

# AGWM Seminar with Melvyn Ming

July 1, 2003

Tape 3

**Ming:** I use some very famous speeches, you know, the *I Have a Dream*, some of these, because it is the medium that helps people get a feel for it. You can't \_\_\_\_\_ vision and be \_\_\_\_\_. The next thing I would do, I would ask them to write out their vision; write it out. This one's going to be a multipart. Write it out, and then write five real life stories that illustrate it—people, about a person, Ben, Susie, whatever, a missionary, John, real life stories. Then I would tell them after they got it all written out, go through and cross out every word that you can cross out and still keep the meaning. Cross out every word if it doesn't have to be there. Then I would say, go through it and simplify every three-syllable word you have down to one or two syllables. Then I would say, go through it and break into sentences anything over thirteen words. Don't do any run on sentences. You talk orally in sound bytes, so you package it that way. Then, I would ask them to share their vision with me and I would tell them, "I want you to get me so excited that I jump out of my chair." And I would sit there, and I would keep rattling them until finally they would get \_\_\_\_\_, and then I would say, "Now you've got it. Keep going." Because once you've felt it, you know how it goes. Then I would tell them, "I want you to share your vision with somebody every day for a week, *not* in a service." Find somebody to share it. Say it. Learn how to say it every day for a week. Those are a couple of things I would do along that line.

Let's go to the second question, and this one, I think, many of you actually addressed it there, but you know one of the questions I think I would ask them: "How do you seek God for your vision? How do you keep this from just being sound bytes? So, how do you seek God? How do you wait on God for your vision? How do you \_\_\_\_\_? How do you communicate your values by telling the story?" You don't want them to list their values; you want them to tell their values. Obviously, we'd ask them, "Okay, I want you now to prepare your vision for 60 seconds, for a minute and a half, for 3 minutes, for 12 minutes, and for 30 minutes. Repackage it in all these packages."

Let's move to the third one. Specifics. Now we're not general. We're getting really specific. Coaching technique here. We'll start right back up here—one idea from each table on number three here. What specifics? You have to get to the mike.

**Audience:** Be concise.

**Ming:** Be concise. Okay, this table here.

**Audience:** You know passion statement, a goal statement, and a response statement.

**Ming:** So the key: the clarity statement.

**Audience:** A story. (Laughter) Something personal.

**Ming:** Absolutely.

**Audience:** Ours are already covered.

**Ming:** Okay.

**Audience:** We were saying that you must communicate sincerity and genuineness in what you are doing.

**Ming:** Genuine sincerity. Good.

**Audience:** Go early and try to get a feel for the audience.

**Ming:** Read your audience. I'm going to talk more about that one in just a minute. The back one. Back there.

**Audience:** We're still working on not drooling right now.

**Ming:** Oh, you're still working. Carry on. (Laughter.)

**Audience:** To communicate your call, vision, passion, and commitment.

**Ming:** Communicate your passion, your call and commitment. Yes.

**Audience:** Use short phrases and descriptive words.

**Ming:** Yes, use short phrases and descriptive words, colorful words, yes.

**Audience:** Be yourself.

**Ming:** Be yourself. That's right. You've got to be yourself. Okay, I will show you some that I would use. I wouldn't ever listen the way we are now. I would kind of \_\_\_\_\_ here and there. Eventually I would probably give them all the same. Smile with your eyes; don't smile with your mouth. If you smile with your mouth, you look like a hypocrite. People can see it, the incongruence. They think you're lying. Always smile with your eyes and your mouth will smile, so \_\_\_\_\_ that smile. Keep eye contact, especially the first 15 seconds and the last 15 seconds. Make sure you never look down at your notes. You always know the beginning, and you always know the ending. Tell the story of one person's transformation and use their first name. The minute you use a name, it makes it real. If you just say *a girl*, it's not, but *Barbara*. Okay. Always tell one story. Don't tell group stories. Keep with the \_\_\_\_\_. Connect to individuals. Keep your chin down. People who \_\_\_\_\_ have a tendency to raise their chin that makes them look arrogant. Keep your chin down. It makes you seem warmer. Look at someone a third of the way back who's got an expressive face, because if you look a third of the way back, the people in front and back will think you're looking at them. If you look at the back, everybody in front will think you're looking over their heads, so go about a third of the way back. Pick somebody and do that. Then, take that person and make them lean forward when they feel your passion. If they don't lean forward, crank it up a notch.

Now, here's what I want you to think about here. I mean, we have some outstanding vision casters in missions, but sometimes we're not teaching the others how to do it, and they hurt the enterprise. But if you know if you're a pastor, you've got to know this, if you get one guy who bombs, and it's tougher to book the service for everybody from now on. Okay? You just live with that. But if people can communicate it, people are going to open doors. They do need to know how to do it quick. We are a sound byte society. You can't take an hour warming up. You've got to do it here. Now, you come up with your own \_\_\_\_\_. People can learn. People can all of a sudden become exciting \_\_\_\_\_. Very few will without coaching. Okay, I'm going to sum this up

and then I'm going to take it somewhere, kind of some summary, and I really appreciate \_\_\_\_\_. They're going to give you the notes and they are very complete.

I'll summarize two or three other styles for you. If you're going to coach, you've got to mature your attitudes. You've got to be committed. You've got to be not worried about your kingdom and you. You've got to really be willing to invest in somebody and care if anybody ever knows who did it. You do have this \_\_\_\_\_ to develop the coaching model. Most people need some handle to do this or what happens is they get started but never get to the conclusion. You do need to develop some questions based on your model. Your questions have to fit your model. If your model has five points, get at least five questions for each of your five points. Not that you would ask all five, but you have them in your toolbox to bring out. And then you can listen with total abandonment because you don't have to worry about questions, you know. You've got it memorized. And then you have to build confidence and credibility. Great coaches grow their coaching. They don't start out grown. You have people in coaching, they'll tell their friends who'll want coaching and pretty soon you can coach anybody else. But you don't have to start it \_\_\_\_\_. You can start coaching anybody. Just start helping somebody. People that are helped are good evangelists. So in your missions area, in your field, in your region, you'll have one and then word will get around, and then other people will want help.

Now, I'd like to take a couple of minutes before the break, and I am going to do this unbelievably fast. I'm going to amaze myself here. If I lose you along the way, I've already figured Plan B, how I can catch you up. A couple of things that came up in discussion related to vision casting is that in the 1960s-70s, you could itinerate and the truth is have one package and have it fit most A/G churches. That is no longer true at all. What I do really for a living is helping \_\_\_\_\_ churches and all, and I work with 16 different style churches, all A/G. Frankly the spiel you would make one place would be totally inappropriate in another. Now I'm not going to give you all the techniques about how these things are that way and why there that way. I'm going to paint you a big picture because I think every missionary needs three versions, and I think I can show you how they are and I'll hopefully give a little bit of coaching. Now, if I overcome, get a little bit too complex, don't worry about it yet, but connecting with your church base.

