Abstract: In the Australian Church, attitudes towards innovation are mixed as some regard it with suspicion, if not hostility, while others welcome it as the means of bridging to a different future. Innovation as a process is poorly understood by many leaders, yet it arises from the pursuit of mission in contemporary Australia. This paper argues that the growth of the church's capacity to become genuinely missional hinges on its effectiveness at innovation. I contend that the principal challenge of innovation is not merely a matter of theological subtlety or organizational flexibility but the capacity of leaders to link together ideas about the Church's nature and purpose with effective structures and local strategies for mission.

URLs: http://www.missionstudies.org.au/page/journal-ajms/

http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=44567&local_base=GEN01-CSU01

Author Address: wbrighton2008@gmail.com/

Innovation: a pathway to effectiveness in mission

In the Australian Church, attitudes towards innovation are mixed as some regard it with suspicion, if not hostility, while others welcome it as the means of bridging to a different future. Innovation as a process is poorly understood by many leaders, yet it arises from the pursuit of mission in contemporary Australia. This paper argues that the growth of the church's capacity to become genuinely missional hinges on its effectiveness at innovation. I contend that the principal challenge of innovation is not merely a matter of theological subtlety or organizational flexibility but the capacity of leaders to link together ideas about the Church's nature and purpose with effective structures and local strategies for mission.

Introduction

Innovation is the cornerstone of the global economy and an important feature of contemporary life in advanced societies such as the UK, US and Australia. It is woven into the fabric of commercial life and increasingly into government and educational systems. It is a key feature of social life that promises to assist Australia become a more dynamic, creative and highly productive society in a highly competitive global environment.

Yet innovation is a confusing and controversial reality for many of Australia's Christian denominations. These churches are uncertain and even reticent about the nature and dynamics of ecclesial innovation. On the one hand, innovation promises to be the route to growth and transformation where creativity and imagination in mission offer new possibilities for the future. However, such local congregational change produces stresses and strains in denominational structures.

This paper examines the importance of innovation to contemporary Australian churches. It explores what the concept means, observes some of its broad dynamics and discusses how churches might benefit from a broader understanding of innovation. It argues that the growth of the church's capacity to become genuinely missional hinges on its effectiveness at innovation. I will contend that the principal challenge is not merely a matter of theological subtlety or organizational flexibility but the capacity of leaders to create a corporate culture of innovation that links together ideas about the Church's nature and purpose with effective structures and local strategies for mission.

How have churches innovated?

The church's understanding and approach to innovation has often been poor. Hans Küng observed that for much of its history the Christian Church in all its diversity has not welcomed innovation and often misidentified it as heresy.[i] From this perspective, innovation is most often associated with the introduction of new ideas aimed at effecting change in doctrine, ceremony or structure. Many Australian churches have been embroiled in conflict over the ordination of women, indigenous reconciliation, multiculturalism and sexuality. Consequently, many have a negative view of innovation approaching it with suspicion, if not hostility.

While these changes have been important, they obscure our appreciation of a host of other innovations that have occurred in the Australian Church since the 1960s and largely associated with the practice of mission. David Millikan's **Sunburnt Soul** (1981) was instrumental in popularizing the view that institutional foreignness was a barrier to more effective engagement with Australians culturally.[ii] Consequently, innovation was perceived and experienced as a battle over heritage and structures. Christians divided between those urging renewal through a greater depth of engagement and those who saw it as invariably compromising their church's identity. Much of the change was a response to a shift in the social nature and value of religion from a socially deposited vision of Christian faith that stressed values and belief to a privately developed and active faith that emphasized access and experience of God.

Nevertheless, churches did innovate and the church growth movement together with the charismatic revival revolutionized how western churches participated in mission.[iii] In the US, Donald Miller observed that new charismatic churches like the Vineyard and Calvary Chapel were most able to capitalize on this shift and interested in "appropriating stylistic and organizational elements from our postmodern culture."[iv] A host of new churches also emerged in Australia, some within existing denominations but many independently forming their own organizational structures and associations. Existing denominations launched or participated in ecumenical initiatives like the Decade of Evangelism and Discipling a Whole Nation (DAWN) throughout the 1980s and 1990s.

