ABSTRACT

The Transformative Church as a Kingdom Agent in a Village Setting

Osnad Anim-Danso

Faculty Supervisor: Michael W. Stroope, Ph.D.

This project assesses the impact of a theological breakthrough in the understanding of the kingdom of God on the church and the subsequent impact on the community, especially in a village setting. A series of workshops were organized for four local churches in a rural community over a period of eight weeks. The workshops were designed to have two components: teaching component and practical component.

The teaching component of the project is aimed at providing the platform for discussions on the kingdom of God so that the plausibility structures of the church concerning their mandate and responsibilities as a community of faith and kingdom agents will be shaped in accordance with scripture.

Through the practical component, the love of God was revealed practically in the community in accordance with Bible teachings. There was a “a revolution of serving others,”¹ what Dino Rizzo referred to as “Servolution.”² The church went out to the community to serve the people through acts of love and social services and to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ.

A pre-intervention direct observation, survey, and interviews were conducted to serve as the baseline to measure the church’s initial level of understanding of the

¹ Dino Rizzo, Servolution: Starting a Church Revolution through Serving (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 16.

² Ibid.
kingdom of God before the start of the workshop. Similarly, the initial situation of the community before the intervention was measured to serve as a baseline to assess the impact of the church’s activities in the community.

At the end of the project, post-intervention, the same research methods were used to measure the impact of the interventions both on the church and the community. The initial data was then compared to the final data and a positive change was observed in both cases. This led to the conclusion that when the church becomes an embodied witness in their communities by employing social services and acts of love to both tell and show the love of God to their communities, significant transformation occurs in the community; and in the process the church is transformed.
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CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROJECT

*Topic Statement*

The title of the project is “The Transformative Church as a Kingdom Agent in a Village Setting.” Church transformation occurs when the body of Christ begins to take “seriously its calling to ‘announce peace’ and to bear faithful, public, and embodied witness to the kingdom of God in its own context.”¹ This kind of witness is not only focused on the intra-church activities but also on the community. Again, the transformed church considers God’s mandate to humankind to “replenish the earth, and subdue it” (Gen.1:28, KJV) as still valid. The transformed church understands that humankind is created in the image of God, vested with authority as the representative of God in God’s kingdom on earth, and charged with the responsibility to “work it and take care of it” (Gen.2:18, NIV). The church operating with the understanding that humankind is the representative of God in the kingdom of God on earth serves as a kingdom agent in the community. When the church focuses on carrying out this responsibility to its logical conclusion in the community, there is no doubt that the church will become an agent of transformation in the community. Unfortunately, the reality on the ground does not seem like it. This project seeks to measure the extent of the church’s external activities in the community and their impact on the community, especially in village communities; and find out whether by gaining a theological understanding of the kingdom of God, the church may be transformed to influence the transformation of the community.

Problem Statement

The vestiges of the effects of Christendom and colonialism on mission in the African church, and the agelong debate on the definition of mission to mean evangelism to the exclusion of social action, and vice versa, has left the church to understand mission to mean someone or group of people being sent to a distant geographical location by a church or institution with greater resources to evangelize, make converts, and plant churches. This has led to the problem where local churches have now become more concerned about their intra-church relationships instead of seeking the transformation of their communities. They expect that some missionaries from abroad with greater resources will come and provide resources for the development of their community. So that “the church is in a state of crisis . . . because of the abiding tension between [its] essential nature and its empirical condition.”

Consequently, there is the need for a paradigm shift from internally focused to externally focused ministry; a shift from focus on the conversion of individuals and quantitative church growth, to the establishment of the kingdom of God in the community to transform the community. Therefore, the question, “How does the church’s involvement in social services in a community influence the transformation of both the church and the community?” is worth probing.

Purpose Statement and Thesis

The objective of this project is to give heed to John the Baptist’s admonition to “bear the fruits worthy of repentance” (Matt. 3:7) and practically make a case for a shift in ministry from the myopic vision of intrinsic focus only to include extrinsic focused ministry. This paradigm shift demands that we employ a realistic application

---

of the whole gospel (word and deed) to include loving and caring for the whole community to seek the salvation and transformation of the community.

Once the church focuses on loving the community and seeking its peace and prosperity, some of the prevailing conditions that do not merit the kingdom of God may become concerns the church may want to address. Some of these concerns may include, but are not limited to, poverty, lack of good drinking water, poor sanitation, and so on.

Therefore, this project is a test on the ground to run a pilot project to find out if the application of kingdom mentality, whole gospel theology, externally focused ministry, and “word and deed” approach to ministry through acts of love and social services et al., may have a direct influence on the transformation of both the church and the community, especially a village community.

The thesis of this project is that by employing ministerial principles and methods that have the right hermeneutics of the theology of the kingdom of God and the whole gospel of word and deed as its theological foundation, the church might influence the transformation of some of the prevailing conditions that do not merit the kingdom of God in a community.

Definitions

*Kingdom Agent.* Kingdom agent refers to regenerated souls (who through faith in Jesus has been born again) and who have been transformed by the renewal of their minds to be responsible representatives of God by taking active roles in the management of the earth in accordance with God’s will and purpose. It also refers to the community of faith, the church, which has been transformed by becoming conscious of her essential nature as the body of Christ and practically discharging her
responsibility as a body of agents for the development and transformation of various people groups and communities.

*Kingdom Business.* Anytime we are involved in doing things that help in making this world more reflective of God’s kingdom and are redeeming something that was lost or broken because of the fall, Adam’s sin, then we are involved in kingdom business (or kingdom work). It is about practically doing things to replenish or restore what had been destroyed because of sin. Isaiah 61:4 speaks of transformed people who “will rebuild the ancient ruins and restore the places long devastated; they will renew the ruined cities that have been devastated for generations.” In this broader sense, those involved in rebuilding, restoring, and renewing the city or the community are doing kingdom work. Thus, the original mandate to multiply, replenish and subdue is still in force as humankind’s responsibility (Gen.1:28). The kingdom business is about practically doing things that will make the prayer “your will be done as it is in heaven” (Matt. 6:10) become a reality.

*Embodied Witness.* An embodied witness is a whole lifestyle (or way of life) of the body of Christ, in their life together, which displays a character that makes them a peculiar people and presents a new social option to the community such that it is both invitational and counterculture (or subversive). Thus, the church that bears an embodied witness to the kingdom of God is involved in activities and practices that are both invitational and subversive. Invitational means their invitational bait is “love,” their means of invitation is through service, and their invitation is motivated by “love.” Subversive means their activities and practices present a new set of principles and values as the norm, challenge the prevailing culture, and seek to reconstruct the plausibility structure and worldview of their community.
**Transformation.** Transformation is deemed to have occurred when the change in the inward nature manifests itself as a real and observable change in character or form. Thus, there must first be a change in what gives the thing its character or nature and then the change must manifest in a tangible and observable way. Whereas transformation is a change that goes deep to the core and pertains to changes in the nature and or character (like changing the engine of a car), reformation is shallow change and pertains only to change in appearance (like change in the body of a car). Transformation changes both the inner character and the outward appearance, while reformation may affect only the outward appearance but not necessarily the inner character. Transformation is permanent but reformation may be temporal.

**Transformed Church.** The transformed church bears an embodied witness to the kingdom of God in her community.

**Community Transformation.** Community transformation is the process of restoration of the physical, spiritual, environmental, and/or social breakdown due to the Adamic sin. Thus, community transformation occurs when situations and conditions that can be described as non-kingdom realities are transformed in a community.

**Rationale**

The disconnection between faith as an inward virtue and the practice of faith as a social reality was one of the mischiefs this project sought to cure. There seems to be tension between the positional truth about the essential nature of the church and the progressive truth of how the church expresses this truth in everyday life. Consequently, the role of the community of faith as salt and light of the world (or kingdom agents) has not been accounted for effectively as expected. The God-given responsibility of humankind to work and take care of the earth, which the people of
faith must be seen to champion, has not been discharged or is not being discharged faithfully.

The world does not know the will of God and the people of God (i.e., the church), who have been given the grace to discern the will of God, are busily focusing on their internal affairs, leaving the external issues of their community unattended. Most often, the church is willing to share their faith by speaking the word but not by the demonstration of the word through deeds. This has raised questions about the relevance of the church.

This project seeks to draw the church’s attention to her collective mandate and responsibility as agents of transformation or kingdom agents in their community. A proper understanding of this mandate is drawn from a theological understanding of the kingdom of God. According to the biblical narrative, after God created the heavens and the earth, he created a kingdom on earth and made humankind both his representatives and stewards over all his creation (Gen.1:28). God chose humankind above all his creation because he created them in his own image (Gen.1:27). Therefore, humans qualify to represent God as the agents of his kingdom. As kingdom agents, they are responsible to work and take care of the earth (Gen.2:15); it is also their responsibility to multiply, replenish the earth, subdue it, and have dominion over all of God’s creation on earth (Gen. 1:26, 28). They were thus chosen to act on behalf of God to manage and develop the kingdom that God had created on earth; as a result, they became kingdom agents. From the beginning, the kingdom business has been to multiply what has been given, to replenish what has fallen short, and to subdue all things, and thus humankind has dominion over all creation to keep it under the authority and leadership of God. Replenish involves restoring to original levels, rebuilding, and bringing things back to how they were originally made. Doing
these things will transform the outlook of communities and demonstrate the love of God to the world. We as believers must teach the world the principles of the kingdom of God. Believers in Christ must go to our communities and show them that the kingdom of God is different from the kingdom of Satan. Thus, the community of faith, the church, must demonstrate to the world what the kingdom of God looks like.

The kingdom of God reflects love because God is love (1 John 4:7-21). One of the cardinal principles of the kingdom of God is love. Love can be demonstrated through disinterested benevolence (i.e., acts of love) and service.

Research Questions

The focus of the project is driven by one major question and a subset of supporting questions that provided the needed indicators to inform the design of the study. The major research question was, “Does the church's involvement in social services in a community influence the transformation of the community and the local church?” Supporting research questions follow:

1. Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?

2. Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry?

3. Does the life together of the community of faith, the church, portray a peculiar people?

4. Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community?

5. Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?

6. Does serving people speak the language of love?

7. Does the ministering to the needs of people demonstrate the love of God to the people, open doors for the gospel, and affect one’s vertical relationship with God and the horizontal relationships with others and creation?
8. Does sharing the gospel message in the community help to draw the heart of people toward God and affect one’s vertical relationship with God and the horizontal relationships with others and creation?

Significance of the Project

The project sought to demonstrate that if the church body were an “embodied witness” in their communities by employing social services and acts of love to both tell and show the love of God to their communities, there would be significant transformation in the community, and the kingdom of God would be revealed in the community.

The outcome of this project served as empirical evidence to challenge churches in Ghana to change from being internally focused to externally focused churches. The result of the project has proven that if the church focuses on transforming communities instead of conversion of individuals, then the mandate of the church given by the head of the church, Jesus Christ, in the Great Commission to make disciples of all nations, shall be fulfilled.

The outcome of this project has also proven that the principles of city transformation are also applicable to village settings.

The project has demonstrated that the church’s involvement in social services in a community can influence the transformation of both the church and the community. Over time, the knowledge of how such influence occurs will help the church in Ghana to turn to and or continue serving their communities in more predictable and practical ways.

---

CHAPTER TWO:
A BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL FOUNDATION

Introduction

Transformation of communities may best be visualized theologically in the context of the kingdom of God. The Bible is fundamentally a record of the reestablishment of the kingdom of God and the reinstatement of humankind as God’s chosen representatives through whom he may rule on earth. The metanarrative of the Bible traces the story of God, the Creator, creating the heavens and the earth (Gen. 1:1), and setting up a kingdom by appointing his image-bearers, humankind, as his representatives to have dominion on earth (Gen. 1:26-28). Now God’s bitterest foe, Satan, wrestles with the bona fide representatives of God and takes the dominion from them through deception and misrepresentation of the truth.

The reign of Satan on earth is characterized by oppression, greed, discrimination, disorderliness, destruction, unproductivity, poverty, sickness, fear, and death, all of which are legitimized consequences of sin and disobedience to God, the true King, Creator, and owner of the universe. God promises to crush the head of the serpent, Satan, by the hand of the seed of the woman (Gen 3:15) and thereby reestablish his rule through his image-bearer, humankind. Thus, God gave a hint that he will use “the seed of the woman” (Gen. 3:15), without the seed of the man, and therefore will not inherit the distortions in the image of the first man, to crush the “deceiver” and “usurper” to recapture the stolen dominion over the earth. The rest of the story, from Gen 3:15 to Rev. 22:21, recounts how God will make this happen: the story about the kingdom of God.
John Bright is right when he writes, “The Bible is one book. Had we to give that book a title, we might with justice call it ‘The Book of the Coming Kingdom of God.’ That is, indeed, its central theme everywhere.”¹ He even deduced from Isaiah 51:3 that “The primitive Eden peace (51:3) will once more come to earth, and the rule of God, long disrupted by sin, will be re-established.”² Nicholas Perrin also says that “The Kingdom weaves its way through the length of history (Genesis through Revelation) and the width of human reality (politics, social issues, culture, technology).”³ Therefore, any Bible teaching to instruct the people of God for practical living that lacks an understanding of the values and principles of the kingdom of God as an overarching theme of the Bible will woefully miss a significant ingredient of the will and purpose of God for his people.