Church worship styles. Now these are all Pentecostal A/G, we're not talking about everybody else now, and I could name churches for each if you want, if it would help you to have a real church. I can do that, no problem. We have seeker-driven churches. You know, the most famous in America is Willow Creek, but some \_\_\_\_\_ Christian Center in Northern Cal to give you an example of an A/G one, that would be like that. In those churches, the weekend service is not a worship service. It's an outreach rally. It's for pagans, not Christians. Their worship service is midweek, so if you're speaking a weekend in one of those, you've got to speak to pagans. I mean, they've never heard of Booneville Avenue. Then there are seeker-sensitive churches. Radiant \_\_\_\_\_ A/G. That would be one seeker-sensitive. They think that lost people can watch Christians worship, but you've got to speak in such a way that non-Christians can interpret what you mean. So you can go . . . Did you ever notice how in missions that we love a \_\_\_\_\_? and all these kind of things that are just totally bizarre to a non-Christian. You've got to articulate what you mean by it. It's not like \_\_\_\_\_ literature. You've got to say what it is.

Then we have casual contemporary. This would be like a Timberline Church, Gary Northrup. These churches, the dress is usually casual, \_\_\_\_\_ usually band driven. The speaking would be conversational and they probably won't have an altar call. Then you have celebration style. This is like Hillsongs. You can always tell a celebration style church. The minute the music starts, everybody stands. If somebody has to say, "Will you stand," it is not a celebration church. They will stand and stay standing, and by the way, the music in a celebration church will go fast, fast,

slow, fast, slow, slow, fast, slow, fast. There's no middle. \_\_\_\_\_ going to be soft and all of a sudden, it's going to explode and then it's going to be really soft. They don't work it down and up. Then you have traditional contemporary. That'd be like James River here in town. They tend to do things really well. Their music is a little more traditional. They often, by the way, have the fanciest buildings in style and \_\_\_\_\_ number that would be examples of traditional contemporary. They are traditional probably in dress, but they have contemporary . . . for example, they often use media, lighting. They tend to be a little more polished on transitions and segue. Traditional, the name says it, but by traditional, I'm talking about A/G traditional, not evangelical traditional. Central Assembly. Okay.

Formal and liturgical. I'm not taking a lot of time here, friends. I coached here in all these styles. I don't have anything against any of them. Formal and liturgical. I have to tell you that a lot of people say we have A/G churches that way. A lot of the postmodern churches being planted are liturgical. For example, we have a church in our district, there's probably no one in the church over thirty, all saints, Assemblies of God, all saints, and we're going to have ancient future modern \_\_\_\_\_ postmodernism. Okay.

There are teaching churches, and you can always tell a teaching church because people going in have a Bible and a binder. When the pastor goes to the pulpit, there's this \_\_\_\_\_. It's not the Holy Spirit. It's all the binders opening. They can be either casual or formal.

Then we have new Pentecostal churches. These would be churches that run on a lot of passion and energy. They kind of blend a little bit of the celebration and renewal. They tend to be very supernatural, faith-based, so there's a lot of God-talk going on. Their services are slightly longer than the last ones.

Then we have renewal churches. Renewal churches put emphasis on experiencing and personal encounter. By the way, you can tell the difference between these two if you ask people going out, "How did you like the service." If they say, "Great music" or "Great preaching" it was New Pentecostal. If they say, "I loved the altar call," it was \_\_\_\_\_ Renewal, because they have a different focus in the service. But this is kind of a minor, little point here.

There are cell churches that think that the church is small group and we now have \_\_\_\_\_. And by the way, something that is a shock to many people, but the home church movement in America is huge, and they're not part of any denomination. But it is huge, and it's almost off our radar scale, but it's an amazing kind of thing.

There are multi-track churches. This one is actually becoming the most common in many ways for the growing churches. They offer two or three different styles, so we have a church in our district and they offer what they call spirited traditional, celebration, and casual contemporary. Pick your blend of \_\_\_\_\_. It's a multi-track movie theatre. You pick your venue.

Multi-sensory. This is by the way the hardest to do and the most expensive, and we don't have a lot of them, but we have a few, especially a couple of postmodern ones around. The most famous church, by the way, that would be that way would be Ginghamburg Church in Tipp, OH. Postmodern. Truthfully, there are a number of versions of postmodern churches in the Assemblies of God, and I'll show you that one in a minute. We have at least three or four venues.

Then, the urban styles. Urban and near urban. For example, Tommy Barnett is a Near Urban style. You can't run that model if you're not adjacent to an urban area. It's a contextually based

model. It's a great model in that environment, but for example, you can't run Tommy Barnett in rural America. It has to have an urban area.

And then, obviously, blended. Now that's where people merge styles. They have to merge styles that are appropriate. Here's what happens. They take, if you will, they use all kinds of senses, including visual, smell, and all that, but they layer it. During the course of a service, you add layers and you keep layering them over, so by the time you get to the end of the service, you might have a speaker speaking, music going and a visual going, none of which match all at the same time. It's wonderful sensory overload.

Okay, now. All of this is to get to a point. Give me a minute here and I'll get you to a point and then to a break. For the sake of just conceptual understanding, here we have a continuum that moves really from most focus on the outside or the most focus on the inside. So you have seeker-driven, seeker-sensitive, casual, contemporary, traditional contemporary, traditional liturgical. And the truth is they are focused into \_\_\_\_\_ moving from the total pagan to the insider. Then you have some of these things. For example, a teaching church is almost always blended. But you could have a teaching seeker-sensitive or teaching casual contemporary. By the way, an example of that would be Chuck Smith. Almost all of the Calvary Chapel are teaching casual contemporary. You could have a teaching traditional contemporary. You could have a teaching traditional. John MacArthur at Grace would be an example there. So those would be a blend.

A cell church. You could have a cell church that's seeker-sensitive \_\_\_\_\_. For example World Prayer Outreach Center in Louisiana would be a cell traditional contemporary.

Postmodern, which is not an age, but a way of thinking, but primarily Millennials and Gen-Xers—they are almost all either casual contemporary or liturgical. They tend to go in those two.

Then multi sensory. You almost always find them over on the seeker casual contemporary side. Now, the celebration moves on a line between casual contemporary and traditional. For example, some celebration churches are casual, and some dress up. See, the music defines them, not the dress. By the way, everything going down this line, the preaching has to be passionate. You can't have a celebration church with a sharing pastor. We've been all over the globe and we've had the lights moving everywhere and subwoofers bouncing, and the dance team and all this, and the guy gets up, "I'd like to share with you today out of Romans." It just doesn't happen. They guy gets up there and says, "Today I want to talk about *destiny*!" And you're on your way. The new Pentecost comes into there and then the renewal, and urban is contextual. Now, what I want to show you, by the way, is that a blended has to come from the same family tree. So like a lot of blended would have a traditional contemporary, casual contemporary, and then a postmodern casual. You're not going to have a church that one side is seeker-sensitive and another service is renewal and another liturgical, because two of the three are faking it. It's not in their DNA. They have to be close, okay?