Those who realized its significance seized the opportunities afforded by innovation very quickly. In Australia, NCLS Research observed that people were "flocking to high-energy, contemporary Pentecostal and Evangelical churches" while traditional denominations experienced declining levels of vitality, participation and affiliation.[v] Efforts to identify factors or qualities associated with such growth showed that pentecostal and charismatic churches consistently scored higher on most, if not all, compared to other denominations, particularly their willingness to try something new.[vi] The willingness to be imaginative and flexible was an important catalyst for growth, particularly when combined with nurturing worship, a clear vision and leadership that is inspiring and empowering.

Although growing churches has never been easy, denominational evangelism initiatives like DAWN and the Decade of Evangelism did not deliver what many leaders expected with most denominations closing more congregations than they opened.[vii] Innovation, it seemed was about competition and the capacity to attract Christians and make new converts.[viii] Mega-churches, with their vibrant worship and myriad of programs, were therefore most easily identified with being innovative and criticized for their perceived cultural compromise.

Through the 1990s, a range of leaders in the US, UK and Australia assessed their missional challenges and concluded that a new kind of church was required.[ix] They envisaged a missional church and its proponents claimed that its nature, purpose, structure and strategy would be radically different to either that of the neighborhood focus of traditional institutional churches or the programs of new ecclesial corporations. For such churches, innovation would be a key attribute and the means of pursuing its missional purpose.

Many questioned the capacity of traditional churches to undertake any kind of innovation at all, viewing them as defensive, stuck and dying.[x] Their corporate life seemed to inhibit innovation because they diverted too much energy by rule keeping, heritage protection and fruitless planning. The truism that change occurs only at the institutional edge and not the center became accepted wisdom.[xi] The path of innovation was more presumed that explained. Many believed that new kinds of churches would emerge spontaneously from the post-modern world.[xii] Others sought to identify and classify its characteristics, even though missional leaders believed it to be incomplete and they were not particularly interested in creating structures of any kind.[xiii] Taken together, the capacity of denominations to innovate in any meaningful way was routinely dismissed and Christianity's future associated with newer churches especially the formation of organic communities.

Denominationalism revisited

Projections for denominational decline in Australia remained disconcerting.[xiv] Read superficially, they sent two erroneous messages. First, denominations that were growing would continue to do so in the future. Second, that existing denominations were unlikely to disappear any time soon, even though their organizations would become more precarious. NCLS Research argued that, "an openness to change and a spirit of innovation are part of what is needed to reverse these trends [of decline]."[xv] If the mission of the church was to be realized more fully, the implication was that all Australian denominations needed to think carefully about how they encouraged, supported and sustained innovation.

While some denominations endeavored to incorporate missional insights and practices into their corporate life few have reflected systematically on their understanding and approach to innovation. Those whose ecclesiology were most congruent with an organic ecclesiology

were the first to make the shift, like the Mennonite Church USA in 2001.[xvi] For churches with episcopal or conciliar ecclesiologies, the route was not so clear-cut. Things began to change when the Church of England accepted many of the recommendations of the **Mission-Shaped Church** (2004) report.[xvii]

The report's popularity and influence exceeded all expectations and while criticism has grown its influence remains muted.[xviii] Not only did it capture the missional challenges confronting institutional churches, the report offered a vocabulary and a conceptual framework attuned to institutional needs. The image of the mixed economy where the institutional and fresh expressions of church could work collaboratively was foundation. It showed how organic communities could work within a larger institutional framework. This language worked partly because it drew on the cultural experience of privatization of state-owned enterprises that has been a feature of innovation in the UK and Australia but not the US. Australian leaders from a wide variety of churches quickly undertook study visits while the report's writers and proponents lectured here extensively.

The report focused attention to the vexed question of the relationship between mission and ecclesial structures. While the report galvanized the Church of England's resolve to re-engage in mission in new and different ways, the magnitude of institutional change required was generally understated. As its author's observed,

> there is a fabric of the old way of being society and being church. We are not about patching the fabric of that old garment but seeking to set up a new loom to weave the new fabric for tomorrow's society of the kingdom.[xix]

The report was not simply concerned with theory or practice of mission but with its implementation. In order for meaningful change to occur, an "enabling framework" was proposed in order to multiply the kind of initiatives that discussed in the report.[xx] Critical to its success was the church's acceptance and engagement in contextualization or inculturation as the report preferred to call it.