This lack of understanding in the biblical teaching of the values and operations of the kingdom of God translates into wrong strategies to counter the schemes of the enemies of the kingdom (Satan and his agents) and a myopic approach to kingdom business. Jesus taught the importance of our understanding of how the kingdom of God operates and its values by using parables to explain what the kingdom is and is not to make up for the theological deficit. In Matt. 6:33, Jesus pointed out the preeminence of the kingdom of God when he said, “But seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.” Again, when he taught the disciples how to pray, he said, “Pray then in this way: ‘Our Father, who is in heaven, hallowed be Your name. Your Kingdom come. Your will be done on earth as it is in

---


² Ibid., 143.

heaven” (Matt. 6:9-10). The Christian faith is about demonstrating the kingdom of God to the world, inviting people into the kingdom, teaching them to do the will of God on earth, and exercising the recaptured authority to transform every non-kingdom reality around us. This chapter’s focus was multifaceted:

1) To explain what the kingdom of God is,

2) To further show from the teachings of Scripture that the kingdom of God is an overarching theme of the Bible,

3) To show that understanding the kingdom of God has a direct effect on the transformation of the non-kingdom realities around us,

4) To discuss the modus operandi of the kingdom of God,

5) To show the relationship between the concepts of salvation and the kingdom of God,

6) To discuss the relationship between the church and the kingdom of God,

7) To discuss how church history gives evidence in support of kingdom minded ministry (holistic ministry) in the early church,

8) To present an overview of pertinent literature in support of the project and hermeneutical principles.

What Is the Kingdom of God?

Scholars describe different conceptions and understandings of what the kingdom of God is, where, and even when is the kingdom coming, or if it has already come, when it came. These questions have always been relevant and legitimate, such as in Luke 13:18, when Jesus asked, “What is the kingdom of God like? What shall I compare it to?” In attempt to answer these questions, some Christians seem to understand the kingdom to be a future reality while others consider it to be already here. Some even see the kingdom as an intrinsic virtue, while others are of the opinion that it is an extrinsic reality.
Whatever one’s understanding of the kingdom, it has a consequential effect on practice in real life. Those who see the kingdom as an internal virtue, or what Perrin refers to as “personal reality” . . . “may not rule out a corresponding objective kingdom reality, but the emphasis is on the soul, the interior life.”

When allowed to stand alone, this understanding may not be a motivation for the actualization of beliefs in practical tangible terms. Those who consider the kingdom as an extrinsic reality may also see it as “a social ideal characterized by certain practices, values, and attitudes.”

Looking at the kingdom exclusively in this manner may plunge it into the realm of the tangibles of life.

Scholars have written scores of materials about this important biblical theme. Recent Roman Catholic theology seems to align the kingdom concept with the church. In the past, prior to the Second Vatican Council (1962–65), Catholic scholars used to separate the kingdom from the church. This twentieth-century theological position of the Catholic Church translates into the understanding that the kingdom of God is an already here reality. Some Protestants, on the other hand, do not see the kingdom as interchangeable with the church. For them, the kingdom of God is something different from the church. Perrin refers to Brian McLaren and Walter Rauschenbusch, who share similar ideas, as examples of the theological position of some Protestants on the kingdom of God, which is that “the Kingdom is a social ideal awaiting realization within history.”

Both sides see the kingdom as a social reality, even though they have sharp differences.

---


5 Ibid.

6 Ibid.

7 Ibid.
Historical records have it that this kind of interpretation that relates the kingdom of God in one way or another to the church became popular during and after the era of Augustine and was the prevalent view even up to the time of the reformers. The growth of the church is directly proportional to that of the kingdom. Various forms of this understanding teach that the church may be a prototype of the kingdom, which thinking has been held by many Protestant theologians. This position comes down to the teaching that the propagation of the gospel, and the engagement of the church with the world, expands the kingdom. It teaches that the mandate of the church to be witnesses of Christ Jesus is aimed toward winning the world over to Jesus and thus establishing the kingdom of God in the world. This is how George Eldon Ladd puts it:

The gospel is the supernatural redeeming Gospel of Jesus Christ, and the Kingdom is to be established by the Church’s proclamation of the gospel. The gospel must not only offer a personal salvation in the future life to those who believe; it must also transform all of the relationships of life here and now and thus cause the Kingdom of God to prevail in all the world. The gospel of redeeming grace has the power to save social, economic, and political orders as well as the souls of individual believers. The Kingdom of God is like a bit of leaven placed in a bowl of dough which slowly but steadily permeates the dough until the entire lump is leavened. So is the Kingdom of God to transform the world by slow and gradual permeation.”

This interpretation, though I do not subscribe to it exclusively, resonates well with this project. I also believe the biblical witness supports the veracity of other interpretations. The church can be likened to the kingdom only to the extent that the members are the people of the kingdom, and in her privileged capacity as the body of Christ, and hence the representative of Jesus Christ, the Messiah King of the kingdom of

---


God on earth. To this extent, the church is a vehicle for the transformation of the world, the members are instruments of righteousness, the hands and legs and eyes of the King of the kingdom. Thus, if they live to expectation, they will be kingdom agents for its expansion and transformation of communities. This interpretation seems to connect the kingdom of God our Father who is in heaven, and what the children of the kingdom are doing here on earth while we wait for the kingdom, which is already here and yet to come, to be fully revealed. Understanding the kingdom this way presents an ideal reality for human society. This is how Ladd put it:

The Kingdom is not primarily concerned with individual salvation or with the future but with the social problems of the present. Men build the Kingdom of God as they work for the ideal social order and endeavor to solve the problems of poverty, sickness, labor relations, social inequalities, and race relationships. The primary task of the Church is to build the Kingdom of God.¹⁰

It is also the responsibility of the church to invite people into the kingdom. Though the church may work with all manner of people to build the kingdom, doing kingdom work does not necessarily make one a member of the kingdom.¹¹

Another perspective to the kingdom concept is those who see it neither as a personal virtue nor a social reality. This group understands the kingdom in future terms—it is conceived not to have anything to do with the present-day realities; rather, only when we go to heaven will we experience the kingdom.

Scholars have done a lot of work on the kingdom of God, among whom each of the following take one or two or various combinations of the above positions (even


¹¹ Eric Swanson and Sam Williams, *To Transform a City: Whole Church, Whole Gospel, Whole City* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 79.
though the positions described above may not be exhaustive). The following are some of the most salient ones.

*Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer.* Weiss portrayed Jesus’s ministry to suggest that he was a prophet whose teachings and proclamations were quite consistent with the prevailing apocalypticism of the first century. The apocalyptic proclamations centered on the expectation that God was about to break into history to unleash severe punishment and judgment on the world.\(^{12}\) Thus, for Weiss, Jesus’s conception of the kingdom was not different from the apocalypses of the Jews, which were futuristic and eschatological.\(^{13}\) Even though the majority of scholars around that time were of the opinion that Jesus had prophesied about the future coming of the kingdom with force and great power, “Weiss insisted that every scholar worth their salt ought to own up to this twofold proposition: the historical Jesus was relatively disinterested in conveying timeless and universal truths, and very interested in announcing that the eschaton—the end of the present age—was at hand.”\(^{14}\) According to Weiss, Jesus proclaimed on earth what had already been accomplished in heaven—the kingdom of God emerged victorious over Satan, and that future reality would be a supernatural act of God.\(^{15}\) Weiss captured his apocalyptic conception of the kingdom in his book, *The Proclamation of the Kingdom of God*, which he published in 1892.

---


Albert Schweitzer built on Weiss’s work and interpreted the whole earthly ministry of Jesus from the lens of his apocalyptic comprehension of the kingdom. He called this interpretation *konsequente eschatologie* (consistent eschatology). In 1906, he published his work in his book, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. He used the event recorded in Matthew 10 where Jesus sent out the twelve to make his case:

The whole of the discourse at the sending out of the Twelve . . . is a prediction of the events of the “end time,” events which are immediately at hand, in which the supernatural eschatological course of history will break through into the natural course of history. . .. The announcement of the suffering as holding out the prospect of the eschatological distress is part and parcel of the preaching of the nearness of the Kingdom of God.

Schweitzer opines that the disappointment of not seeing the expected catastrophic end where the Son of Man will come in the clouds with great power to judge the world forced Jesus to say that he was that expected Son of Man who was to suffer and die, as was prophesied about the Messiah.

Thus, for Weiss and Schweitzer, Jesus’s proclamation of the kingdom was a prediction of future events that would close the curtains on the world and open a new order of beginnings. Effectively, the kingdom as Weiss and Schweizer comprehended it would be realized in the future; for them, it was a future reality.

*Albrecht Ritschl and Adolf von Harnack.* It has been said that the works of Johannes Weiss (1863–1914) and Albert Schweitzer (1875–1965) were their responses to
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critique Albrecht Ritschl (1822–1899). Ritschl was Weiss’s father-in-law, so the debate was like Steve Harvey’s “Family Feud.” The core of Ritschl’s argument can be found in one of his best works, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation* (1870–1874). Ritschl believed that faith and religion must be expressed in the realm of the tangibles, and that they must be practically experienced, which must also develop and establish themselves in an ethical way.\(^\text{20}\) According to Ritschl, one of Jesus’s most salient contribution to the cause of human history was that he became our role model with all the desirable elements and qualities worthy to look up to for the achievement of our aims and aspirations in an unyielding world. Christ set for us the highest standard example by staying focused on the crown, which was set before him and persevering, even unto death, to fulfill his calling.\(^\text{21}\) Ritschl did not consider the deity of Jesus as relevant as his human contributions and responses to questions posed by the struggles and challenges of real-life experience. Ritschl even suggests, as Perrin puts it:

> if he [Jesus] was divine, it was only because the community of believers, duly impressed by his words and deed said so. Today all those who honor Jesus as the greatest embodiment of human vocation enter the Kingdom. These same could be called “believers.” As believers, they would go on to be gradually reconciled by working out their conviction as they participated in the ever-expanding, ethically minded social space known as the Kingdom of God.\(^\text{22}\)

While Ritschl conceived the kingdom as present-day social reality, his son-in-law, Johannes Weiss, on the other hand, understood the kingdom as a future event.

---
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Adolf von Harnack (1851–1930), a student of Ritschl, built on the fundamental argument of his tutor on the kingdom of God to shape some of its core objectives. From Harnack’s perspective, when the integuments of various Christian expressions throughout the years of history are peeled off, the core of the gospel can be reveled and recovered. Harnack considers this core as the essence of the Christian faith and practice. In his book, What Is Christianity? he summarizes this core of the gospel into three fundamental points, “Firstly, the Kingdom of God and its coming. Secondly, God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul. Thirdly, the higher righteousness and the commandment of love.”

Harnack’s work What Is Christianity? represents the old liberal view. According to him, Jesus used the apocalyptic teachings only as “the time-conditioned husk that contained the kernel of his real religious message.” When individuals imbibe the gospel of the kingdom of God with clear understanding in their inner being, it will lead to “a properly functioning social order.” Unlike his mentor, Ritschl, Harnack did not consider the achievement of this end as a necessity to make the kingdom complete. Even though he did not ignore Weiss’s arguments and conclusions, he considered them as an exaggeration of the “importance of Jesus’s apocalyptic metaphors, which were in reality nothing more than rhetorical window dressing to sharpen the urgency of the kingdom call.”

Harnack conceived the kingdom as a present-day reality, fully manifested with
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the incarnation of Jesus. He did not believe in the events of a catastrophic eschaton that would bring the full realization of the kingdom. Rather, he believed the kingdom is realized in the souls of individuals who believe and identify with Jesus and his teachings.

After the works of Weiss and Schweitzer, the understanding that Jesus’s teachings on the kingdom were apocalyptic was taken seriously by most scholars, who were considered part of the core and not merely integumentary. Yet, only a small number recognized them as exclusively apocalyptic. For instance, Rudolf Bultmann seems to agree with the apocalyptic conception of the integumentary but with a reservation that it must be understood “in existential terms: the nearness and the demand of God.”