Now, here's what I want to show you. All of that was to get to the point. How do your missionaries connect with a church that could come in 16 flavors? See what I'm saying? The whole communication style changes here. For the sake of conceptual understanding, I would tell you if the rookie missionary had three packages they could fit in all 16, and I will try to show you that, and by the way, this is one person's opinion. This is not rocket science. Some of you may have far better concepts than I do, but I think I can kind of demonstrate it. All of these churches that are here, anything that is this side of this line and above here—the preaching tends to be conversational, and the most important quality is authenticity. Almost all of them are going to be casual, and many of you know, if you travel now, you have to take multiple kinds of clothes,

because you're not sure what the venue is going to be. In some of the churches, you change between venues. It's true; at least, it happens in my circles.

Share in group number one. Now this was that group all over on that one side: seeker and the casuals. Here's a couple of do's and don'ts I would suggest for a new missionary.  
[Unintelligible comment.]

No, yeah, they will probably and you know this is stuff I could probably . . . They've got to be authentic. You know, in those churches, if they ever perceive them as inauthentic, they will not listen to another word. They cannot come off looking like Slick Willy. They have just got to be genuine and just look real. They have to share the story conversationally. This is not the place to crack your C. M. Ward voice. It's got to be \_\_\_\_\_. They've got to talk in terms of vision and outcome. As a result of the investment of this church, we're seeing this happen because they think bottom line. They want to know outcomes. You have to tell stories of everyday people. "Let me tell you what happened in..." BOOM! and you tell the story. "Let me tell you about this person," and you tell the story, but you share it. A couple of don'ts: Don't talk about programs. These people don't want to hear that we have 97 programs. They don't even want to know about it. They connect to vision and people. Don't talk about Springfield. They've never heard of it, and they don't care to. Don't act like all you want is their money, and don't talk too long. These churches are quick. You get 2 minutes, 7 minutes, 10 minutes, 12 minutes. Take it and get off because, by the way, you go over, and you're never back. If they have multiple services and you go over in the first service, you won't speak in the next two.

*[Unintelligible comment with laughter]*

You develop mature attitudes. *[Laughter]* Okay, can you see the truth is if you learn this is just standing up? And talk casually, but you've got to do it with conversational passion, and you do it by your stories. Mary, John.

Now the next group, kind of the other side, the more traditional side, the traditional liturgical. At this one, you have to be professional. And don't get hung up on the word, but they expect you to have decorum, the dress. They don't want you in your Levi's. They expect your speech—they don't want slang. They don't want accouterments. They want you to be gracious. They have a certain decorum that is part of their culture. They want you to preach the story, not share the story. They do want you to talk about programs, because they identify with them, because they are program churches. They want to hear the stories of victory. They want to hear when God moved. They don't want you to talk about yourself. They don't care that you got hangnails or that your Ford doesn't run right or—they don't want to hear all this little stuff. They don't. They don't want you to act like you wish you were somewhere else. They are proud of who they are, and they want you to be happy there. And they don't want you to ramble. They want you to get up and say it, shout it out, this kind of thing.

Now let's go to the bottom line: celebration, new Pentecost, renewal. You'd better communicate with passion here. You'd better believe it. You'd better be able to turn up the crank a little bit here. Now you share the story, but the story that's breaking your heart! You get with it there. You talk about faith and the supernatural. You tell the stories of victory: "But, you know, God moved when it seemed impossible!" And you get into the whole rhetoric; you hope you develop your rhythm. You don't overdo. They don't want to know all the minutia. They don't want to know how many layers of structure. They don't care about that. They don't want you to act casual because that to them is boring. They don't want you to sound like an egghead. "Today, I have

good news for you that will . . . “ They want you to be this real, passionate person that can stir their hearts.

What I want you to see is, that’s only three speeches. And in three speeches, you can get 16 different styles. You obviously \_\_\_\_\_ a little bit. If a first row is 30 feet from you and you ask them what’s this for and they say, “Dancing room,” then you’ve got an idea, you better crank it up. This is not the time to \_\_\_\_\_. You can read that very quickly.

Break time. We’ll start at 3:15.

We’ll start with just a little video clip, so if I can get you . . . Okay, let me just say again how enjoyable to dialogue at the breaks, and the interaction and just such a wonderful ability to kind of engage together and talk and all. You know, we just came out of that little session about styles and vision and all, and many of you admitted, I guarantee you our leadership of our Movement is recognizing the need for reorganization and changes all over the place. That’s true of the churches. I mean obviously, if 17 out of 20 churches have plateaued or are declining, many of them are becoming acutely aware that things are . . . but even if you know it, it’s kind of a tough issue, so I’ve got a little clip for you. Just kind of relax. By the way, any of you that are hypersensitive, just chill out. Don’t get offended.

*[Video clip plays. There are technical difficulties, and then it starts up again. Different voices speak.]*

How did all this happen?

Well, I guess it all began a few months ago.

The messages were great, the pastor was great; everything was *great*.

It was all so wonderful back then.

None of us, absolutely none of us had any idea that this could happen.

I always knew this was going to happen.

People aren’t always what they appear to be.

It happened while our pastor was out of town, attending a conference. That’s usually when these things happen.

An idle mind is the devil’s playground.

When he returned, we could tell there was something different about him.

He was different, so different.

He tried real hard to conceal his transgression.

So I marched right into the pastor’s office and made him tell me exactly what happened. Our pastor finally broke down and confessed to \_\_\_\_\_ Faye, our church matriarch, on the condition that she tell no one.

I immediately notified the prayer chain. I was shocked to hear what the pastor had said. You read about this thing happening elsewhere, but you never think it's going to happen to your church, to your pastor.

Help us. I couldn't believe it. I said, "No! No! Pastor would never do something like that." But the very next week, in front of the whole congregation, he admitted it.

There in the hotel room, free from all the people and duties that usually hold him accountable, our pastor decided to do something that would forever change the way that he is seen and remembered by this congregation.

He

He

He decided

He decided to change

Change

Change our church!

I mean, you think you know somebody, and then, this.

We trusted him. We thought he was one of us.

The first change he wanted to make was to update our musical style.

As the organist, the pianist, and the choir director for the past 13 years, I wasn't quite sure how to take that.

So I stood right up and told him. If the organ was good enough for the apostles, then it is good enough for us.

He wanted to use fewer hymns and more praise and worship songs.

So what in the heck is wrong with *The Old Rugged Cross*? I love *The Old Rugged Cross*.

We hardly ever use our hymnals anymore.

We had to learn a bunch of new songs that they put up on the screen with a . . . a . . .