Many Australians skipped these chapters as the framework seemed relevant only to a highly specific English audience. Yet the report highlighted the denomination's capacity to revivify its internal corporate culture, from one of disdaining innovation to supporting it. The report called for repentance and highlighted the uncomfortable reality that it may need to die to its own interests before becoming effective at mission once more. It's at this cultural level that innovation remains problematic for Australian churches.

Like any phenomenon, innovation happens even when it is unrecognized. Although the **Mission-Shaped Church** report grappled with the reality and the challenges of innovation, this phenomenon was never identified explicitly. However, the church's capacity to cultivate, manage and utilize innovation depends greatly on its ability to recognize, name, and facilitate its dynamics. Just as pastors help people attend to the unseen presence of God in their lives, churches should be more aware of how innovation shapes their corporate life otherwise their efforts will lack coherence and the search for greater effectiveness prove elusive.

A fuller picture of innovation

Innovation is about the intentional management of change so that greater effectiveness, efficiency or social benefit may be achieved. [xxi] Our understanding of innovation has grown as the study of this complex phenomenon has broadened beyond its founding disciplines of engineering, economics and sociology. It has become a substantial area of study chiefly because of its potential to integrate disparate disciplines as organizations endeavor to put ideas into action in order to yield improved outcomes.

However, innovation as it used in popular culture is often a synonym for change, creativity or anything technological that is new, exciting, edgy or risky. It has become a buzzword for governments and fodder for in-flight entertainment.[xxii] But innovation is more than being up to date, it is greater than being cool and more complicated than anyone imagines.

Innovation is complicated because of the way it is applied to outcomes, processes, individuals and systems, often simultaneously. The mobile phone that sits on your desk is a perfect example. Whether it is an iPhone4, a Nokia or Blackberry, such products didn't exist until a few years ago. Innovation is also used to describe the processes used to create such products or services. In this case, it includes the commercialization of scientific research, design, regulatory compliance, manufacturing, assembly, distribution, marketing, not to mention after sales service, billing and device recycling. Innovation is often associated with exceptional individuals, like Steve Jobs, who bring brilliant ideas to market and yet no individual is fully responsible for the development or success of any innovation. This is because innovation works socially through interpersonal relationships, not only between developers but with their external clients and competitors also. Furthermore, innovations also change as they are adapted for adoption by various market segments.

Innovation is increasingly viewed as a holistic concept. It pays close attention to the nature of creativity and how ideas emerge, as well as being vitally interested in the processes of implementation that deliver improved performance, enhanced effectiveness or raised efficiency. This includes not only those efforts which yield small incremental improvements over time but those that produce discontinuous change, that fundamentally alter market and user behavior. Innovation is not simply as a one-dimensional chain of activity that begins with inventiveness and which moves through into development, testing, distribution, evaluation, and improvement. Innovation requires organizations not only to improve successful products, processes and systems but planning to replace them in a systematic fashion. Crucially it has focused attention on how innovation depends greatly on the culture of an organization, particularly its capacity to manage and sustain change effectively. Innovation has to be cultivated culturally by organizations. This involves not merely words but actions, policies, programs and structures that reflect how innovation is important to nature and their very survival.

Innovation is a deeply paradoxical and complex reality. The achievement of any quality outcome is usually the fruit of a long selection and testing process that whittles thousands of options to a mere handful. Furthermore, it is often impossible to predict accurately which outcome will succeed in advance without prior testing. Markets are highly competitive and while adding or converging functionality is the route to success for some, simplicity is important to others. Products that achieve market dominance often set the pattern that guides and even constrains future development. Finally, innovation is disruptive for as new capacity, skills and communities is created, old capacity is discarded or destroyed. Those that pick and invest in a trajectory for innovation tend to perfect it over time, even when the yields diminish. Discontinuous change that brings advancement and massive change to an industry tends to start life in a small, outside company which then grows to dominance by perfecting the superior technology. Contemporary corporations not only devote significant resources to innovation through in-house development but also by buying-in intellectual property.

Applying innovation's dynamics

When it comes to Christian churches, does innovation work in the same way even when they do not manufacture products or deliver services for profit? How might churches benefit by having a fuller understanding of innovation derived from the world of business and science not only as organizations but specifically as church?

It is important to recognize that while business and the Church are distinctive in their nature, purpose and means of operations innovation should still be integral to their corporate life.[xxiii] Business is by its nature a human matter that works either within God's redemptive purposes or against it. Furthermore, firms are owned either by one individual or by shareholders. In a competitive market environment, innovation is one means of ensuring not merely survival but long-term prosperity.