C. H. Dodd, J. Jeremias, and W. G. Kummel. C. H. Dodd, who presents a more recent interpretation, understands the integumentary to mean that the incarnation of Jesus Christ presents a complete appearance of the “wholly other” in the human realm. He refers to this interpretation as the “realized eschatology.” Thus, Dodd’s interpretation does not completely ignore the apocalyptic diction that was completely rejected by Harnack. Rather, he understands it to represent something too deep for humankind to fathom; thus, the apocalyptic diction used in Jesus’s teachings is symbolic of something beyond the realms of the tangibles that entered humankind’s historical arena through the incarnation and ministry of Jesus Christ of Nazareth. Dodd’s critiques point to the fact that his conception of the integumentary has diminished the eschatological aspect of the
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God’s kingdom. In his most recent work, however, he conceded that the integumentary will be fully realized in the future, an era beyond human history as we know it.\textsuperscript{30}

Recently, the common grounds reached by scholars on the debate has been that the kingdom of God is both present and futuristic. The conception of W. G. Kummel is that the apocalyptic understanding of the Jewish traditions has been transferred to the kingdom idea such that it can basically be described as eschatological.\textsuperscript{31} Thus, the new age the Jews expected to come by a future intervention of God, as part of the Jewish apocalypticism, is the same as the end times era Jesus proclaimed to be at hand. According to Kummel, though the kingdom is eschatological, it is also present; but it is present only in Jesus and not in his followers.\textsuperscript{32} This means that in the person of Jesus and his ministry, the kingdom, which is yet to come, has already commenced, for Jesus’s works speak for themselves. Kummel did not explain in detail to make clear how the kingdom can both be already here in the person and works of Jesus and at the same time be eschatological. This deficiency has been resolved by other scholars, who explain that although the kingdom is futuristic, “it was so very near that its power could already be felt—as the dawn precedes sunrise; or else the signs of the Kingdom were present not the Kingdom itself.”\textsuperscript{33}

Jeremias is of the opinion that Dodd has downplayed the significance of the futuristic nature of the kingdom. He upheld, however, Dodd’s conception of the kingdom
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as being present in the person and mission of Jesus Christ. Consequently, he proposes “eschatology in process of realization”\textsuperscript{34} instead of Dodd’s “realized eschatology.”\textsuperscript{35} Thus, he considers the whole of Jesus’s mission as a series of occurrences through which the kingdom is progressively realized. The ministry of Jesus and the characteristic miracles, teachings on the kingdom, healings, and deliverance from evil spirits, comprise enough evidence that the kingdom has manifested in the arena of time and space and has become part of human historical records. While there is nothing more real than this, it is also evident from the narrative of the biblical witness that Jesus’s understanding of the kingdom looks forward to its full realization in the future.\textsuperscript{36}

Thus, current scholarship is divided into two main extreme blocks, with some filling in between with various additions to and combinations of the two, though the more current positions are usually not on the side of “either/or” but “both/and.” On the extreme left block are those who represent the position of Weiss and Schweizer, whose perspective of the kingdom is that which will be realized in the future. Those who belong to this block understand the kingdom to come sometime in the future, at the end of this age, when the judgment of God comes upon the world, and it does not matter whether this physical universe will be destroyed or not. Associated with this understanding is the idea that not all will gain admission to the kingdom.

On the extreme right block are those who represent the position of Ritschl and Harnack, who understand the kingdom as a progressive reality that has already started,
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and which will gradually reach full realization. These thinkers “embrace a moral persuasion theory of atonement (suggesting that we obtain forgiveness only after being nudged by Jesus’s good example) and sit loose on Jesus’s divinity.”  

Thinkers who belong to this block consider admission to the kingdom possible only to those who will accept Jesus’s way of life, principles, and values, and follow them. According to this perspective, “the Kingdom is not something that God ‘does’ through violent irruption, but something we ‘do.’”

---

**Biblical Support for Various Positions of the Debate**

Romans 14:17 affirms that “the Kingdom of God is not a matter of eating and drinking, but of righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.” This means that the kingdom is a present-day reality that is attainable spiritually. This is because righteousness, peace, and joy are spiritual graces that can be received by those who surrender to the Spirit.

While this is true, it is also a truism according to the biblical witness that it is at the second advent of Jesus Christ that God will give the kingdom to his faithful and chosen as their eternal inheritance. This truth is revealed in Matthew 25:34, “Then the King will say to those on his right, ‘Come, you who are blessed by my Father; take your inheritance, the Kingdom prepared for you since the creation of the world.’” So, the question is will it be possible for the kingdom to be a present-day reality attainable spiritually and at the same time a gift from God to his faithful and chosen as an eternal inheritance? My answer is a big yes because what is difficult to comprehend with the
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human mind is yet achievable by divine workings. Also, because “All scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching,” these teachings are correct presentations of Jesus’s teachings on the kingdom, and thus are both true and possible. If a virgin can conceive and bear a son, what else is impossible?

Further examination of the biblical witness reveals many other paradoxical positions on the kingdom of God. For instance, scripture supports the understanding of a certain sphere or domain that we enter to be in the kingdom of God. This can be inferred from Luke 16:16 where Christ referred to the kingdom as being preached and people forcing their way to enter it: “The Law and the Prophets were proclaimed until John. Since that time, the good news of the Kingdom of God is being preached, and everyone is forcing their way into it.” In Col. 1:13, we learn that we have been rescued by God and transferred into the kingdom of the son he loves, suggesting that the rescued are already admitted to the kingdom. Though some may argue that the kingdom of the son God loves may not necessarily be the same as the kingdom of God, scripture teaches that the two are the same and interchangeable: “For of this you can be sure: No immoral, impure or greedy person—such a person is an idolater—has any inheritance in the Kingdom of Christ and of God” (Eph. 5:5). This means that the “kingdom of Christ” is either the same as the kingdom of God, or they are so knitted together that they are inseparable. Thus, whereas this sphere or domain can be entered and or has already been entered, there is also scriptural evidence that this sphere or domain may be entered in the future. This was made evident in Jesus’s answer when he was interrogated by Pilate:

Pilate then went back inside the palace, summoned Jesus and asked Him, “Are you the King of the Jews?” “Is that your own idea,” Jesus asked, “or did others talk to you about me?” “Am I a Jew?” Pilate replied. “Your own people and chief priests handed you over to me. What is it you have done?” Jesus said, “My
Kingdom is not in this world. If it were, my servants would fight to prevent my arrest by the Jewish leaders. But now my Kingdom is from another place. (John 18:33-36)

In this discourse with Pilate, Jesus presents a view of the kingdom that does not only suggest a sphere and domain different from this world but also put the context in the future.

Again, this same futuristic sense is seen in Peter’s strong expectation that believers who strive to be in good standing in the faith “will receive a rich welcome into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ” (2 Peter 1:11). This surely suggests a future event, which same future event was spoken of on several occasions by Jesus himself:

I say to you that many will come from the east and the west and will take their places at “the feast with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of heaven. But the subjects of the Kingdom will be thrown outside, into the darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.” (Matthew 8:11-12)

Here again, the phrase “will be thrown outside” suggests a certain cut out sphere or domain and a future event.

In addition, Jesus’s explanation of “The Parable of the Weeds” reveals that “the harvest” stands for the end of the age when his angels will weed out sin and evil, which suggests that the coming of the kingdom is a future event:

Then He left the crowd and went into the house. His disciples came to Him and said, “Explain to us the parable of the weeds in the field.” He answered, “The one who sowed the good seed is the Son of Man. The field is the world, and the good seed stands for the people of the Kingdom. The weeds are the people of the evil one, and the enemy who sows them is the devil. The harvest is the end of the age, and the harvesters are angels. As the weeds are pulled up and burned in the fire, so it will be at the end of the age. The Son of Man will send out His angels, and they will weed out of His Kingdom everything that causes sin and all who do evil. They will throw them into the blazing furnace, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Then the righteous will shine like the sun in the Kingdom of their Father. Whoever has ears, let them hear.” (Matthew 13:36-43)
It is not until the end of the age, which is in the future, that the devil and his people will be purged out of the kingdom of God. This sounds both futuristic and eschatological. This same futuristic and eschatological tone can be found in Jesus’s teaching on “The Parable of the Net” in vv. 47-50 of the same chapter.

On another occasion, when Jesus was giving the opportunity to throw more light on when we should expect the kingdom of God to come, he discouraged his enquirers from looking for the kingdom in the future:

Once, on being asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God would come, Jesus replied, “The coming of the Kingdom of God is not something that can be observed, nor will people say, ‘Here it is,’ or ‘There it is,’ because the Kingdom of God is in your midst.” (Luke 17:20-21)

Contrary to the teaching on the parable of the weeds and net in Matt. 13 above, this teaching of Jesus suggests that the kingdom is already here, and Jesus did seem to downplay any idea of an eventful exhibition of grandeurs. Many other parables teach that the kingdom of God is already in motion and operational in this present age. These include the idea of the kingdom of God being like a minute mustard seed that grows into a great tree, and yeast that leavens a whole lot of flour (Luke 13:18-21).

Thus, while some of Jesus’s parables explicitly suggest that the kingdom of God is already here, others also present a futuristic and eschatological view. These seemingly paradoxical teachings about the kingdom account for the many different views held by scholars throughout history. The debate usually centers on the seemingly enigmatic contraries that are revealed in the Bible concerning the kingdom. Some of these biblical opposites in scripture include the view that the kingdom is a:

1) Present-day reality and at the same time eschatologically futuristic,
2) Present spiritual reality and at the same time a future reality,

3) Present social reality and a future reality,

4) Sphere or domain to be entered now and at the same time a sphere to be entered in the future,

5) Future gift to be given by God in the future and at the same time a gift from God to be received now.

The New Testament scholar and theologian Ladd describes these opposites as follows:

The Kingdom is a present reality (Matt. 12:28), and yet it is a future blessing (1 Cor. 15: 50). It is an inner spiritual redemptive blessing (Rom 14:17) which can be experienced only by way of the new birth (John 3: 3), and yet it will have to do with the government of the nations of the world (Rev. 11: 15). The Kingdom is a realm into which men enter now (Matt. 21:31), and yet it is a realm into which they will enter tomorrow (Matt.8: 11). It is at the same time a gift of God which will be bestowed by God in the future (Luke 12:32) and yet which must be received in the present (Mark 10: 15). Obviously, no simple explanation can do justice to such a rich but diverse variety of teaching.39

The Meaning of Malkuth and Basileia

The Greek word translated as kingdom in the New Testament is *basileia*; and in the Old Testament the Hebrew word is *malkuth*.40 Both *basileia* and *malkuth* represent the same idea but from different perspectives. Geerhardus Vos sees two distinct perspectives, “something abstract”41 or “something concrete.”42 The former refers to “the kingship or rule exercised by the King”43 and the latter “the territory, the sum total of the
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subjects and possessions ruled over, including whatever of rights, privileges and advantages enjoyed in this sphere.”

Ladd seems to agree with Vos except that he sees his second perspective, “something concrete,” as “secondary and derived meanings.”

So, he confirms that “the primary meaning of both the Hebrew word *malkuth* in the Old Testament and of the Greek word *basileia* in the New Testament is the rank, authority and sovereignty exercised by a king.”

This fundamental meaning of *malkuth* (i.e., kingdom) is revealed in Ezra 8:1, where the priest in giving the list of those who returned with him to Jerusalem, and he referred to the period as “during the reign of king Artaxerxes” (Ezra 8:1). Here *malkuth* means the reign of king Artaxerxes. Again, in 2 Chron. 12:1 *malkuth* is used to refer to Rehoboam’s position as king and the establishment of his rule. Daniel also points to the “latter part of their reign” (Dan. 8:23), referring to the latter part of the reign of the “The four horns that replaced the one that was broken off” (Dan. 8:22), which he said represent four kingdoms that will rise. In all these, *malkuth* is used to refer to the rule of a human being. There are many other passages where *malkuth* is used to refer to the reign of a human king, including 2 Chron. 11:17, 12:1, 26:30; Ezra 4:5; Neh. 12:22, Jer. 49:34, and others.

In Exod. 19:6, “you will be for me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation,” the people of Israel are referred to as “a kingdom of priests.” This is one of the rare times that *malkuth* is used to refer to the subjects or the people being ruled over. Most of the time,
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in the Old Testament, *malkuth*, when used in reference to Yahweh, refers to the reign of Yahweh—his rule—as in Psalm 103:19, “The Lord has established his throne in the heaven, and his kingdom rules overall.” Here, *malkuth* refers to Yahweh’s sovereign rule over the whole universe. Hardly ever does the use of *malkuth* refer to the jurisdiction of Yahweh’s sovereignty.47

The prophet Obadiah saw a future where Yahweh will send deliverers to go up to Mount Zion to rule so that the kingdom will become the Lord’s kingdom (Obad. 1:21). When Yahweh will rule in all the earth is when the expected kingdom will be seen to have arrived. The supreme authority of Yahweh will be established in all the earth. This expectation was to be realized in time and the righteous ruler would be a descendant of David (Isa. 9 and 11). After the exilic period, the expectation begun to focus on Daniel’s prophecy where they looked forward to “a heavenly Son of Man with a completely transcendental Kingdom ‘beyond history’ (Daniel 7).”48 It may therefore be that the common usage of the phrase “the kingdom of God” during the time of Christ’s earthly ministry would not be too different from the postexilic era, if not the same.49 The kingdom in Jewish thought has often been associated with Yahweh’s rule or reign, not his territory or domain, which would be realized in a future event.