Movie projector!

Right in the middle of our sanctuary!

The following week, a new instrument arrived on stage.

A guitar.



A guitar.

A guitar! So I said, "What's next? Drums?"

A few weeks later, the drums arrived

Along with an *electrical* guitar

And something called a \_\_\_\_\_!

The sacred ground where my wife and I exchanged our wedding vows? It's covered with wires and amps and speakers . . .

And various other implements of rock and roll devilment

And the music he started playing was sort of . . .

Loud.

Loud!

Loud!!

Loud!!!

Louder than usual.

I had to shut off my hearing aid just to keep from wetting myself.

This is what happens when you change things.

But, that's not all that he wanted to change. Pastor also wanted to change our service times.

It was going to make me late for the Denny's brunch special.

Started using drums

\_\_\_\_\_ had apostles in them.

And started small group ministry.

Sounded like some kind of free love, hippie talk to me.

And none of these changes were as radical and devastating as what pastor suggested next. A slow . . .

But definite

\_\_\_\_\_

of the choir!

That's when we realized that pastor was possessed by a demon.

Get thee behind me, Satan!

But I love the choir.

My life is in the choir!

My entire family is in the choir!

Word has somehow reached the choir during their weekly potluck fellowship in the room that's adjacent to the pastor's study. The response was swift and frightful. It involved many handfuls of fast-moving room-temperature food. The pastor escaped with his life, but none of us have seen him since.

All I wanted to do was make a few changes. I had no idea it would end like this.

Now the instruments are gone and the service times are back to normal and the choir is still singing on weekends, and there's just one thing that's missing

I'm preaching every weekend until we find a suitable replacement, you know, someone who will toe the line.

Yeah, we tried that church out a few times. The first week was great.

We loved the music. The pastor was funny and what he said made a lot of sense.

We went back the next week with some friends, but things were not the same.

The music and the speaker were completely different and it was kind of well,

Let's just say, none of us connected with the service.

Now that the scandal is over, we finally have our church back to normal.

Yessir, we are back to normal, exactly the way God intended us to be!

**Ming:** Do I hear a witness?

*[Laughter]*

Well, you thought change was difficult in missions. I want to talk about in our session here, that we have a chance to hopefully bring some things together. How do we lead change in times of change? We have the subtitle, *How to Bring Change and Live to Tell About It*, because obviously we do want to lead people through change. I want to just talk about it and you have some handouts there.

There's a quote by Thomas Bandy, "The real world is a world of chaos." Culture is changing so quickly with so much diversity and so much simultaneous direction, but \_\_\_\_\_ so many learning

methods. The church group organized around traditional principles can't keep up. They find themselves spending more and more energy, lamenting change, resisting change, struggling with change, expressing anger about change, desperately trying to manage change, or just plain surviving change. Change, however, will not go away. It is relentless and accelerating. Change is an issue that all of us in ministry have to deal with. We have to focus on it. We have to deal with it. Most people are glad for change as long as it doesn't impact them. As long as it's somebody else or somebody other, you know, we're all happy with change. We want to talk about it applying to our specific situation here. Whenever you come to change in a group, whether it be a mission country field, an area, a region, the whole world missions of the Assemblies of God, a church, a school, you have an existing culture.

I just described a minute ago, in Assemblies of God churches we have at least 16 cultures. That's why it's enlarged. It's not one. There's no such thing as Assemblies of God style. We have all these different cultures, and when you lead any organization, through change it is different on the other side. You never go through change without changing the culture. We've got to be careful that we don't mislead people. You know, "All this change won't affect anything." It's going to affect something, and that's where systems thinking comes in. By the way, it could be good or bad. Not all change is good. Now if we look at this for a moment, uncontrolled change is chaos. All of you are probably more familiar than almost anyone I know of seeing countries where they had some kind of a terrible system, and people rallied together and brought down the government only to replace it with a worse government.

We had a church that was interested in coming into our district. You know, you're always open to it. So our leaders went to meet with them. Well, what it really, to kind of summarize it real quickly—you have all of these subgroups in the church and the one thing they had in common was they didn't like the previous pastor. They didn't share vision, values, strategy, but they just were sure. So they banded together, they had a great guiding coalition and voted him out. Once he was gone, they couldn't figure out who they were because he was the only thing that held them together. And the truth is, they disbanded. They just had nothing in common. That's chaos. So, change doesn't necessarily bring growth. Change isn't necessarily good and uncontrolled change is almost always negative. Managed change is leadership, and that's why you're in the room. You have to guide, direct, steer, move ahead with management change. Now, I want to talk a little bit about this. You know people universally resist change. You resist change in certain areas, and in other areas you're pretty open to it, but there are areas for all of us. It's important to know why people resist change. What causes that? Well, I think there are a number of issues—a loss of security. Anytime you change, you're not sure how the new will work. We know how this works. We don't know for sure how the one. We're kind of secure. At least now we understand it and that becomes a factor.

Another big one is—people are afraid that if we change that it will threaten their personal status or position. Maybe in the new I won't be important, needed, whatever word you want to fill in. I was kind of reminded last night. It's been a long time since I thought about it. Rick and I both grew up in Oceanside, CA. When my dad was pastoring there, there was a man in our church who was on our board who was a very dear friend of my father's. They were genuinely good friends. For a series of months, at the board meeting, my father would propose changes to help the church grow. They were stuck; they were landlocked. They couldn't grow unless they did the thing. And every time, this man voted no. Now they were very good friends. I don't think that ever for a moment my dad thought that this man didn't love him or anything like that, but the first time, dad didn't think much about it. After this happened three, four, five times, and my dad couldn't figure it out. To him, "Am I doing something wrong?" And they were good enough friends that he called him one night and said, "

## *SIDE B*

I was actually in our family room kind of down the hall, and I do have an ability. I can, when I concentrate, pretty well turn my hearing and my peripheral vision off, and it really helps me concentrate, but there's a downside to it. And I've done that. \_\_\_\_\_. I was almost oblivious to them down the hall. At a certain point in the evening, though, all of a sudden, I heard my father crying and it kind of penetrated my consciousness. You see, my father didn't cry a lot. My first reaction was almost panic. I remember I was almost out of the chair before I realized, "No, it's not that kind of cry." But, it had my attention, and I listened. This is now some 40 years later, but I can almost quote the conversation, I think, verbatim, because I was just riveted by it. My dad called him by name and said, "Have I done something to offend you? Am I doing something that you think is wrong? I try to do things that help us grow, and you vote against me, but I know you're not against me." There was this silence. Finally I started wondering, "Man, did he leave?" Was my dad just praying? Then after a few minutes, I heard this man cry, and I'd *never* heard him cry. I said, "Whoa!" I'll never forget what he said next. He said, "If the church grows, then you'll get better people, then I won't be a deacon, and we won't have time together." Now, I honestly believe that it would have made no difference in their relationship. I honestly believe he would have grown with us. He would have become better, but he was so afraid of losing the relationship that he voted against things that he knew were right. The amazing thing about him was that he understood it. Most people would have done it and not known why. It would have all been subconscious. He had figured it out. He knew what was going on enough that he kept asking and figured it out. Well, there are people who every time you talk about change, they are worried. "Will I be in the equation when it's on the other side?" If it's not good or bad, they are not, by the way, even necessarily power-hungry, they are just dealing with their own issues there.