The Church exists because of God and his mission. Humans are called to participate through the Holy Spirit (John 20.21-22) who constitutes the Church. As human culture is continually shifting, churches must continually adapt to new circumstances so that the invitation might be made known. The Church is therefore both the agent and the outcome of God's mission.

Although it is unsatisfactory to conceive of evangelism as a market driven activity nevertheless Christians live in a world where ideas, values and lifestyles compete for attention. Innovation may be more central to the life of the Church than many Christians realize.

Business and the Church have distinctive purposes. A firm is organized to achieve specific or limited goals, usually with meeting human needs and generating profits for its owners. The Church is never solely concerned with human ideas, creativity or self-interests but rather uses such gifts and attributes for God's purposes for the general purpose of personal and social transformation through Christ.[xxiv] Its leaders are sent into the world so that God's people may emerge as blessing to others and that yet more capacity might be released for mission. Innovation should never be about personal enrichment so much as finding new ways to release the social benefits that come through a dynamic relationship with God.

As organizations, churches and businesses operate in distinctive ways. Firms are sustained by profitability, which is achieved through improved efficiency by raising revenues and reducing costs. They often have a high degree of control over the product and the innovation process. The Church exists by virtue of gifts, often built up over generations yet its ability to achieve efficiency is constrained because missional engagement is highly inter-personal by nature.[xxv] Churches have made great use of its practices and procedures to organize their corporate life, such as management, goal setting and strategic planning yet such rationalization has important limits.[xxvi] When it comes to innovation, churches often have a highly fragmented development process with a low degree of control over achieving specific outcomes.

Churches certainly face significant challenges when it comes to innovation but its difficulty does not negate its importance. Innovation should be viewed by the Church as an activity, birthed and gifted by the Spirit.[xxvii] Innovation should not be confined to small organic groups or the domain of new charismatic and pentecostal denominations. It should be integral to life of every denomination as they seek to share in God's mission to a changing world.

A fuller application of the dynamics of innovation could help Australia's churches in three ways. First, it can focus attention on the essential activity of contextualization by broadening it beyond issues of communication. Second, it highlights critical aspects of the process of mission by drawing attention to the systemic aspects of mission that are frequently neglected and overlooked in denominational systems. Finally, it challenges how we hold together tensions that are critical to the life of the Church.

Contextualization

Stephen Bevans has observed that the recognition of context's importance is arguably the definitive feature of 20th Century Christian theology.[xxviii] Contextualization or inculturation describes the relationship of engagement between faith and contemporary culture used by missiologists, particularly in the majority or non-western world. It replaced 19th Century terms like accommodation or adaption that developed pejorative overtones. As a process, contextualization consists of the interplay between several inter-related elements, namely: (1) the Holy Spirit; (2) the evangeliser; (3) the Gospel; and (4) the social context that is engaged.[xxix]

The challenge at the heart of contextualization is how to develop culturally appropriate forms of Christianity that allow for effective communication, critical self-awareness, and engagement that creates faith communities among people who live in a diverse range of cultural contexts. Christians have differed markedly as to how they understand contextualization, as a process and outcome. They differ over the influence of the evangeliser, the cultural embeddedness of the Gospel, and the nature and means of the Gospel's engagement with culture, and the degree to which culture should allowed to influence or inform the church and its understanding of the gospel. They also differ over whether contextualisation means Christianizing a culture or enabling people to become authentic Christians within a given cultural environment. The fact that churches have had such debates has enabled innovation

to occur as the practice of contextualization has moved through a variety of phases, from uncritical to more critically nuanced approaches.[xxx]

For all the importance accorded to contextualization, practice of it remains poor as ideas are divorced from organizational realities and implementation is often problematic.[xxxi] Although the theory of contextualization is known, churches have been highly resistant, viewing it as a threat to their identity and often suspicious of local experience. Furthermore, non-contextual churches often look more successful while the fear of syncretism; peer criticism and departing from well-worn traditions easily inhibit its practice.

When Christians presume to understand the people of a locality the opportunity for contextualization falls because efforts at innovation are minimized or avoided. When leaders say they want innovation but inhibit or constrict the scope for local contextualization they are invariably creating ecclesial cultures that will become missionally ineffective.