The Old Testament clearly reveals that God’s kingdom, his *malkuth*, is his rule, such as Psalm 145:11, “They tell of the glory of your kingdom and speak of your might.” The kingdom of Yahweh is manifested in his might, his authority and power, not his


48 Ibid., 58.

territory. Verse 13 talks about the kingdom of God being an everlasting kingdom. This verse may be referring to the reign of God as everlasting and not the jurisdiction of his rule.\textsuperscript{50} Ladd argues that in Dan. 2:31, “You, O king, the king of kings, to whom the God of heaven has given the kingdom, the power, and the might, and the glory,” the words, power, might, and glory meant the same thing, kingdom.\textsuperscript{51} He further points out that they refer to the authority that Nebuchadnezzar received from God to rule as king.\textsuperscript{52} When Daniel interpreted the strange hand writing on the wall concerning King Belshazzar, he said, “Here is what these words mean: Mene: God has numbered the days of your reign and brought it to an end” (Dan. 5:26). Ladd explains that this can only refer to the rule of King Belshazzar but not the jurisdiction or domain of his reign since the historical facts show that the Babylonian territory, and even the people, were not touched in the fulfilment of the vision. It was only the reign of the king that was brought to an end (Dan. 5:31).\textsuperscript{53}

In the New Testament, \textit{basileia tou theou} (“kingdom of God”) may have a meaning not different from the Old Testament understanding of \textit{malkuth}. Even though scholars do not seem to agree on the primary meaning of \textit{basileia}, it is believed that the meaning flows from the Old Testament Jewish understanding of “kingdom,” which means “a rule.” Beginning from this meaning, Jesus expanded it to cover other important aspects of the kingdom; and “it would begin to mean, if not a territory or body of
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subjects, at least a realm, a sphere of life, a state of things, all of these more or less locally conceived.”

The Old Testament meaning of “kingdom,” which has been transported to the New Testament, is clearly seen in Luke 19:11-12:

While they were listening to this, he went on to tell them a parable, because he was near Jerusalem and the people thought that the kingdom of God was going to appear at once. He said: “A man of noble birth went to a distant country to have himself appointed king and then to return.”

The use of basileia here refers to the recognition of the authority of the man of noble birth by a higher authority to rule as king. Clearly, he did not go to receive the territory or the people, because the land or jurisdiction he sought to rule and the people were already there, and he was going to return to the land and the people after he has received the kingship—authority to rule. According to Ladd, the parable was a lesson picked from an historical event:

This very thing had happened some years before the days of our Lord. In the year 40 B.C. political conditions in Palestine had become chaotic. The Romans had subdued the country in 63 B.C., but stability had been slow in coming. Herod the Great finally went to Rome, obtained from the Roman Senate the kingdom, and was declared to be king. He literally went into a far country to receive a kingship, the authority to be king in Judaea over the Jews. It may well be that our Lord had this incident in mind in this parable. In any case, it illustrates the fundamental meaning of kingdom.

Thus, basileia tou theou (“kingdom of God”) fundamentally refers to God’s reign or rule. Though it is not in all occurrences of basileia in the New Testament that the rendering
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“God’s rule” or “God’s reign” may fit, one may “be inclined to believe, that the thought of a revelation of God’s royal power lay uppermost in our Lord’s mind.”

The Kingdom of God and the Church

The theological connection between the kingdom of God and the church is important and necessary to this project. Whether or not to identify the kingdom of God with the church is a necessary but difficult question that must be investigated. Their relationship as revealed in Scripture, and the theological interpretations we may impute to these important concepts, have serious implications on practical Christian living and practice. Therefore, there is the need to scrutinize these important concepts to find out the correlation between them.

Some scholars are of the view that the biblical witness does not support the allusion that Jesus intended to establish the church, but others still think that the church was a consequential baby of Jesus’s mission and teachings. Ladd suggests that the first advent of Jesus marked the beginning of the advanced fulfillment of the kingdom, which would be fully realized in the future, but was present in the earthly mission and teachings of Christ. He further argues that if this statement is valid, then those who accept Jesus’s teachings about the kingdom of God and identify with him are considered not only as those who will inherit the already here but yet-to-be fulfilled kingdom, “but as the people of the Kingdom in the present, and therefore, in some sense of the word, a church.”

Whereas Jesus’s teachings on the kingdom cut across all the periods in his earthly ministry, those on the church showed up only twice, both in the gospel of Matthew (Matt.
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16:13-20; 18:15-20). Jesus specifically mentioned the church in Matt. 18:17, but it does not seem that he was speaking directly about the establishment of the church; rather, he probably referred to it under the subject of church discipline. Some have even suggested that it may not necessarily refer to the New Testament church but may be referring to the Jewish ecclesiastical establishment. In Matt. 16:18, on the other hand, Jesus seems to announce the birth of the church. Here, our Lord made a clear and succinct statement about the church that defined her nature and correlation with the kingdom.

Jesus’s statement came after Simon Peter had made his most salient confession revealing that the promised Messiah had come in the person of Jesus Christ of Nazareth: Simon Peter answered, “You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God” (Matt. 16:16). Based on Peter’s direct answer from first principles to our Lord’s question, “Who do you say I am?” Jesus declared that upon Peter he would build his church. This may not be the maiden confession of Jesus’s messiahship by Peter, but it is significant given the background that it came at a point where some former followers of Jesus had deserted him. Jesus found Peter’s unwavering understanding of his messiahship worthy of recognition. Parallel to the meaning of his name, which means rock, Peter stood firmly rooted on this solid understanding, which is the bedrock foundation upon which Christ Jesus would build his church. This unwavering, bedrock understanding and insight about the messiahship of Jesus was a revelation from God the Father in heaven that enabled Peter to discern who Jesus was, even though the human expectations and visual evidence did not necessarily support such a conception. Consequently, many people rejected Jesus as the promised Messiah as against Peter’s confession. This implies that one
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characteristic of the church may be that it “will have for its peculiarity the recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus in contradistinction from the denial of this Messiahship by those without.”

The implication deduced above from the background and historical circumstantial context of the event is confirmed by the verbal pronouncement of Jesus, “I will build my church,” which means he makes this church his bona fide property in preference to another. The Hebrew words Qahal and ‘Edah, at some point became the general name of congregational Israel. Thus, when Jesus says, “my church,” he may be saying, “this church I am talking about must be distinguished from the congregation of Israel in that this one is the assembly of people who subscribe to my messiahship.”

It also flows from our Lord’s statement that he himself will build this church, that it is his church, and it does not belong to anyone else. He will build it on the solid rock foundation of Peter’s understanding and confession, yet it does not belong to Peter; it is the Lord’s church. Because Jesus owns it, he alone has absolute authority over it; all others have delegated authority. He demonstrated his absolute authority over the church when he said to Peter, “I will give you the keys of the Kingdom of heaven” (Matt. 16:19).

The phrase “I will give you” shows his sovereign authority over the church, which he reserves the right to delegate to whomever he pleases. I therefore agree with Geerhardus when he says, “Objectively considered, therefore, the Church is that new congregation taking the place of the old congregation of Israel, which is formed by Jesus as the Messiah and stands under his Messianic rule.”
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Analyzing our Lord’s statement further, it will be observed that he uses the future tense in both the phrase “I will build” and “I will give,” which shows that the church he was talking about was not yet instituted and the keys not yet handed to Peter. It is observed from the biblical witness that the church was built, and Peter became the natural leader after the death, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord. This links the beginning and administration of the affairs of the church to the full attainment of Jesus’s glorious status after his resurrection and ascension to take his seat at the right-hand side of the Father. Geerhardus explains this as follows:

In order to understand this, we must remember that Jesus, while in one sense conscious of having Messianic authority and doing Messianic work already here on earth, yet in another sense regarded the exercise of his Messianic function as beginning with his state of glory. It was entirely in harmony with Jesus’ own point of view when Peter later declared that God by resurrection had made him both Lord and Christ, Acts 2:36. Now in this sense we can say that according to our Lord’s teaching the Church could not begin until after he should have entered upon the exalted stage of his Messiahship.62

Geerhardus further argues that there must be a connection between Jesus’s death and resurrection and the establishment of his church because, “From that time on Jesus began to explain to his disciples that he must go to Jerusalem and suffer many things at the hands of the elders, the chief priests and the teachers of the law, and that he must be killed and on the third day be raised to life” (Matt. 16:21).63

Furthermore, the statement, “I will give you the keys of the Kingdom of heaven” (Matt. 16:19), which immediately followed “I will build my church” (Matt. 16:18), shows a strong correlation between the concepts of the kingdom and the church. Various forms
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of interpretations, however, have been given to the relationship between the two concepts, with some suggesting that they are two separate entities. Flowing from Matt. 16:19, the keys may be construed to mean the authority to grant or deny access to the kingdom, which may be understood as the fully realized kingdom of God. With this understanding, the authority to grant or deny access to the kingdom was then given to the church, because Peter, whose unwavering understanding of the messiahship of Jesus became the bedrock foundation upon which the church would be founded, and hence the foundation of the church receives this authority on behalf of the church.

The critique of this interpretation has been that “the binding and loosing do not refer to heaven itself, as if heaven were shut or opened, but refer to certain things lying within the sphere of heaven, and not of heaven alone but of earth likewise.”

I must add that some have explained that the Semitic presuppositions underneath Jesus’s statement in Matt. 16:18 make the Greek words Petros (Peter) and petra (rock) stand out to be examined. It may be that Jesus made the statement in Aramaic, and he might have said, “You are kepa’ [Gk. Kephas], and on this kepa’ I will build my church.” Roman Catholics interpret this to mean an office occupied by Peter in the church governance structure, while many Protestants understand it to mean that Christ is the rock in line with Luther’s interpretation, or the rock represents Peter’s faith in Jesus as the Messiah (in line with Calvin’s interpretation).
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The figurative expression Jesus used, i.e., “binding” and “loosing,” may be conceived differently. First, it could be conceived to mean declaring one’s sin forgiven and another’s sin unforgiven. In this way, the former gains entrance to the kingdom and the latter is denied access. Thus, all consequences of sin cannot be enforced on the one who is forgiven, while the other faces all the consequences that come with sin, including spiritual death and denial of entrance to the kingdom. Second, it could be interpreted in line with the way many Jews would understand the words in their ordinary conversation: “to bind” would mean “to forbid,” and “to loose” would mean “to allow.” The authority to impute or forgive sin interpretation seems to have the upper hand when Matt. 16:13-21 is read side by side with Matt. 18:15-20. Yet, some scholars suggest that the statement, “whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven,” is linked to church discipline, which somehow makes the community of disciples a peculiar people comparable to the congregation in the Jewish synagogue. Matthew 16:13-21, however, does not seem to limit the expression to church discipline; rather, it gives a more generalized interpretation. Geerhardus puts it this way:

The keys spoken of are in all probability not the keys of the outer door, but the keys pertaining to the entire house, the keys not of the gate-keeper, but of the house-steward, and therefore symbolize the administration of the affairs of the house in general.67

Clearly, the authority to bind and loose was given to Peter to operate on earth, even if it included binding and loosing the activities of spiritual entities like Satan and his demons. It also meant that the decisions and actions of Peter’s leadership of the church here on earth were sanctioned by God who sits upon the throne in heaven. It can be concluded that in Jesus’s conception of the church and the kingdom, the two are identified since the

promise to give the keys of kingdom to Peter comes immediately after the declaration to build the church with the same Peter as the foundation of rock. Also, it can be observed that the building of the church and the giving of the authority to the kingdom were both illustrated with a house imagery, and both were presented in the future tense; it therefore follows that the house imagery cannot be interpreted to mean different things in the two instances.68

The house imagery fits the description of the kingdom and the church; thus, the kingdom as the church has the semblance of a household, a community. The nature of the Old Testament church was also that of a community, a household, and it was usually referred to as the house of Israel (Matt. 15:24; Jer. 3:18, KJV). This is in tandem with the meaning of the word ecclesia, “which designates the assembly of free citizens called together to deliberate and take action in matters pertaining to the commonwealth.”69 The Scriptures capture several sayings of our Lord that portray the kingdom concept as a peculiar people living as a “new and distinct society.”70 Their principles and values reveal an upside-down character. In Mark 9:35, Jesus said, “Anyone who wants to be first must be the very last, and the servant of all.” This surely is an upside-down principle that defines a peculiar group of people and a “new social option.”71 The people who stayed faithful and who followed Jesus were taught to change their plausibility structure to accommodate the new principles and values that represent the kingdom. Thus, at least a demonstration of the nature of the kingdom of God was made to the world through the
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earthly mission of Jesus. The parable of the weeds (Matt. 13:24-30, 36-43) and the parable of the net (Matt. 13:47-52) confirm the idea that the kingdom involves a society of humankind. In the parable of the weeds, as part of Jesus’s explanation, he said, “The Son of Man will send out his angels, and they will weed out of his kingdom everything that causes sin and all who do evil.” So, the people who will accept these new values and principles given by the Messiah King, Jesus, are the people of the kingdom, and they will remain intermingled with the people of the evil one until the end of the age. At the end of the age, the son of Man, i.e., Jesus, will command “his angels,” and they will weed out of “his kingdom” the bad seed. This seems to suggest that Jesus’s people, who are the good seed, are identified with “his kingdom,” which in turn is identified with the kingdom of their Father (Matt. 13:43). Thus, the good seed of the Sower (the Son of Man) are the people of the Son of Man, the people of Jesus, who also are the people of the kingdom, are identified with “his kingdom”; therefore, the church is identified with the kingdom. Geerhardus submits that “This ‘kingdom of the Son of man’ agrees with the ‘church of Jesus,’ in that both phrases make the kingdom a body of men placed under the Messiah as their ruler.”