Almost all change in some way, to some people implies criticism that the past or the present wasn't good enough. "You know that's the way we did it; wasn't it good enough?" The fact is, we all know things change. But in a church, you try and change the carpet. Whoever gave the money for that carpet isn't going to be a happy camper even though it's worn out, threadbare, and people keep tripping on it, because, you know, "It was my gift to God you're throwing out."

Almost all change is additional work. We know how to work the present system. We don't know how to work the new one. That's why \_\_\_\_\_ to go down. Anytime you're learning something new, you go back to a learning phase. This is the most common one I find in the church circles: We get up and announce changes to problems nobody knows we have, because we don't tell them the problems. We only tell them the change. They are sitting there and, "We've got to expand the parking lot." And they are thinking, "Well, there are plenty of places for me." "We've got to go to two services." "Man, I've got \_\_\_\_\_ right there. What do you mean?" Because we've never explained to them about once you get to 80% of growth, about visitors, about . . . we haven't told them the issue, we've just told them the solution. That almost always gets resistance.

Most of us plateau when we lose the tension between where we are and where we ought to be. There's a certain tension that happens and many of us plateau when we lose that tension there. Every level of growth calls for a new level of things. Now this is what's amazing. You know what? Every time world missions gets bigger, it has to change. Every time. And if you won't change, it will cease getting bigger. Organization puts a lid on organizational size, and every level, demands a change. If we're going to grow, if we're going to grow a national church, if we're going to grow a school, if we're going to grow a field, if we're going to grow a region, if

we're going to grow the mission support, we have to recognize that with that choice for growth, comes change. There's no way to escape that issue there.

How do people respond to change? I'm going to talk about response a couple of different ways. There's a lot of research on it. The next piece of research I'll show you in a few minutes is a more common one, but this one here talks about how people emotionally respond, not how they vote. This is what's going on inside them, okay? So this is kind of \_\_\_\_\_. In a normative group of people, about 7 to 10 are innovators. The truth is they never met a change they didn't like. You take, "We're going to change . . ." "Alright!" They just love change and they thrive on it. In fact, they go crazy when it's not changing. To them change is progress, \_\_\_\_\_, manifest destiny and all those kinds of things.

Then there are the early adopters—about 15 percent. Now these are people... and if you'll follow my thinking here and do not put negative connotation on it, people think differently. It's not a matter of intelligence, period. It's how they process, okay? Some people are what they call "fast-process thinkers." The truth is, they multi-task very well. They are the kind of people—you make a presentation and real quickly they know how we're going to pay for it, who we're going to have do it, how we're going to raise it. They quickly in their minds already catalogued all the issues there. If you address the issues in your presentation, when it's all done, if you've addressed them all, they'll say, "Okay." If you haven't addressed it they'll ask about that one, but as soon as you address it . . . because they're able to process quickly. They're not necessarily smarter, but they are multi-track people. Normally when a change is presented, within seconds they already know all the questions they've got. VOOM! Now they make up about 15 percent. Those people do tend to make very good judgments, and by the way, those people are often what some people would call the cutting edge.

There is another group of people that they call the Show Me's—no reference to Missouri. Now, these people could actually be more brilliant than the Early Adopters, but they process differently. They are what are called Slow Process Thinkers. They're not slow—they process slowly. Here is the difference about them. The fast process thinkers, the truth is, they're doing several processes at once. The slow process thinker runs one at a time, so they go like this: You start a presentation and whatever issue comes to them first—"How are we going to fund this?" They are stuck there and they probably hear almost nothing more until you answer it. If you haven't answered it when you're done, they're going to say, "How are we going to fund it?" And then you answer and then they go on to the next question. Now, you may have already answered that question, but they never heard it because they weren't asking it then, so you say, "I already covered that." "I didn't hear it." Now you cover it, and then they go to their third question. Now these people could have 200 IQs. They're mono; they think one thing at a time. They are the kinds, by the way, that go home and then call you at 10 o'clock at night and say, "Got another question," and at the meeting next week, "By the way, I've got another question about that." And they hate it if you make them make a decision quick. They feel manipulated and taken advantage of. Now, it has nothing to do with brilliance. It's how you process. This is why, with these people, you always have to present an idea long before you take the vote for they process through their questions.

Here is the problem with these people, and I say that in a \_\_\_\_\_. The fast-process thinker is thinking so quick that he's through the process and now he's able to engage interpersonally with the question. The slow-process thinker tends to get consumed by the questions and not \_\_\_\_\_ politically correct ways. So, it comes out like this: "How are we going to pay for it?!" which sounds like we can't afford it, which is not what they said. You explain it. "Well! Who's going to staff it?!" They don't know how to, if you will, craft the statement. They're not very politically sensitive. It's not that they're anti. By the way, they start in neutral. Now, here's what poor

leadership does. Somebody says, "How are we going to finish it?!" "We've taken care of that." Now, they're against it. You just drilled them because you didn't answer them; you treated them like they were ignorant. You just pushed them away. With slow-process thinkers, you cannot react to their tone of voice, and you can never belittle them. You always answer graciously. By the way, they are comfortable if you say, "I don't know, we're going to have to work on that." Fine. You work on it and come back and they'll be happy campers, but if you get an edge in your voice and return it, you'll drive them away. Now, they start in neutral. Here's what happens: They don't make a choice for it until all their questions are answered. They stay in neutral until then. By the way, you'll hear them say something like this: "I think that settles it for me." Which says, "Okay, I'm through processing." Now, not only does it take these people a week or two to process, what I want you to see is, this is 30 percent of the people. This is not an insignificant number, and you can alienate them very quick.

Then, there are the tagalongs. Anybody that's ever been in any political meeting, a church business meeting, committee meeting, the truth is, these people are never going to make up their own mind. They're the kind that you can always tell them by the way they don't look at the front. They watch people. "Yeah, they're right. That's a good point. You know, you've got a point too, though. I don't know." See, they're not engaging the issue. They're engaging the endorser. They're kind of fun, because they can change opinions four or five times in 30 seconds. Somebody they respect says, "I think we need to take a step of faith. Step out here." "Yeah, we've got to be bold for God." And somebody they respect more says, "But we can't be foolish before you start to build the \_\_\_\_\_." "Yeah, we've got to protect God's reputation... I don't know!" Whoever speaks loud, they vote with. You can get frustrated all you want, but you ain't going to change them. So you better know who the influencers are.