Churches need more networks and systems that support contextualization as an intense inter-subjective journey into sensemaking as Christians collectively engage different people in new contexts. Storytelling is rewarding but Christians need to share them in a way that expands the imagination and capacity for mission while accepting that they will invariably come to different conclusions about how a missional context should be engaged. This is vitally important because an unfamiliar social context only becomes receptive to engagement through repeated circling that tests effective strategies and discards ineffective ones. Innovation is therefore a key means by which the churches capacity for mission can be enhanced.

Systems

Many leaders separate mission from the institutional systems and structures that frame it, often discarding the latter when they obstruct the former's pursuit. Phillip Jensen typified this view commenting that new congregations were preferable to old ones with problems because "its easier to bring to birth than to resurrect the dead."[xxxii] Invariably, talk of new wine and old wineskins that followed implied that denominational structures were too inflexible for mission today and the sooner they were abandoned for the sake of the Gospel so much the better.

The development of mega-churches with decentralized structures compounded this view. Decentralized structures were said to enable leaders to be more engaged with their people and focused on developing lay gifting for ministry.[xxxiii] They tended to have pattern of authority that emphasized relational means than impersonal bureaucratic methods associated with policies and legislation. The implication was that innovators needed more freedom and fewer committees that lacked sensitivity to contextual needs and interests.

Advocates for innovation easily latched on to models of organic community with minimal structure that they soon identify with first-century Christianity.[xxxiv] These models were often constructed in opposition to existing institutional or corporate churches and usually functioned as a critique of their many evident deficiencies. Structure was typically regarded as an unnecessary impediment to growth and development while mission was associated with maximizing a leaders freedom to act and engage. What often went unseen was the culture that animated structures either to function as a cage that constrained others or a skeleton that gave freedom for movement in mission.

Denominations are a multitude of congregations linked by a common name, heritage, legal framework or theological outlook but they are not one single organization. They are layered organizations where multiple entities often function with a high degree of independence. Nevertheless, Australian denominations have done much to address their institutional rigidity in recent years. They have developed legal provisions that allow for the emergence of new kinds of churches, often with pared down administrative requirements and responsibilities. Training, ordination and deployment processes have become better coordinated. Yet the challenge of addressing the culture towards innovation remains problematic, perhaps because churches struggle with paradox.

Managing paradox

Paradox is a feature of all organizational life. For the Church, it emerges from the greatest paradox of all – the Incarnation. The Church is itself paradoxical for although it is simultaneously animated by the Spirit yet it functions as a human organization, grounded in context and limited by personal weakness. It is both ancient and yet always emerging as its leaders engage new people in different contexts. Perhaps it is here where we learn that in our weakness the power of Christ can be seen (2 Cor 12.9-10).

The life of religious organizations is shaped by a variety of paradoxes concerning role, perspective, structure and mission.[xxxv] They are focused on producing outcomes with processes over which they have little control. Personal and social transformation are deeply spiritual outcomes which cannot be manufactured but depend on the work of God through our efforts at proclamation, nurture, service, action and care. The mission of God requires the Church to simultaneously develop its internal life and yet look beyond itself to participating in God's activity in the world beyond its doors. The challenge is to openly acknowledge and address paradox rather than seeking to resolve and lay it aside.

Innovation is a paradoxical quality in the life of the Church. It manifests itself in the tension between continuity/discontinuity, institutions/ individuals, identity/performance and internal/external audience. Whenever continuity, institutions, identity and internal audience are strongly emphasized, scope for innovation is reduced and with it the church becomes pre-occupied with its own life and isolated from the culture in which it lives. Scope for innovation is released when people emphasize discontinuity, individuals, performance and the external audience yet this always risks syncretism as the church risks its identity to find new ways of connecting with different people. For Christian leaders, maintaining the tension between these polar realities is vitally important to enable genuine innovation to emerge which links ideas about the Church's nature and purpose with effective structures and local strategies for mission.

Conclusion

Christians misunderstand innovation if they conceive it as a magic bullet that will somehow fix all their ailments and usher in a new age of vitality and influence. Such views reduce innovation to a reproducible formula. Neither is innovation about gaining a competitive advantage against other churches. It should be about working more effectively with God so that Christian communities can grow more disciples who are more capable at participating in mission to a troubled world (Matt 12.28-30). If the Church is both the agent and the outcome of mission, innovation is integral to its life and its leaders should be more intentional about management of change so that its participation in mission can be enhanced over time.