This implies that the followers of Jesus, the body of Christ, the church, represent the kingdom here on earth now, as inaugurated by the earthly mission of Jesus, and shall inherit the kingdom yet to come, which now cannot be seen physically. So that the people of the community of faith, the church, may now be said to have replaced the house of Israel, the Old Testament church. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the church to physically and practically demonstrate to the world the values and principles of the yet to
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be fully realized kingdom, which is unseen, to the world—just as Jesus “is the image of the invisible God” (Col. 1:15), and he physically and practically showed the world who God the Father is by doing the work of the Father who sent him.

This project is about encouraging the church to focus on demonstrating the kingdom to the world and giving the world a foretaste of the kingdom of heaven here on earth. With the keys of the kingdom, what the church sanctions on earth shall be approved in heaven. Again, the church will be endued with supernatural power when the Holy Spirit comes upon them (Acts 1:8), and thus, the capacity of the church to reveal the invisible kingdom to this physical world is well boosted.

Some have suggested that Jesus initially focused on the house of Israel (Matt.15:24; 10:5-6), the Old Testament church. The biblical witness shows that Jesus was born to a Jewish family, lived like a Jew, and ministered among the Jews. He frequently quoted the Old Testament as an authoritative source and accepted the rituals and practices in the Temple. Jesus accepted that the children of Israel were the people to whom the promise belongs, and as descendants of Jacob they were “sons of the kingdom” (Matt.8:12, NASB) in the natural. He set out to announce to Israel that the promise given to their fathers was being fulfilled by God, with him as the promised Messiah, in their time and before their very eyes. But Israel rejected the good news proclaimed by Jesus and refused to accept him as the Messiah.

In Matt.23:37, Jesus expressed how he longed for Israel to accept him and come under the safe and far less burdensome rule of God; for he was the promised one with the scepter of righteousness. He further warned them that they had been left desolate, completely abandoned by God (Matt.23:38), to be destroyed by their enemies (Luke
19:42-44). Though most of the people of Israel and their leaders rejected the kingdom as announced by Jesus, there were still many who accepted him and his message. So those who received him were given the right to become the children of God (John 1:12); thus, “The recipients of the messianic salvation became the true Israel, representatives of the nation as a whole.” 73 Therefore, there is no doubt that “Jesus’ disciples are the recipients of the messianic salvation, the people of the Kingdom, the true Israel.” 74

As recorded in the Bible, the life and ministry of our Lord, including his sayings, seem to favor an interpretation consistent with the idea that the church is identified with, but not equal to, the kingdom. In the dispensation after the death and resurrection of Jesus and the completion of his messianic task, the kingdom took the form of the church on earth. Whoever is born again (John 3:3) gains access to the kingdom and the same becomes a member of the church. One of the essential things common to the church and the kingdom is that they are both composed of regenerated people. The church, therefore, represents the community of faith who have been called by God to be unto him instruments of righteousness, to demonstrate to the world the values and principles of the kingdom as they live those principles in their life together and in their engagement with the world.

This is a people group who recognize the sovereignty and kingship of God and live as a distinct people and a “new and alternative public.” 75 In the spirit of the parable of leaven, they are supposed to influence the whole world, not through violence, but
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through an embodied witness of Jesus Christ. The greatest weapon with which Christ continues to conquer the world is love. The world will be permeated with the love of Jesus if the body of Christ, the church, will leaven the world with the leaven of love. The church must invade the world with the weapon of love administered through service and disinterested benevolence. This is what Dino Rizzo refers to as “Servolution”\textsuperscript{76}—“This is a revolution of serving others.”\textsuperscript{77} “The troops are followers of Christ . . . and the weapons are towels of service.”\textsuperscript{78} The church must allow God to use her as an instrument of righteousness to change the life of the people through acts of love and social services to establish the kingdom of God in their communities. The church must launch a revolution in the community through serving.

Every sphere of life must be conquered, and the sovereignty and kingship of God must be recognized by bringing our communities under the influence of the principles of God and Christ through the power of love; this is the physical manifestation of the kingdom of God. Geerhardus puts it this way,

There is a sphere of science, a sphere of art, a sphere of the family and of the state, a sphere of commerce and industry. Whenever one of these spheres comes under the controlling influence of the principle of the divine supremacy and glory, and this outwardly reveals itself, there we can truly say that the kingdom of God has become manifest.\textsuperscript{79}

The Old Testament presents an important concept, the faithful remnant, that may further explain the idea that the followers of Jesus and all those who received him and
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accepted his messianic salvation became the true Israel. The people of Israel were a stiff-necked people who rebelled against and disobeyed the commandments and ordinances of the Lord their God. Many turned their back to the Lord and played the harlotry with foreign gods. Consequently, the Lord through the prophets pronounced judgement over Israel. Even so, there remained in Israel a faithful few who continued to trust in the Lord. In 1 Kings 19: 18, the Lord said to Elijah, “Yet I reserve seven thousand in Israel—all whose knees have not bowed down to Baal and whose mouths have not kissed him.” God has always kept a remnant who remained faithful to him and who never worshiped foreign gods. The priest, Ezra, referred to the remnant when he said, “But now, for a brief moment, the Lord our God has been gracious in leaving us a remnant and giving us a firm place in his sanctuary, and so our God gives light to our eyes and a little relief in our bondage” (Ezra 9:8), and Isaiah talks about “all the remnant of the people of Israel” (Isa. 46:3). These few but faithful “remnant will take root below and bear fruit above” (Isa. 37:31). The remnant will then be the true representatives of the house of Israel, the people of God.

In the New Testament, Jesus did not make any direct reference to the remnant idea. In Luke 12:32, however, he referred to his disciples as “little flock.” The imagery of the house of Israel being the flock of God is referred to here. This same flock and shepherd are used in Ezek. 34:22-24,

I will save my flock, and they will no longer be Plundered. I will judge between one sheep and another. I will place over them one shepherd, my servant David, and he will tend them; he will tend them and be their shepherd. I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David will be prince among them.

Jesus is that seed of David who will be prince among the people and who will be the one shepherd over God’s flock. He links these two images when he said, “I am the good
shepherd” (John 10:11). Therefore, by referring to his disciples as “little flock,” it seems that Jesus did have the concept of the faithful remnant in mind. The disciples of Jesus are now the faithful remnant. As prophesied by Ezekiel, there will be one flock under one shepherd (Ezek. 34:23), so the disciples of Jesus being the faithful remnant does not mean that there are two separate flocks.

The house of Israel remains the flock of God except that they have been rebellious and disobedient and have wandered away. They have become the “lost sheep of Israel” (Matt. 15:24) and Jesus’s mission is to seek the lost sheep, as the good shepherd, and to save the lost sheep of Israel.80 Jesus came as the promised Messiah, too, first to save the lost sheep of Israel and then the world, but the people of Israel rejected him as their Messiah. So, the few who accepted him as the Messiah became his flock, the faithful remnant, the true Israel. Thus, there is a direct correlation between the “image of the flock and the covenant community of Israel.”81 In Luke 12:32, Jesus said, “Do not be afraid, little flock, for your Father has been pleased to give you the Kingdom.” This sounds futuristic, yet it gives assurance that the followers of Christ, the little flock, will inherit the kingdom of God.

Some have also suggested that if the basic definition of the kingdom is considered to mean the reign of God or the rule of God as King, then the kingdom of God may not be said to be identified with the church. The kingdom as God’s rule as a king implies that there is a realm or domain in which it is experienced. It is further argued that biblically, the kingdom is seldom identified with the subjects. In any kingdom, the subjects are the
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people of that kingdom, they live in that kingdom, and are ruled by the king of the kingdom. In the same way, the church is a community of God’s people who are ruled by God; thus, the church is the people of the kingdom but may not necessarily be the kingdom itself. The followers of Jesus who accepted him as the Messiah may be members of the kingdom but may not be the kingdom itself. The kingdom is the rule of God as King, and the church is a congregation of God’s people who are subjects of the kingdom of God.\(^82\)

As part of the explanation to debunk the idea that the kingdom is identified with the church, it is further argued that the disciples of Jesus, just like Jesus, go around propagating the gospel of the kingdom of God; they do not preach the church. Scripture references like Acts 8:12, 19:8, 20:25, 28:23, 31 support this assertion, and it would be difficult to use church as a synonym of kingdom in these verses. It must be noted that in Rev. 1:6 and 5:10, the people of the kingdom were referred to as the kingdom (i.e., \textit{basileia}), but even here, the people are so referenced because they are coheirs of the kingdom with Christ and “they will reign on earth” (Rev. 5:10). The reason why the people were referred to as \textit{basileia} is not because they are citizens of the kingdom but because they will rule as kings. Thus, the primary connection of kingdom and the rule of a king is invoked here.\(^83\)

As discussed above, the idea that the kingdom is identified with the church can be deduced from the parable of the tares. Matthew 13:41 seems to suggest that Jesus’s people, who are the good seed, are identified with “his kingdom,” from which the angels
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will weed out evil. At the same time, some have also raised legitimate issues from the same parable of the tares. They argue that in Matt. 13:38, the Lord explained that the field in the parable stands for the world, not the church; and indeed, the good seed represents the people of the kingdom (i.e., the church). The parable is not so much about the character and essence of the church but about the fact that even though the kingdom of God has already manifested in human history, the day of reckoning, where all evil will be removed from the people of God, is yet in the future and until then both will be allowed to dwell together.

Ladd opines that it is wrong to deduce from Matt. 16:18-19 and conclude that the kingdom is identified with the church. He criticizes Vos for taking the house imagery to the extreme; for example, in Matt. 16:18 on the building of the church, in the first instance, and in Matt. 16:19 on entrusting the keys to the completed house in the second instance. He argues that the expression used in both instances is metaphorical and must not be stretched too far; that the idea of what “house” meant in the first instance can only be the same in the second instance may not necessarily be valid, because sometimes metaphors can have different meanings for the same images. Ladd, therefore, suggests that Matt. 16:18-19 “sets forth the inseparable relationship between the church and the Kingdom, but not their identity.”

Further to Ladd’s argument that the church is not identified with the kingdom, he points out that the context of the many scriptural references stating that people must enter the kingdom cannot be substituted with people entering the church. Also, he queries that

it is erroneous and confusing to say that the church is a sort of an intermediate form of the kingdom in between the first and second advent of Christ.  

Ladd concedes that there is some similarity between the two concepts in that when the kingdom is considered as the realm of the rule of God where people may enter, then it is just like the church as a realm into which people may enter. He adds, however, that a biblical and theological consideration of the kingdom as the realm of the rule of God will show that it is presently not of this world. He concludes that “the church is the people of the Kingdom, but never that Kingdom itself.”

Ladd further argues that the power of God’s rule, active in the ministry of Jesus Christ, challenges humankind to respond to God’s call to come into a special covenantal relationship with him and to form a new community of faith referred to as the church. Thus, the church is a creation of the kingdom of God. He analyzes the parable of the draw net and concludes that the working of the kingdom of God does not necessarily lead to a homogeneous community of saints but a nonhomogeneous one that is composed of both the regenerate people of the kingdom and the non-regenerate. The draw net catches both good fish and bad fish. Thus, gaining admission into the kingdom may mean participation in the church, but also not the inverse, because admission into the church does not necessarily mean admission into the kingdom.
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Ladd again submits that it is the church’s mandate to be an embodied witness to the kingdom, but not to build it because the church does not have the capacity to build the kingdom or be the kingdom. He cites Matthew 10 and Luke 10 to illustrate this point.\(^\text{89}\) The church has the mandate to engage the world with the full gospel. The mission of the church is tied to the business of witnessing to the full gospel of the kingdom of God in the world. Thus, the church now replaces Israel as the people with the mandate to be witnesses to the kingdom of God. It is the responsibility of the church to showcase to the world what the kingdom looks like—which is already here and still yet to come—the modus operandi, principles, and values of the kingdom. The church must give this present age a foretaste of what is to be consummated in the age to come. The church must empirically show to the world that it has a dual nature, and that it both lives in the present age and will live on in the age to come. Even though the nature of the church in the age to come, unlike that of this present age, is that of perfection and sinless like Christ, it is her responsibility to demonstrate to this world the principles and values of the life of the kingdom in the age to come.

Some of the most fundamental principles and values of the kingdom are love, faith, and hope, among which we are told that love is the greatest (1 Cor. 13:13). For instance, flowing out of love is the kingdom principle of forgiveness. Jesus teaches that we should forgive those who sin against us: “‘Then Peter came to Jesus and asked, ‘Lord, how many times shall I forgive my brother or sister who sins against me? Up to seven times?’ Jesus answered, ‘I tell you, not seven times, but seventy-seven times’” (Matt. 18:21-22). The world does not know this; what the world is used to is tit-for-tat.