Now, by the way, you're that way. Have you ever gone this way? You go out of here tonight. "Where you want to go eat?" "I don't care." Well, at that point, you're a tagalong. "It doesn't matter to me." See, all of us at times kick out. It doesn't mean we're not smart, just kind of—this issue isn't my issue. Then, by the way, they're the biggest group. They're the biggest group.

And then you've got the non-adopters. Emotionally, they've *never* heard an idea they liked. I mean, they're still complaining about the orange carpet of 1970. They know it was wrong, "And look, it went out of style!" This is why unanimous votes are ludicrous. They would be opposed if Jesus Christ presented it, because they just emotionally do not like change. By the way, you can get them to vote with you. I told you that this is an emotional reactor. I had a fellow in our church that's a friend, a dear friend. But he is by life a non-adopter. He doesn't like change. He doesn't like change anywhere there. It was kind of funny, before I became a pastor, he had really gotten crossways with the previous pastor, and they had really had some blow-ups and all, and both of them are good people. They're just good people, they just had some change issues here. People wanted to warn me, "Be careful of . . . Be careful of . . ." \_\_\_\_\_ this is a godly man. He's a good man, very humble man. When I began to pastor, I said to him, I called him by name and said, "Listen, I want to go out to lunch with you, and I want you to write down all of the questions you've got about the church and what's happening at the church and what we're . . . Write them all down, and at lunch, we'll talk about them." Well, we got to lunch and he pulled out this notebook. I mean there are reams, pages \_\_\_\_\_ and most of them had to do with what he perceived had been integrity issues and all of that. Okay? So, he \_\_\_\_\_. I answered every one of them. When he got to the last question, \_\_\_\_\_. And the next week, he went out and put out all the fires all over the church of everybody that had a little problem. "You know, that's not the way it is. Pastor told me . . ." He was the greatest help I had, because he explained it to everybody. And I said, "Now, we'll meet again next week and you can come up with your new questions." Every week the list got lower and lower and shorter and shorter. Finally one day, we

go to lunch, and he says, “What do you think it means in Revelation 6?” And we were through with those questions. Now, I’m going to tell you something. He never met a change he liked, but he voted with me 100 percent of the time because of relationship. See, this is emotional. He wasn’t comfortable with it, but he trusted it. People often overcome their own biases, and so don’t write them off. These are good people.

Now, that’s emotional. Then, if you look on page 4, you have the work that comes from Edward Rogers and the Fusion of Innovation, and this one is talking about the political sides, the speed of adoption. Now, there are a couple of negative things. I think it’s too bad the two sets of research used some of the same terms to mean different things, but understand one is what’s happening on a person’s insides, one is how they’re politically active. You’ve got to understand that. It’s easier. Okay, speed of adoption. In this case, there are 2.5 percent that are innovators. What it amounts to is they adopt change quickly. They are the radical cutting edge. By the way, they’re often so far ahead they aren’t necessarily looked up to. They may be making some right choices, but they are often so far ahead that people don’t look to them. The other thing is they make a lot of bad calls. They’re so adventuresome that they make some good ones, but they make a lot of bad ones. But, you see, these people \_\_\_\_\_ be there first. The worst thing you can do to this person is say, “Yeah, I saw that a couple of years ago in another church.” \_\_\_\_\_ because they want to be there first. Good or bad, they want to be there.

The next group are what are called early adopters. These people are the most respected because they look through all of these \_\_\_\_\_ that the innovators try and select the good ones, but they’re not the radical cutting edge, they are the real cutting edge. They move very . . . you know, they’re adventuresome, they’re \_\_\_\_\_, they step out, they’re the first to do things a little bit different.

Then you have the early majority. Now they watch the innovators and they kind of reject them. They watch the early adopters and they pay attention. In fact, they’re the ones that want to know what the early adopters are doing, but as soon as they think it’s really going, this thing’s going to take off, they get on board as soon as they think, “Hey, there’s something to this, let’s go with it.”

The late majority, they are the ones that don’t want to announce their vote until press day. They want to watch it to be sure. They’re the people that are testing the wind. If it’s going to pass, they want to be with it. If it’s not, they want to stand their ground. You know what I mean. This is political. They are the ones that kind of say, “You know, I’m kind of holding my judgment until I’m just sure.” Truth is, they would like to have Oprah telling them what the odds are and then they could go; they wouldn’t have to think.

And then you have the laggards. The fact is, there are very rarely any opinion leaders here. Their goal is *tradition*. They could be in *Fiddler on the Roof* and just do well.

What I want you to see from this is: People respond to change at multiple levels. They respond emotionally. They respond politically. One I don’t have \_\_\_\_\_. They respond relationally. This is why, for example, with younger people the relational dominance, because they aren’t as political, so the relation \_\_\_\_\_. There’s not good research yet. Some of you may want to do some research on that.

What is our reaction to change? We’re going to have it. We can do a couple of things. One is we can feel that the opposition is a personal threat and resign with hurt. “If you’re not going to do it my way, I’m taking my ball and going home.” It’s kind of a sourly way to do it, just kind of my way or the highway. So they use coercion and manipulation a lot, guilt, \_\_\_\_\_—obviously not a very acceptable way. The worst one is actually this one. You forcibly enforce your change in

spite of resistance, and this is where you call in the chips. “You know, I helped you when you needed that, and now I need your vote.” I’m going to tell you something: You get the vote and their hate for life. They voted with you because they owed you, but they hated you for asking and they feel like you’ve trashed them. You won the battle and lost the war. By the way, in a church, if the pastor does this, statistics say it will take five to ten years before he gets the credibility back he had before. I almost never recommend people leaving churches when they make a mistake. I do hear it. It’s not worth ten years to back to zero. It’s not worth it—for the church or you. That was a bad call, but you’ve got to be careful of this one. You don’t call in the chips to force decisions. The real thing is you keep positive to resistance and provide leadership in the middle of it. This is the time to not get angry, not get hurt, not pout, but be positive to the people and move ahead.

Now, a couple of hints about this, especially when it’s not going your way: First, all resistance is not bad. In fact, resistance is one of your greatest friends. Any great leader knows that resistance is one of the best things that happens, because it helps you see your blind spots. Resistance helps you see what you didn’t see, and you need to in a sense embrace it, not fight it. Many of us have the idea that resistance is opposition, and so we have to work on that. I think we have to express understanding of the opposite viewpoint. Just like in the little video clip, “He’s demon possessed!” We’re real good at polarizing, and the truth is there are always some people who have character flaws. Okay. They’re a minority. Most pastors, most missionaries, most district officials, most people at Headquarters, they want to do right. You know? They may want to do it different, but they’re not really out there . . . I mean, they wouldn’t stay in all of this. Okay? If we make it polarized where one is right and one is wrong, it’s probably not realistic. We just have different lenses, different viewpoints. Nine times out of ten, if we’ll stop, they are real, legitimate issues from their viewpoint. We may still not embrace it, but there are some legitimate issues there. I think that a good leader will admit the strength of the other’s position. Now here’s an interesting thing: An insecure leader attacks it. A secure leader lifts it up, because if I can lift up the strength of your position, the truth is, it makes my position stronger. He’ll think: “If he recognizes that, boy, he must \_\_\_\_\_. That’s a good point.” It’s an interesting thing. If you have that kind of integrity, it works the opposite of how people think it’s going to work. Admit the strength of their position.