The principal challenge of innovation is not theological. Even though contextualization is a debated and contested process, the vast majority of missiologists, theologians and church leaders do not doubt its importance rather how to become proficient at it. A sound understanding of innovation will undoubtedly assist in this goal.

Neither is the challenge merely one of organizational flexibility and freedom. Mission is a deeply inter-subjective process that requires cooperation, conversation and time. Institutional arrangements can help facilitate emerging congregations and many denominations are exploring how to great ecosystems were existing and fresh expressions can cooperate and collaborate often within a single entity. Much has been done in the last decade to achieve the flexibility so earnestly desired by the pioneers who first trod this path during the 1960s.

Foremost, innovation is a cultural matter. For although many denominations now support innovation in mission and have appropriate structures in place, their cultures seem to have an acute deficiency of innovators. Churches would well be advised to remember that innovation is a spiritual activity and that welcoming the heralds of change is the vital first step in finding a new future.

[i] KUNG, HANS and TRACY, DAVID, *Paradigm Change in Theology* (New York: Crossroad, 1989).

[ii] MILLIKAN, DAVID, *The Sunburnt Soul: Christianity in Search of an Australian Identity* (Homebush West: Lancer, 1981).

[iii] MCINTOSH, GARY and TOWNS, ELMER L., *Evaluating the Church Growth Movement : 5 Views* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2004).

[iv] MILLER, DONALD E., *Reinventing American Protestantism: Christianity in the New Millennium* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), ELLINGSON, STEPHEN, *The Megachurch and the Mainline. Remaking Religious Tradition in the Twenty-First Century.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

[v] BELLAMY, JOHN and CASTLE, KEITH, *2001 Church Attendance Estimates*, in *NCLS Occasional Paper 3* (Sydney: NCLS Research, 2004).

[vi] BELLAMY, JOHN and KALDOR, PETER, *National Church Life Survey Initial Impressions 2001* (Adelaide: Openbook, 2002).

[vii] CAMPBELL, ALEXANDER, *A Report on Church Planting in the Uk since 2000* (Manchester: Mission 21, 2006).

[viii] FINKE, ROGER and STARK, RODNEY, *The Churching of American, 1776-2005. Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2005).

[ix] ROBINSON, MARTIN, *To Win the West* (Crowborough: Monarch, 1996). GUDER, DARRELL L. and BARRETT, LOIS, *Missional Church : A Vision for the Sending of the Church in North America* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1998), CORNEY, PETER, *Change and the Church. How to Initiate and Manage Constructive Change in the Local Church.* (South Sydney: Aquila Press, 2000). William M. Easum and Dave Travis, *Beyond the Box : Innovative Churches That Work* (Loveland, Colo.: Group, 2003),

[x] EASUM, WILLIAM M. and TRAVIS, DAVE, *Beyond the Box : Innovative Churches That Work* (Loveland, Colo.: Group, 2003), EASUM, WILLIAM M., *Unfreezing Moves : Following Jesus into the Mission Field* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001). In Australia, Alan Hirsch achieved infamy by declaring that traditional churches had 20 years left at best, see LANGMEAD, ROSS, *Conference Report* (paper presented at the Re-imagining God and mission within Australian cultures. Australian Missiology Conference 2005, Melbourne, 2005).

[xi] PIERSON, PAUL E. , *The Dynamics of Christian Mission* (Pasa, CA: William Carey International University Press, 2008). and his Australian student, Steve Addison, Director of Christian Resource Ministries Australia, have been very influential in popularizing this view.

[xii] WARD, PETE, *Liquid Church* (Peabody / Carlisle: Hendrickson / Paternoster, 2002), WARREN, ROBERT, *Being Human, Being Church : Spirituality and Mission in the Local Church* (London: Marshall Pickering, 1995).,FROST, MICHAEL and HIRSCH, ALAN, *The Shaping of Things to Come : Innovation and Mission for the 21st-Century Church* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003), BREWIN, KESTER, *Signs of Emergence. A Vision for Church That Is Organic, Networked, Decentralised, Bottom-up, Communal, Flexible, Evolving.* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2004).