According to the teachings of Christ about the kingdom, those who seek to be great must be the servants, which is contrary to what is known and acceptable to the people of this world. Thus, the church as the community of faith and people of the kingdom must demonstrate to the world, through service, the alternative to what they know. By so doing, the world will be influenced to reconstruct its plausibility structure to accept the kingdom principles and values as the default operative code. Ladd cannot be any more forthright when he says, “It is therefore the church’s duty to display in an evil age of self-seeking, pride, and animosity the life and fellowship of the kingdom of God and of the Age to Come. This display of kingdom life is an essential element in the witness of the Church to the kingdom of God.”

It is Ladd’s argument that since the Rabbinic understanding of Israel’s role as children of the kingdom includes the responsibility as custodians of the kingdom, and since the church has replaced Israel, that role has been entrusted to the church. He explains that God started the agenda to establish the kingdom of God (i.e., the rule of God) on earth in Abraham, in a covenantal relationship that committed Israel to the kingdom agenda through God’s laws.

Ladd argues that the rule of God is practically realized through the demanding obeisance of the commandments of God (i.e., his laws), and since the same was under the custodianship of the people of Israel, then Israel can be said to be the custodian of the kingdom of God. He explains that when Gentiles accept to be part of the Jewish faith
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and worship, they become proselytes, which implies that they have adopted the laws of God and, therefore, have subscribed to the rule of God, the kingdom of God. As a result, it can be said that since the Gentiles subscribed to God’s rule through Israel, who “alone were the sons of the kingdom,”⁹³ then all others grafted in were adopted sons of the kingdom.

With the historic advent of Jesus and the demonstration of messianic authority and powers in his mission, however, he clearly announced himself as the Messiah King. This claim was largely rejected by the nation of Israel, but clearly some accepted him as the Messiah and became his disciples or followers. These disciples were then given the power to become the children of God, and children of the kingdom, to replace Israel. Whereas the people of Israel became children of the kingdom through natural birth as descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the disciples of Jesus became children of the kingdom through spiritual birth as people born again through faith in Jesus as the Messiah. The latter, therefore, are preferred to the former and hence replaced the former as the custodians of the kingdom.

The disciples who formed the community of believers were the ekklesia of Jesus, and in line with Mark 12:9, were the others who have been given the kingdom that was taken away from Israel. The ekklesia of Jesus, the church, was mandated to be a witness to the kingdom and to demonstrate the authority and powers of the eschatological kingdom here in this age, just as Jesus promised in Matt. 16:19. To these, he gave the keys of the kingdom to the church so that whatever they bound or loosed on earth would be bound or loosed in heaven.

Earlier, the disciples had exercised this when Jesus, as part of training them in kingdom work, sent out the twelve and the seventy-two, in Matthew 10 and Luke 10 respectively. The fulfilment of this promise may be linked with the confirmation promise given after the resurrection in Acts 1:8, which was fulfilled in Acts 2 on the Day of Pentecost. During their kingdom training trek in the towns and villages of Israel, they preached the kingdom of God and demonstrated the power of the kingdom through healing and deliverance (Matt. 10:5-8). Jesus told them that whoever listened to them listened to him, and whoever rejected them rejected him and God (Luke 10:16). Their peace would rest on any house that accepted them, but those who rejected their message would attract upon themselves the judgement of God (Matt. 10:14-15). Thus, the resultant effect of the ministry had the potential of giving access to the kingdom to those who would accept their message, and the opposite if they did not. Jesus gave them sleeves on training for the responsibility of being custodians of the keys of the kingdom.

Ladd sees it as close and difficult (if not impossible) to separate relationship between the kingdom of God and the church, but at the same time he insists that the kingdom is not identified with the church. He submits a comparison of the two concepts in the following:

The Kingdom takes its point of departure from God, the church from human beings. The Kingdom is God’s reign and the realm in which the blessings of his reign are experienced; the church is the fellowship of those who have experienced God’s reign and entered into the enjoyment of its blessings. The Kingdom creates the church, works through the church, and is proclaimed in the world by the church. There can be no Kingdom without a church—those who have acknowledged God’s rule—and there can be no church without God’s Kingdom; but they remain two distinguishable concepts: the rule of God and the fellowship of men and women.94

Whether the kingdom of God is identified with the church (as Vos’s argument suggests), or that the two are different but inseparably related (as Ladd’s argument suggests), both concepts support the role of the church to demonstrate the kingdom principles and values to the world. Through her embodied witness to the world, the church must both tell and demonstrate the love of God. Therefore, no matter how one slices it, a biblical understanding of the relationship between the kingdom of God and the church demands that the church engage the world with a gospel that practically displays the culture of the eschatological kingdom right here on earth. The church must give the world a foretaste of the eschatological kingdom that is preached both in its power and virtue. When the church grabs this theological breakthrough, it will be transformed and become a potent kingdom agent. This is the main objective of this project, and this has been God’s plan for his people to partner with him in his agenda, to reinstate humankind after the fall from the beginning.

The Kingdom of God from the Beginning

The Bible begins with the story of God creating and establishing a kingdom for himself. He commences by creating and establishing its boundaries and domain, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” (Gen. 1:1). So, the heavens and the earth are the domain and boundaries of the kingdom God created, and they declare his glory, “the heavens declare the glory of God; the skies proclaim the work of His hands. Day after day they pour forth speech; night after night they reveal knowledge” (Ps. 19:1-2). Thus, for six days God worked hard to define, decorate, and institute law and order in his kingdom. For instance, he instructed the waters below the heavens to gather to one place, which clearly defined the separation of the waters from the land so that the dry
land would be distinct from the waters; and he called the dry land earth and the gathered waters seas (Gen. 1:9-10). He also made the sun and the moon to give light to the earth, the latter to govern the night whilst the former governs the day (Gen. 1:16-19); thus, law and order was instituted. Then God created living creatures, the fish and all creatures that live in water, the birds that fly above the earth, and the animals that move along the ground.

Now, God decided to create a special being after his own kind, in his own image, and made him his representative, and to whom he delegated authority and power to rule and manage his kingdom (Gen. 1:26-30). So, God created humankind as his image-bearers so that he may rule his kingdom through them. The man and the woman as image-bearers of God, therefore, “are such representatives—not of an evil ruler but of the creator of heaven and earth, the only true God.” As part of their responsibilities, the man and woman God had made were put “in the Garden of Eden to work it and take care of it” (Gen. 2:15). Thus, they were chosen to act on behalf of God to manage and develop the kingdom God had created on earth; as a result, they became kingdom agents.

Therefore, the *imago Dei* concept is directly connected to the idea that humans were made agents of the kingdom of God on earth. Sigurd Grindheim links the *imago Dei* concept with the idea that humankind was made to govern on behalf of God on earth 
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when he says, “As God’s image, we are such representatives—not of an evil ruler but of the creator of heaven and earth, the only true God. To be a bearer of God’s image means . . . to govern on God’s behalf.”

In Gen. 1:27, we are told that God created humankind in his own image, and immediately following this, in v. 28, he mandated them to be his representative and be in charge of creation—“and let them have dominion” (Gen. 1:26, KJV). This shows that being God’s image bearer is connected to the mandate to have dominion over creation.

Thus, as it is written in Ps. 103:19, “the Lord has established His throne in heaven, and His Kingdom rules over all.” In other words, God, the King, who rules over the heavens and the earth, decided to make humankind his representatives and agents on earth. This idea of God’s image-bearers being God’s representatives or agents stems from the understanding that God is the King of both the heavens and the earth, and he chose to delegate the authority to humankind to be stewards on earth; so that God may reign on earth through humankind. The fact that God is the King of the earth is clearly stated in Ps. 47:2-3, 6-8:

For the Lord Most High is awesome, the great King over all the earth. He subdued nations under us, peoples under our feet. Sing praises to God, sing praises; sing praises to our King, sing praises. For God is the King of all the earth; sing to Him a psalm of praise. God reigns over the nations; God is seated on His holy throne.

God is the King, and he reigns over the nations. Although he chose to exercise his kingly rule on earth through humankind, he retains absolute authority and humankind has delegated authority, and they will report directly to God; “God’s plan from creation was
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to delegate his rule of the earth.”99 “He created humans in his image so that they could rule on his behalf.”100 God will work with humankind to achieve his divine purpose. For this reason, humankind was originally created to vibrate at the same moral frequency as God, so that they may enjoy a blessed and wonderful fellowship with him. They are coworkers with God (1 Cor. 3: 9) and were created to be laborers together with him. Clearly, God has bestowed on humankind a great honor and responsibility above all his creation on earth. The psalmist points out the unmerited favor God has bestowed on humankind to have authority and the mandate to rule the earth:

LORD, Our Lord, how majestic is your name in all the earth! You have set your glory in the heavens. Through the praise of children and infants you have established a stronghold against your enemies, to silence the foe and the avenger. When I consider your heavens, the work of your fingers, the moon and the stars, which you have set in place, what is mankind that you are mindful of them, human beings that you care for them? You have made them a little lower than the angels and crowned them with glory and honor. You made them rulers over the works of your hands; you put everything under their feet: all flocks and herds, and the animals of the wild, the birds in the sky, and the fish in the sea, all that swim the paths of the seas. LORD, Our Lord, how majestic is your name in all the earth! (Ps. 8:1-9)

From the verses of Psalm 8, God is described as the Creator and King, whose majesty is in all the earth; and who has crowned humankind with glory and honor. One of the chief reasons why the Psalmist says God has crowned humankind with glory and honor is that he has “made them rulers over the works of your hands; you put everything under their feet” (Ps. 8:6), a position we did not attain by merit. This leadership position comes with great responsibilities. God created the heavens and the earth, but humankind will procreate. They were mandated to multiply what God had given to them and replenish or
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restore what would fall short, “And God blessed them, and God said unto them, be
fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the
fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon
the earth” (Gen. 1:28, KJV).

From the beginning, the kingdom business has been to multiply what has been
given, to replenish what has fallen short, and to subdue all things, and thus humankind
has dominion over all creation to keep it under the authority and leadership of God.
Replenish involves restoring to original levels, rebuilding, and bringing things back to
how they were originally made. It is said that God created the universe out of nothing,
creatio exnihilo, but humankind procreates out of what has already been made. I submit
here that this responsibility of humankind as God’s representatives or kingdom agents has
remained to the present. It is this maiden mandate for kingdom work that this project is
all about and seeks to recapture, rediscover, teach, train, and emphasize, to draw people’s
attention to this God-given mandate that requires their immediate attention and action.
Children of the kingdom at all material times are required to live up to this God-given
mandate, as revealed in the book of beginnings, the “genesis” of the Bible. So long as
humankind, God’s image-bearers, remained faithful, loyal, and obedient to God, the reign
of God would continue to be functional and established on earth, and the will of God
would be done on earth as in heaven—but with the contrary, the opposite would be true.

In Genesis 1, we see God creating the heavens and the earth and establishing his
kingdom. Then, he chose to create humankind in his own image and made them his
representatives on earth. Chapter 2 gives the account of how God created and planted a
garden in Eden. The narrative gives the account of how God made the woman out of the
man and fashioned her into a suitable helper for the man, and together they would serve as representatives of his kingdom on earth. God furnished the garden of Eden with every good thing humankind may need, and he handed it over to them.

So, God put humankind in the garden of Eden and commanded them to “work it and take care of it” (Gen. 2:15). He further gave them the rules and regulations of the kingdom. Thus, the man and the woman were given clear instructions and assignments as part of the orientation to prepare them for the work entrusted to them. For instance, God brought all the animals to the man for him to give them names, and whatever name he gave to each one of them became its name (Gen. 2:19), which demonstrated to him the depth of the delegated power, authority, and the responsibility entrusted to him. This clearly demonstrated the power and ability to procreate out of what had been made. Again, the man and woman were told what they could take and what they could not take (Gen. 2:16-17), which was a clear instruction on what their limit of the use of the facilities provided in the Garden were, and it also served as a reminder that they were stewards and accountable to a higher authority—God, their King. They did not have absolute authority; theirs was a delegated authority, and they were answerable to God alone.

The Great Turning Point of the Kingdom

Genesis 3 accounts for a significant “turning point”¹⁰¹ in the biblical narrative of the kingly rule of God on earth; there was a change in loyalty and allegiance to the great King and Creator by the woman and the man—there was disobedience. Genesis 3 is also
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¹⁰¹ These refer to important events that signify a change or deviation that has major rippling effect on the overarching theme of the biblical narrative—the kingdom of God.
a turning point for other important biblical themes, including the story of salvation. I must submit here that the kingdom of God and the salvation story have similar, if not the same biblical foundation, hence similar turning points and “promise fulfilment progression nodal points.” The salvation theme is a subset of the kingdom of God.

This change happened when an intruder and a cunning usurper entered the garden of Eden to talk to the woman. Appearing in the form of a serpent, he succeeded in deceiving the woman to act against God’s instructions to take and eat what God commanded them not to eat, and she gave also to her husband and partner who also took it and ate. By this singular act of disobedience, humankind fell out with God and destroyed the relationship between them. In the process, they also submitted to the old serpent, and as a result surrendered to his authority, for it is written, “Don’t you know that when you offer yourselves to someone as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one you obey” (Rom. 6:16). Instead of submitting to God, humankind chose to submit to the old serpent, also called the devil.