Now, here’s one I would mention to you about leading teams, groups, committees, a task force, whatever. If you’re in a group, and in truth, a strong majority is already sided, but you have one person who’s just not on board, obviously, you could take the vote and nail it. Obviously, you could argue, but the truth is, it’s going to be five against one, six against one, seven against one, okay? That’s a huge price to pay for the emotional damage. If you realize it’s just one, and it is not a crisis, as a leader, you can say this: “You know, I think we’re pretty near a decision, but Bob, how about you and I go to lunch. I’d like to talk to you a little bit about this one on one.” We can then come back and say, “Bob and I talked about this and here’s some ideas we had together,” and both of us win. If we debate in front of the crowd, we have to defend our position even when we think we’re wrong because of an audience watching the performance. Now, I’ve got to tell you—there’s a down side to this one. Don’t stop and do the private meeting if you’re going to manipulate us. If you’re going to get there and say, “I’m the leader. It’s time to shape up here. I’m tired of this nonsense. Get with it or you’re out of here.” You’ve just made it a hundred times worse, but if you’re going to really meet and talk, you can come there.

When the opposition becomes intense, shift into neutral. Let me give you a couple of hints on this one. There are unwritten rules in business, but everybody knows the rules. In almost everything, there are the rules, and then there are *the rules*. Here’s one in business. If you present an idea and you lose, you can’t bring the idea back to the table for review. You present it and lose, so you



come back a month later and say, “Well, I’d like to talk about that again.” “We talked about it now. That’s settled.” Now it’s 18 months. (*Laughter.*) See what happens? People don’t want to keep hashing this over, but if we get there and I know it’s not going to go, not going to vote, and I say, “You know, I don’t think we’re ready for this. Let’s table it and bring it back next week. And if we’re not ready, I can bring it back the next week.” As long as I don’t call the vote, I can bring it to the table whenever we’re ready. Now some people think because of their impatience, “If we don’t vote on it now, I’m going to lose time.” The truth is: I’m often going to gain time. Don’t push the vote before you’re ready.

Now I’m going to give you a hint here, and I’m just being *real* transparent. I trust your character is right. I don’t think you’d be in the room if you didn’t have some character. \_\_\_\_\_. From now on, every meeting you’re in, before the vote, write the vote down by number on your paper, before the vote. If you aren’t almost exactly right, you’re not paying any attention. You’re missing all the clues, and you’ll probably get to the point where you can write the exact quote down 90 percent of the time. The others, you won’t be off much. I’m going to tell you, if you’re off, you’re not watching people. You’re not listening. You’re not catching the clues, which means you’re so absorbed with yourself, you’re not engaging things. Now you’re not doing that to manipulate it, by the way. You’re doing it to learn to listen and look because people tell you their vote before the vote. You need to develop that kind of skill there.

I think many of you are familiar with John Collins and have read John, and I won’t take much time, but he analyzed all these corporations that failed and they found eight reasons that corporations fail. Number one: They allow too much complacency. They relaxed, you know. They said, “We’re doing okay. We don’t need to work too hard.”

Number two: Failing to create a sufficiently powerful guiding coalition. A guiding coalition is not you. You may have position and title, but that’s not a coalition. You’ve got to get the players. By the way, if you’ve read *Good to Great*, he said, “You not only have to have the right people on the bus, but the people got to be in the right seats on the bus,” *before* you do the action.

Understanding the power of vision. Now notice that word *power* of vision, underestimating it. Then, the next one: Under-communicating the vision by a factor of ten or one hundred or a thousand. One is underestimating power. Now, under-communicating. And then—permitting obstacles to block the vision. In a lot of the literature, Collins will use this illustration: If you take a locomotive out here on the prairie somewhere and you build right on the track, a five-foot cube of bricks—five foot cube, and you get that locomotive going at the same speed of 60 miles per hour. If it’s been going 60 miles per hour and it hits the bricks, the truth is it will shatter them and pop them off and only slow to 50 miles an hour. But that same engine, if it’s stopped, you can take four 1-inch cubes of wood and put it under the driving wheel, and it cannot start. When you’re starting change, you don’t have momentum. Later on, the momentum could help you. You permit little things to block you early. It takes big things to block you late.

Now, what I want you to see are the first five reasons to evaluate. These are in order if you’ve read the book. Three of the five relate to vision. Now, you have this. Can you communicate it? Can you articulate it in sound bytes? Does everybody know it or do we have 1600 visions? \_\_\_\_\_ that there.

Okay, let’s move on. We’ll just do the other couple. Failure to create short term win. You’ve got to have some successes. People don’t want to wait ten years and then declare victory too soon. Never declare victory until you’re going to have to fight when people try and change you. You are the new culture. You’re the tradition. And then, this is the one I’ve alluded to several times:

Neglecting to anchor changes firmly in the corporate culture. You never win by trashing the past. You never win. Always find the good and connect to the good. You're not connecting to everything. You're not saying it was perfect, but anchor it to your heritage. Your heritage got you to this point! Connect to it in a positive way. On page number 6, there's a little chart, and I wanted to use the illustration for you, because that one dealt with a church and deals with issues and some of those transformations, but people think you change an organization at once. You change an organization a layer at a time, and you change it from the top down. You've got to understand. You build your coalition, if you will, as you go down. First off you've got \_\_\_\_\_ and then you've got a couple of layers, and then a couple of more layers, and by the time it gets to the masses, the truth is all of the influences are already in the coalition. And really, it's a foregone conclusion \_\_\_\_\_ vote. This is leadership. You don't try and make a 90-degree turn with the whole body. You change a layer at a time and then you filter it down. And that's just kind of a visual illustration of that.

Then his eight stages of change, and I think this is crucial to some of the things we've been talking . . . You've got to create urgency. For example, your success can also cause you problems, \_\_\_\_\_. If you get up to the wonderful numbers that John read off yesterday, I mean about the \_\_\_\_\_ and those others, you know. But they can make a person feel, "Hey, we're doing okay. We don't need to do much more." It's real easy to let success produce complacency. And you've got to watch that. See, you've got to be careful, for example, from a vision-casting standpoint, to talk about the success but then quickly point out those not reached, where the urgency stays true. We've got to create coalitions, guiding coalitions. By the way, in many of your regions of the world and countries you work in, these are multi-national coalitions. They're certainly multi-ethnic, but they're many times multi-national. I would encourage you—there's a good body of literature out there now on dealing in multi-national enterprises. By the way, some people have mentioned it: there is a good body of good literature out now on dealing with virtual teams. Randy Walls who does Continuing Ed, his doctoral project is on virtual teams. You might want to connect to some of the literature he has.

