influences the health of the *oikos*. This information can then be overlayed on whether a survey respondent has undertaken Arrow Leadership development program.

**Occupation**

Data was collected from survey respondents concerning their primary contribution to the local church (see Appendix Two). Respondents were able to identify more than one responsibility in a local church. From this data, it will be possible to assess whether there is a relationship between the health of the leader’s *oikos* and the extent to which they carry a formal responsibility at the local church. Additionally, the data can show whether there is a relationship for Arrow leaders between carrying multiple responsibilities and the health of their *oikos*. This could be potentially significant if it reveals that the more roles one carries at the local church, the less health is sustained in their *oikos*.

The results will also show whether those survey respondents who carry a formal designation of pastor possess a healthier *oikos* than those who are not serving in a pastoral capacity. Usually congregants feel that those serving in a pastoral capacity are worthy of being emulated since the pastor provides an example of a disciple of Jesus in the twenty-first century. The outcome of these results will be significant.

**Location and Time in Role**

Questions were asked of survey respondents about the nature of their employment, including how long they have been employed, how many different
employers they have worked for, and how many years they have been employed by their current employer. Respondents were also asked to answer questions around their physical home: how many people usually live in the respondent’s home, how many homes the respondent has lived in since becoming an adult, and how many years the respondent has been living in their current home. Finally, respondents were also asked about their frequency of attendance at a local church worship service.

Like the statistical variants already identified, the data gathered will reveal whether there is a correlation between the permanency that a survey respondent has in their employment, in their home, and in their participation in a local Christian church worship service and the health of their oikos. Ian Adams refers to the discipline of staying, referencing that relationships go deeper when men and women of faith choose to stay in the context of community and relationships, thereby travelling the difficult road together and enjoying the highlights of life together. In a societal context where the average Gen Y and Gen Z employee will move between three distinctly separate careers over their working life and work for more than seventeen employers, a negative impact upon the health of a person’s oikos might exist because of the high mobility in which people express their Christian faith.

---
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