Thereafter, the devil began to rule on earth through humankind. The rule of the devil is evil and everything the rule of God is not. In response, God exercised his authority over the earth by judging all of them, the woman, the man, and the serpent. In pronouncing judgement, God showed grace to humankind and made the greatest promise that would determine the course of history. He promised to deal with the serpent by crushing its head through the offspring of the woman, “And I will put enmity between

---

102 These refer to important events on the story tree in the biblical narrative that indicate the stage-by-stage dispensational evidence to the progress of the fulfilment of the great promise to reinstate humankind as viceroy and reestablish the kingdom of God on earth.
you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will crush your head, and you will strike his heel” (Gen. 3:15).

As stated, the serpent is the devil or Satan, confirmed by Rev. 12:9: “The great dragon was hurled down—that ancient serpent called the devil, or Satan, who leads the whole world astray.” Thus, the serpent as referenced in the Gen. 3:15 may be considered theologically as a reference to the devil, or Satan, symbolically. By inference, the text “he will crush your head” may also be considered theologically to be a symbolic reference to the conquest of Satan by the seed of the woman to overpower him and recapture the stolen dominion that he (Satan) took through deception from humankind. The text “he will crush your head,” prophetically refers to what the son of the woman, the Savior of the world, would do to wrestle the authority and power to rule on earth from Satan. Literally, if one succeeds in crushing the head of a snake, it becomes powerless, useless, and/or dead. Satan will be rendered powerless and the authority and power to rule on earth will be given back to humankind. The kingdom of God will be reinstated on earth as it is in heaven, and as it was in the beginning when God established his kingdom on earth. When this happens, humankind must work and take care of God’s creation, “Your people will rebuild the ancient ruins and will raise up the age-old foundations; you will be called Repairers of Broken Walls, Restorer of Streets with Dwellings” (Isa. 58:12, NKJV).

This project seeks to incite the people of God into action and provoke them unto good works so that we may practically fulfill our God-given mandate. Pronounced in the mist of judgement, God’s promise reveals the love of God for humankind; clearly, “mercy triumphs over judgement” (Ja. 2: 13). The promise went ahead to prophetically
give a heads-up about how the seed of the woman will wrestle power out of the hand of Satan. The text “and you will strike his heel” symbolically alludes to the painful suffering the promised son of the woman would have to go through to recapture the lost authority and power for humankind.

Thus, Gen. 3:15 sets the stage and agenda for how God was going to work out the salvation of humankind. To achieve this, it was also necessary to restore the marred image of humankind because of disobedience; this needful process is theologically referred to as salvation. The Apostle Paul linked salvation of humankind to this same promise in Gen. 3:15, the promise of “the seed of the woman” who would “crush the head of the serpent.” Paul goes further to show that this promise was fulfilled in Jesus Christ, the son of Mary, who can be said to be the daughter of Eve, who was the woman referred to in the promise. This is true both theologically and genealogically, as Paul explains in Gal. 4:4-7:

But when the set time had fully come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, to redeem those under the law, that we might receive adoption to sonship. Because you are His sons, God sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, the Spirit who calls out, “Abba, Father.” So, you are no longer a slave, but God’s child; and since you are His child, God has made you also an heir.

Therefore, Gen. 3:15 is a prophetic text of promise that foretold how the second Adam would be born of Eve, without the sin infested seed of the first Adam, so that he would qualify to take back the authority and power lost to Satan by crushing him and his kingdom. From this point forward, the Bible gives the account of how God moved toward fulfilling his promise of saving humankind, his image-bearers and kingdom agents.

Although salvation is a major theological theme of the Bible, which is also an overarching theme in the biblical narrative, it is a subset of the much bigger theme, the
kingdom of God. The salvation theme focuses on dealing with the marred image of humankind and the broken relationship with God, hence the lost access to the source of life and ultimately how to regain eternal life. Salvation focuses on how to solve the sin problem and deal with death to grant eternal life. The kingdom of God as a biblical theme fundamentally tells the story of God’s primary purpose to reign on earth through humankind. This includes, but is not limited to, the following:

1) Retrieving the lost authority from Satan,

2) Repairing the marred image of humankind,

3) Restoring the broken relationship between God and humankind,

4) Reestablishing the rule of God (kingdom of God) on earth.

Clearly, the kingdom of God deals with all that salvation is concerned with (2 and 3 above) and much more; the kingdom of God covers a wider horizon than salvation. The ultimate result of salvation is to give eternal life to humankind; therefore, the onslaught is against sin and death: “The last enemy to be destroyed is death” (1 Cor. 15:26). The ultimate objective of the concept of the kingdom of God is to reestablish the righteous reign of God on earth with humankind, the Son of Man who is also the Son of God, the Messiah, to reign forever; therefore, the onslaught is against Satan and his kingdom. Our warfare is not against flesh and blood (Eph. 6:12), so that the believing community are to engage the unbelieving world with love. In the revelation given to the elder, Apostle John, we are told that finally the kingdom of the world will become the kingdom of the Messiah: “The seventh angel sounded his trumpet, and there were loud voices in heaven, which said: ‘The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Messiah, and he will reign for ever and ever’” (Rev. 11:15).
The kingdom of the world shall be overcome by the chosen “seed of the woman,” the Messiah, who will crush it and take dominion over the earth. He shall be subject to none, except God, and will rule the earth, bringing all things under subjection; and then hand over the kingdom to God:

For as in Adam all die, so in Christ all will be made alive. But each in turn: Christ, the first fruits then, when He comes, those who belong to him. Then the end will come, when He hands over the Kingdom to God the Father after He has destroyed all dominion, authority, and power. For He must reign until He has put all His enemies under His feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. For He “has put everything under His feet.” Now when it says that “everything” has been put under Him, it is clear that this does not include God Himself, who put everything under Christ. When He has done this, then the Son Himself will be made subject to Him who put everything under Him, so that God may be all in all.” (1 Cor. 15:22-28, emphasis added)

The end will come when God’s purpose and will is accomplished, which is when the Messiah “hands over the Kingdom to God the Father” (1 Cor. 15:24). This will happen after he has destroyed every dominion and authority of Satan’s kingdom; thus, the old serpent will have been crushed completely, just as prophesied in the great promise of Gen. 3:15. When Satan’s kingdom has been overthrown, then the scriptures shall be fulfilled and the sons of God will shout for joy, saying, “Now have come the salvation and the power and the kingdom of our God and the authority of His Messiah” (Rev. 12:10).

Fulfilling the Promise to Reinstate Humankind

After the promise in Gen. 3:15 through to Revelation, the remainder of the Bible narrates the stories of how God has been executing his plans to fulfill his promise to crush Satan to save humankind. Genesis 6–9 records how corrupted humankind had become because of the devastating effect of sin; humankind had become totally depraved.
Consequently, God destroyed the people with the flood but saved Noah and his family. After the flood, God made an important move toward fulfilling the “Gen. 3:15 promise” by calling Abraham, which has become one of the most significant promise fulfilment progression nodal points in the biblical narrative. Thus, the fulfillment of the Gen. 3:15 promise started with the call of the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and somehow Joseph.

The Call of Abraham

God’s move towards fulfilling his promise to save humankind was kicked into historical action by giving Abraham an unmerited call to be father of many nations, from whose root the holy seed holding the scepter of righteousness would emerge:

The Lord had said to Abram, “Go from your country, your people and your father’s household to the land I will show you. “I will make you into a great nation, and I will bless you; I will make your name great, and you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and whoever curses you I will curse, and all peoples on earth will be blessed through you.” (Gen. 12:1-4)

The promise of the Abrahamic covenant was land and seed. Even though Abraham’s call was undeserved and unmerited, he believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness (Gen. 15:6). When Abraham had finished the course of his ministry in the mission of God for his life, he was expected to transfer the ministry to Isaac, his son. There was a lapse, however, and the transfer was not done, for which reason God recommissioned Isaac to make it possible for him to continue in God’s mission. So, instead of Ishmael, God called Isaac as he had called Abraham, and confirmed him as the rightful heir to the Abrahamic promise:

The Lord appeared to Isaac and said, “Do not go down to Egypt; live in the land where I tell you to live. Stay in this land for a while, and I will be with you and will bless you. For to you and your descendants I will give all these lands and will
confirm the oath I swore to your father Abraham. I will make your descendants as numerous as the stars in the sky and will give them all these lands, and through your offspring, all nations on earth will be blessed, because Abraham obeyed me and did everything, I required of him, keeping my commands, my decrees, and my instructions.” (Gen. 26:2-5)

Like Isaac over Ishmael, God chose Jacob over Esau, calling and confirming him as the rightful heir to the promise. Thus, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were all elected to work with God in his agenda to save humankind and restore the marred image and the broken fellowship—not because they earned it by merit or that they were anything good in themselves, but it was out of an act of God’s graciousness. They were all invited by God to be partners in his agenda to save humankind. The call of the patriarchs can be linked to the Gen. 3:15 promise of the conquering seed of the woman, which is especially evident in the case of Isaac and Jacob, where God reintroduced the idea of the “seed” as the agent of his promise to crush Satan (Gen. 3:15; 26:4; 28:14). Consider Gen. 28:10-15:

And Jacob went out from Beer-Sheba and went toward Haran. And he lighted upon a certain place and tarried there all night because the sun was set; and he took of the stones of that place, and put them for his pillows, and lay down in that place to sleep. And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And, behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the LORD God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. And, behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land; for I will not leave thee, until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of.

God connected the call of Jacob to the Gen. 3:15 promise when he added the phrase “and to thy seed” to the covenantal blessings and promise to Jacob. Everything is just a role out of the plan to save humankind and re-establish the kingdom of God.
The Call of Moses

In accordance with the prophetic message given to Abraham in Gen. 15:13-14, the children of Jacob were enslaved and oppressed in Egypt for many years: “Then the Lord said to him, “Know for certain that for four hundred years your descendants will be strangers in a country not their own and that they will be enslaved and mistreated there. But I will punish the nation they serve as slaves, and afterward they will come out with great possessions.”

So, God heard the cry of the children of Jacob and called Moses to lead them out of slavery, as promised:

When the LORD saw that he had gone over to look, God called to him from within the bush, “Moses! Moses! And Moses said, “Here I am.” “Do not come any closer,” God said. “Take off your sandal, for the place where you are standing is holy ground.” Then he said, “I am the God of your father,” the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.” At this, Moses hid his face, because he was afraid to look at God. The LORD said, “I have indeed seen the misery of my people in Egypt. I have heard them crying out because of their slave drivers, and I am concerned about their suffering. So, I have come down to rescue them from the hand of the Egyptians and to bring them up out of that land into a good and spacious land, a land flowing with milk and honey – the home of the Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Perizzites, Hivites and Jebusites. And now the cry of the Israelites has reached me, and I have seen the way the Egyptians are oppressing them. So now, go I am sending you to Pharaoh to bring my people the Israelites out of Egypt.” (Exod. 3:4-10)

God called Moses and made him a god to Pharoah, and his brother Aaron was made to be his prophet (Exod. 7:1). Thus, God commenced a new era with the children of Israel as his chosen people and Moses as his chosen leader, which was a prototype of the future event of the conquest of Satan by Christ through the death on the cross to set humankind free. The story of the Exodus is a demonstration of God’s power and ability to wrestle the lost authority from the hand of Satan and give it to his chosen people. It is the story of how God shall rule his people as King through his chosen servant. Moses became leader.
of his chosen people, the children of Israel; thus, God raised a nation where the kingly rule of God was practically “re-established”\textsuperscript{103} as a prototype of the future worldwide establishment of the kingdom of God.

In the historical story of God fulfilling his promise to Abraham, Pharoah serves as “the archetype of earthly powers that buck God’s rule and refuse to submit to his will.”\textsuperscript{104} God used Moses as his representative to stand up against Pharoah to crush the evil and oppressive rule that would not submit to God’s rule and orders. Moses, speaking on behalf of God, the King, whom he represented here on earth, demanded justice for the people of Israel as he stood before Pharoah: “Afterward Moses and Aaron went to Pharoah and said, ‘This is what the Lord, the God of Israel, says: Let my people go, so that they may hold a festival to me in the wilderness’” (Exod. 5:1).

Instead of obeying the commands of God, the true King, Pharoah chose to make things worse for the children of Israel, the people of God. He questioned the authority of God to give him orders, saying that he did not recognize God’s authority, so he decided to oppress the people of Israel even more and make life more unbearable for them:

That same day Pharoah gave this order to the slave drivers and overseers in charge of the people: You are no longer to supply the people with straw for making bricks; let them go and gather their own straw. But require them to make the same number of bricks as before; don’t reduce the quota. They are lazy; that is why they are crying out, “Let us go and sacrifice to our God.” Make the work harder for the people so that they keep working and pay no attention to lies. (Exod. 5:6-9)

So, God responded to Pharoah’s bluff and told Moses that he should just wait and see what God would do. He would show Pharoah that he was God, King of the universe, and
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via his mighty hand, Pharaoh would let the people of Israel go (Exod. 6:1). God knew that Pharaoh would not let the people go unless he was compelled by a strong and mighty hand (Exod. 3:19). With just such a strong and mighty hand, God dealt a devastating blow to Pharaoh, and he allowed the children of Israel to go, just as God through Moses had commanded. In the end, God emerged as the one who calls the shots here on earth and not Pharaoh, who was the king of the superpower nation of the then known world. The hand of God, the King of the heavens and the earth, is stronger than his adversaries, and it is he who will wrestle the authority and rulership on earth from anyone who opposes his kingly reign.