*[Unintelligible question.]*

**Ming:** That's not physically present in the same room. It could be, I mean, there's many, many ways it could occur, but not there physically present.

*[Unintelligible question.]*

**Ming:** Could be. Yeah. Could be even a city too, to be honest, but . . .

*[Unintelligible comment.]*

**Ming:** In your case, yes, \_\_\_\_\_. Developing \_\_\_\_\_ right now. Here's what I want you to know \_\_\_\_\_ a couple of times. You notice the vision isn't established until the team is. You first get the coalition and together do the vision. You don't get the vision and then find the coalition. See, this is a reversal that people don't think about. This is where you get buy-in and ownership. This is where people feel like they're part of the decision that this is *ours*! Significant and all that. A communicating the change vision, there's communication again. Empowering \_\_\_\_\_ for broad based action. Generated short-term wins. Consolidating gains producing more change. And then, anchoring the new approach. Now those are a couple of issues there.

If you look with me on page number 8, there are components of change. Some call this a change matrix. No, wait a minute. I went too far. Let me . . . I skipped a page. I turned too many pages at

once here. It should be at the bottom of page 7 first. Let me do that and then I'll kind of catch up there. Some ideas to help people feel the need for change. Never offer a solution until you've shown the need. Never tell them the answer until you've shown why you're giving the answer. Be careful about that. Talk about the need before the solution. That helps people feel the need to accept it there. People can share in it. They'll feel more ownership. I think those are a couple of things on the first question.

A personal characteristic. Let me just tell you something about that. You've got to be personable if you're going to lead change. In our psyche in America, we hate the arrogant. I mean, people will vote against you if you're arrogant, even though they like your ideas, they don't like you. You know we just kind of \_\_\_\_\_. We like the underdog. Okay, make sure you keep your head out of the clouds. Be humble. Keep a sense of humor, especially about yourself. They already have one. What principles would you suggest? Don't oversell the idea. I love what Benjamin Franklin said. This is a great quote. He said, "The way to convince another is to state your case moderately and then accurately. Then scratch your head and shake it a little bit, and say, 'Seem that way to you?' At which point your listener will perceive that you have doubts and try to convince you that you were right." You know, don't oversell, you know. Okay, there.

Watch your timing. A lot of time the change is right, it's the wrong time. Watch your timing. I do think that people expect you to be positive but they also expect you to recognize the negative. They don't want, "It's all one way." They want to know that you've thought through it.

And then, spiritual resources. I think almost every leader's story/narrative in scripture is an example in how to bring change. I do think that prayer is unbelievably important, and I think the power of the Holy Spirit to break down resistance. Now somebody asked me earlier about do I think churches can change. Absolutely. Absolutely. You would be amazed. One example. We were leading a group, talking about how you go through change, and by the way, as long as the people are involved in the process. Now here's a guy that *controlled* the church for 20 years—not the pastor—but no question, has *controlled* the church. Many pastors would have had some interesting descriptions of him, but the pastor that he's got now is smart. He brings into this project, and it was interesting. During the \_\_\_\_\_, my son-in-law happened to be in it this \_\_\_\_\_. We were working with him over a period of time and my son-in-law says to me, "Why is he mad at you?" I said, "He's not mad at me." "Listen to it." "No, no, no, he's not mad, he's working. Relax." You know the week when . . . because he had all these questions. You know and he was firing these questions at . . . He was probably one of those slow-process thinkers. They would tend to be kind of sharp, but he was not mad. It was interesting, on Friday, the last Friday when we were meeting together, he said, "Can I say something?" "Well, sure." He said, "For 20 years, I've thought the problem in our church was the pastor. It was *me*, and I ain't going to be the problem anymore!" Nobody said a word to him, but when he saw and understood the issue, all of a sudden, he understood it. People are like that. People will change. I have people all the time say, "\_\_\_\_\_." That's not true. There are a few. The vast majority of the people if you take them on the journey will change because they want to see souls saved. They don't want to see people in darkness. They want good to come. They're not against you. They just need to understand the rationale, to see why, and that can help you.

Well, the change matrix. There are a number of things that are involved in change and I think that if you think about it, this shows what happens if an element is missing. The thing, by the way, involved in change are \_\_\_\_\_. Vision, values, communication, skills, resources, and action plan. If you have everything but vision, you shouldn't have confusion and chaos. If you have everything but values, you tend to have conflict and apathy. If you have everything but communication, you have misunderstanding. If you have everything but the leadership skills, you

have anxiety and insecurity. If you have everything but the resources, you have frustration. If you have everything but action plan, you get a lot of false starts and erratic behavior. And what I want you to see—it takes all of the elements. When you lead change, you've got to have all of the elements.

I wanted to just give us a little bit of time on the end to talk about the change issues as it affects Assemblies of God. These are couples of big issues, I think, that affect our enterprise, which involves you and me. We have to do an increased emphasis on relation building. Missionaries on deputation, they need to be stopping and having lunch with people and having coffee. They need to be calling people on the phone. They need to be at fellowship meetings that aren't \_\_\_\_\_. They need to be at places where they are just connecting relationally to people because the churches that aren't supporting missions, they'll become supporters when they have a relationship with a person, not a program. I think we've got to emphasize relationships. I think for all the new people you're bringing on to your field, these younger generations cannot exist without relationships. They just die. They wilt without relationships. You've got to figure ways. Now don't worry about change and all—but you've got to figure ways that they can talk and share, feel loved. There's got to be that.

A second thing, I think the leadership has to move out of management and move into vision. Leadership has to do a lot more vision-casting because it's going to take vision to drive us ahead. I think we have to show and demonstrate by our attitudes, voice, and programs greater passion for the lost. We cannot look like we're building an institution. They have to see who we're doing it for. I think we have to recognize that in missions there will be a variety of styles and approaches and it can all be under the one gifting. It's okay. Everybody doesn't have to do it \_\_\_\_\_. And I do think we're going to have to recognize—we're going to have to use different strategies with prescription and post-scription constituents that you've got to understand that there's a radical difference in how you approach depending where they are. Those are a couple that come to mind to me. I wanted to, and I think I've reserved about 20 minutes, and I think I'm on schedule pretty right for that, to allow any questions, feedback, dialogue that you might have. For two days I've kind of been pumping information at you and you know, I'm not sure I will always . . . in fact, I'm sure I will not, always have solutions, but I would be glad if I could, something that that you were unsure about or wanted clarification. I wanted to give us at least a little chance to have that kind of feedback as we kind of wrap up here.

*End of tape.*