[xiii] Travis I. Barbour and Nicholas E. Toews, "The Emergent Church: A Methodological Critique," *Direction* 39, no. 1 (2010),

[xiv] HUGHES, PHILIP and REID, STEPHEN, *All Melbourne Matters: Research of the Whole Church in Melbourne for the Future of the Church and the City* (Nunawading: Christian Research Association, 2009).

[xv] POWELL, RUTH, *Why Innovation Is Needed in Church Life*, Ncls Research Fact Sheet Catalogue Number 01.10.03.05 (Sydney: NCLS Research, 2010).

[xvi] BOSHART, DAVID W., *Becoming Missional: Denominations and New Church Development in Complex Social Contexts.* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011). Southern Baptists have been more challenging to persuade, see STETZER, ED, *The Missional Nature of the Church and the Future of Southern Baptist Convention Churches*.

[xvii] CRAY, GRAHAM et al., *Mission-Shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expressions of Church in a Changing Context* (2004).

[xviii] HULL, JOHN M., *Mission-Shaped Church: A Theological Response* (London: SCM Press, 2006)., MILBANK, JOHN, *Stale Expressions: The Management-Shaped Church*, *Studies in Christian Ethics* 21, no. 1 (2008), DAVISON, ANDREW and MILBANK, ALISON,

For the Parish. A Critique of Fresh Expressions (London: SCM Press, 2010), NELSTROP, LOUISE and PERCY, MARTYN, ***Evaluating Fresh Expressions : Explorations in Emerging Church : Responses to the Changing Face of Ecclesiology in the Church of England*** (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2008).

xix CRAY et al., ***Mission-Shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expressions of Church in a Changing Context***., 126.

xx Ibid., 125-144.

xxi COOK, GRAHAM, MATTHEWS, MARK, and IRWIN, STEPHEN, ***Innovation in the Public Sector: Enabling Better Performance, Driving New Directions,*** ed. Australian National Audit Office (Canberra: Australian National Audit Office, 2009).

xxii CONROY, SHANE, *Innovation. The New Currency of Success*, ***Virginblue voyeur*** 117, no. April (2011).

xxiii Economists and sociologists generally distinguish three sectors in society namely government which is essentially concerned with the political sector; business which is essentially the economic sector; and associations which are voluntary groups focused on social benefits, see MINTZBERG, HENRY et al., *The Invisible World of Association*, ***Leader to Leader***, no. Spring (2005).

xxiv The general nature of the church's mission may be seen in the Anglican Communion's five marks of mission (1990). An additional sixth mark of worship has also been proposed.

xxv CHAVES, MARK, *Supersized: Analyzing the Trend Towards Larger Churches*, ***Christian Century***, no. November 28 (2006).

xxvi DRANE, JOHN WILLIAM, ***The Mcdonaldization of the Church : Consumer Culture and the Church's Future*** (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2001).

xxvii VAN GELDER, CRAIG, ***The Ministry of the Missional Church: A Community Led by the Spirit*** (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2007).

xxviii BEVANS, STEPHEN B., ***Models of Contextual Theology.***, Revised Edition ed. (New York: Orbis Books, 2005).

xxix ARBUCKLE, GERALD A., ***Earthing the Gospel. An Inculturation Handbook for Pastoral Workers.*** (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1990).

xxx HIEBERT, PAUL G., ***The Gospel in Human Contexts: Anthropological Explorations for Contemporary Missions*** (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2009), SHENK, WILBERT R., ***Changing Frontiers of Mission*** (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1999), ———, *The Missionary Encounter with Culture since the Seventeenth Century*, in ***Appropriate Christianity***, ed. Charles H. Kraft (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 2005).

xxxi WHITEMAN, DARRELL L., *The Function of Appropriate Contextualisation in Mission*, in ***Appropriate Christianity***, ed. Charles H. Kraft (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 2005).

xxxii JENSEN, PHILLIP, *I Will Build My Church*, ***The Briefing***, no. 201 (1997)., 9.

xxxiii MILLER, ***Reinventing American Protestantism: Christianity in the New Millennium***., 156.

xxxiv EASUM and TRAVIS, ***Beyond the Box : Innovative Churches That Work***, BARNA, GEORGE and VIOLA, FRANK, ***Pagan Christianity?: Exploring the Roots of Our Church Practices.***, 2nd ed. (Tyndale House, 2008).

xxxv MALONY, H. NEWTON, ***Living with Paradox. Religious Leadership and the Genius of Double Vision*** (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998)., 8-13.