After God through Moses destroyed the Egyptians in the battle of the Red Sea, “the people feared the Lord and put their trust in Him and in Moses His servant” (Exod. 14:31). Then Moses wrote a song to describe how God, the King, dealt with his enemies:

The Lord is a warrior; warrior; the Lord is his name. Pharaoh’s chariots and his army he has hurled into the sea. The best of Pharaoh’s officers are drowned in the Red Sea. The deep waters have covered them; they sank to the depths like a stone. Your right hand, LORD, was majestic in power. Your right hand, Lord, shattered the enemy. (Exod. 15: 3-6)

In Exod. 15:18, Moses gave his verdict and conclusion of the whole matter, saying, “The Lord reigns forever and ever.”

Now the Lord began to form his government over the people he had chosen and won by confronting the evil government of the Egyptians in a battle; and once again he appointed humankind as his representatives. The children of Israel thus were chosen as agents of the kingdom of God. So, God, the King, told Moses, the leader, to tell the people of God that they must obey him fully and keep all his commandments:

Then Moses went up to God, and the Lord called to him from the mountain and said, “This is what you are to say to the descendants of Jacob and what you are to
tell the people of Israel: ‘You yourselves have seen what I did to Egypt, and how I carried you on eagle’s wings and brought you to myself. Now if you obey me fully and keep my covenant, then out of all nations you will be my treasured possession. Although the whole earth is mine, you will be for me a Kingdom of priests and a holy nation.’ These are the words you are to speak to the Israelites.” (Exod. 19: 3-6)

It is on record that Moses told the people exactly what God had told him; and the people agreed in response that they would do as the King had said. Moses then reported to God the response of the people (Exod. 19:7-8). Clearly, the King, the King’s representative, the people of God, and the pattern of governance of creation God instituted on earth from the beginning played out beautifully here. God even decided to honor his chosen leader and prove to the people that Moses was not a self-appointed leader, and that he had the endorsement and the backing from God, and his authority was from the King of the universe who owns the earth and has absolute authority and power over it: “The Lord said to Moses, ‘I am going to come to you in a dense cloud, so that the people will hear me speaking with you and will always put their trust in you.’ Then Moses told the Lord what the people had said” (Exod. 19:9).

God introduced Moses directly to the people so that they would trust him and obey him as the King’s special representative amongst them. The people themselves are a “Kingdom of priests and a holy nation” (Exod. 19:6) The people of Israel were thus chosen to be priests of the most high God and his representatives on earth in accordance with God’s original plan and promise. This governance structure is replicated in the Akan culture, especially in the Ashanti Kingdom of Ghana, where there is the Asantehene (the King of the Ashanti Kingdom) with various paramount chiefs as his lieutenants, who in turn have various subchiefs reporting to them. The command chain goes down to the Abusuapanyin (the extended family head) who represents their various families in the
governance structure. Coincidentally, the title of the Asantehene goes with the prefix “Otumfuo,” which means “the most high.”

God continued to establish his kingdom with the people of Israel as a prototype of the future kingdom over the whole earth by giving them his laws, the commandments (Exod. 20:1-17), statutes, and ordinances (Exod. 2:21, 22, and 23). By giving them his laws, commandments, statutes, and ordinances, God was instituting his values and principles in the Israelite community. He insisted that they become the default operative code, the principles and laws that would control those practices and cultural presuppositions of the Israelite community. This project is informed by this same idea as one of its major principles, which forms its basis—that is, to influence the community to a cultural change to replace non-godly values with kingdom values.

In line with this same idea of establishing among the Israeli community a semblance of what must pertain in the future kingdom of God, he provided water for them when they were thirsty (Exod. 17), manna for breakfast, and quails for dinner when they were hungry (Exod. 16:4-16). At a point when the water available for the community was not fit to drink, God directed Moses to heal the water and make it wholesome (Exod. 15:22-25). This is what the King expects from his representatives or kingdom agents on earth: to provide for the hungry and thirsty and to make wholesome that which has death in it. Thus, the community of God’s people must act as agents of the kingdom of God to heal the environment and take care of the weak and the suffering. This is one of the principles of the kingdom that this project seeks to promote.

---
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Moses told the people that God would raise another prophet like him, and they must listen to him: “The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among, from your fellow Israelites. You must listen to him” (Deut. 18:15).

Moses was about to go home to be with his maker, and he seemed to comfort his people that God would continue with the grand plan, for he was only a type of another leader, a prophet, whom God would raise from among them. This leader would rule as God’s representative on earth and that they should listen to him. As much as this prophetic message from Moses could be rightly understood to refer to the many successions of prophets God would bring to guide and instruct them concerning how to operate in the kingdom of God, considering the fact that the prophetic message was referring to a particular prophet in the singular number, “a prophet like me,” in similar manner as the promise of Genesis 3:15, “the seed of the woman,” this can be said to refer to the Messiah. Moses’s prophetic direction thus pointed to the seed of Mary who would crush the head of the serpent. This is confirmed by the Apostle Peter in Acts 3:22-26.

In addition to the prototype migratory community of God’s people, we are given the following prototypes about the community of the people of God who would have charismatic pastoral agents like the examples of Moses, Joshua, the Judges et al.

**The Period after Moses—Joshua and the Judges**

After the Moses era, God chose Joshua to continue from where Moses left off. Before he was called home, God instructed Moses to hand over the leadership mantle to Joshua directly. As promised, God through Joshua brought the people to the promised land. Even though Joshua did not hand over the mantle to anyone specific when it was his turn, the people served the Lord while he was alive. After his death, and after the
generation who had seen the wonderful things God had done for the people of Israel, the new generation that succeeded them did not live according to the kingdom values and principles that God had instituted through Moses (Judges 2:7-13). Consequently, they fell into the hands of their enemies who oppressed them so much so that they suffered great distress (Judges 2:14-15). Even though they were stubborn and wayward, God had mercy on them and graciously raised judges who delivered them from their oppressors. Here again, God raised the Judges as his agents or representatives to crush their oppressors’ rule as a sign of his intention to save humankind and establish his righteous rule through them. Thus, the responsibility of all children of the kingdom of God is to renew our minds and be transformed as agents of change to pursue this singular agenda of God that is revealed throughout scripture.

The narratives of Joshua and Judges open for us the reality of the need for transformed humankind, the community of Gods people, to cooperate with God to serve as mission agents in his agenda to reestablish his kingdom here on earth. Those chosen as judges were men and women who without any personal merits received the call and the Spirit of God on their lives to lead the community of God’s people from the hand of their oppressors.

Samuel and the Institution of the Monarchy

Two significant events happened during the era of Samuel, the seer who contributed to God’s plan to save humankind and reestablish his kingdom on earth. First, Israel requested a king because they wanted to be like the nations around them (1 Sam. 8:5-7). Second, God made a covenanted promise to David that his dynasty would never end, and that he would forever establish the throne of David’s son, who succeeded him (2
Sam. 7:13). There would be a future son of David who would reign forever; and this son of David was also in the line of the promised “seed of the woman,” the Messiah. Thus, the genealogy of the Messiah came through the lineage of David.

So, the monarchy was instituted together with the offices of the priest and prophet, which helps to elucidate the character and function of the promised seed of Eve, who would crush the head of the serpent, also referred to as the Messiah. As God’s chosen representative, the Messiah would be the express image of God, without the sin-infested, marred image of God of the first humankind chosen as God’s representatives or kingdom agents. The Messiah, the promised seed of the woman, would be a perfect image-bearer of God who would be commissioned and anointed to rule as king, prophet, and priest. Thomas C. Oden explains, “Messiah is among the most important of all concepts in Christian teaching. By it the person of Jesus is rightly identified concerning his office in the history of Jewish expectation.”

This understanding of the office of the Messiah aided the first century Christians to make meaning of who Jesus was, and his purpose and mandate in the world, as Thomas C. Oden points out:

The office (Heb. kahan, or ministry; Gk. diakonia) of Christ encompasses the three tasks to which the Christ was anointed: “He is the Christ, anointed not simply with oil, but with the Holy Ghost, to be the Highest Prophet, Priest, and King, and raise us through these three offices from our fall.”

Perrin contributes to the notion of the consolidation of the office of the king and priest in the promised son of the woman, the Messiah, to whom he refers as the “Son of Man,” by

---
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comparing Psalm 8 and Daniel 7. According to Perrin, the parallel between Psalm 8 and Daniel 7 involves the “Son of Man,” and this “Son of Man” in both cases “receives “glory” and “dominion” over the “beast.” The “Son of Man” in Daniel 7 “was intentionally portrayed as a knock-off of the Psalter’s Adamic Son of Man.” He concluded that since the Son of Man is a type of Adam, then it implies that he, like Adam, is of the likeness of God, the express image of God.

Thus, in the covenantal promise of the forever dynasty of King David, the Messiah would become the expected king of the Davidic lineage to reign with the scepter of righteousness forever. This fits into the metanarrative of God’s purpose to save humankind and reestablish his kingdom on earth. The Messiah would thus be the perfect image-bearer of God, devoid of all the impurities of the seed of Adam, whose image was seriously marred by the sin of disobedience, who would reign as God’s appointed king. The Messiah would be in perfect fellowship with God and fully obey all his commandments. As king, ruling with a scepter of righteousness, he would destroy the evil government of Satan. Thus, as Perrin puts it, “The kingly rule of Yahweh is meant to serve as a model for Israel’s king, the one whom God has appointed to serve as his vice-regent.” As prophet, he would teach the word of God and demonstrate the principles
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and values of the kingdom to the world. As priest, he would atone for sin of the world with his own blood.

These were all symbolized prophetically with the institution of the monarchy with the associated offices of king, prophet, and priest. The priesthood office came with the reinstitution of the Levitical sacrificial systems. This was an historical illustration of the work of the Messiah as a priest and practically demonstrated in the celebration of the Day of Atonement festival (Yom Kippur). This ongoing annual celebration commemorates the maiden event in Egypt where the angel of death passed over every home that had the mark of the blood of a lamb. The Messiah is therefore referred to as the Lamb of God. This historic and also symbolically prophetic event happened on the tenth day of the seventh month (Tishri, v. 29), and fasting was required from the evening of the ninth day to the evening of the tenth day. According to Charles Ryrie, of all the ordinances given to the children of Jacob, the celebration of the Day of Atonement was the most important. This is because the sins of the whole Israelite community and that of the sanctuary are atoned for.

The Day of Atonement was also a symbolic festival that foretold how God would deal with sin to heal the marred image of his image-bearers and restore the broken fellowship with humankind. This was part of the grand plan to save humankind. The principal objective of the concept of “Atonement” is simply to deal with the marred image of humankind, which goes to the root to deal with sin, the main causative agent. For humankind to qualify to be God’s representative on earth, they must bear the image
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of God, *imago Dei*, so that they will be able to vibrate at the same moral frequency as God to accommodate true compatible fellowship between humankind and divinity. So, God created humankind in his own image (Gen. 1:27), and he established a pure and faithful fellowship with them. Sin broke this perfect fellowship because with sin came all the associated vices, including fear, which are contrary with the virtues of God; as a result, humankind hid from the presence of God (Gen. 3:8). Thus, the broken fellowship between humankind and God is also directly linked to the marred image of God in his children. The former image-bearers of God, who could have represented God on earth, now have a distorted image of their maker and therefore could not fellowship with God to reason with him. Yearning for this wonderful fellowship, God called out through the prophet Isaiah saying, “Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord, though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow; though they be red as crimson, they shall be as wool” (Isa. 1:18, KJV).

It is no coincidence that God followed his call for fellowship, at the same moral level with humankind, with a promise of a solution to the sin problem. It is only when the sin of humankind is completely cleansed that the marred image of humankind can be healed and fellowship at the same moral level can be restored. Therefore, the doctrine of atonement is critical to the agenda of reestablishing the kingdom of God.

Until the sin problem is solved permanently, humankind cannot execute God’s agenda without flaws. Consequently, the human agents God ordained into the offices of kings, prophets, and priests failed abysmally. The Bible is full of records of God speaking to the abysmal performance of the kings, priests, and prophets of Israel and judging them as having failed to be good kingdom agents. The failure was so discouraging that God
encouraged them that the Messiah would come to lead them as a righteous king who
would not fail; further, he promised a new covenant with Israel, which would not require
daily sacrifices of the blood of animals, but that their sins would be atoned for once and
for all.

The scripture narrative reveals that the kings as shepherds of Israel failed God and
their people (Ezek. 34:1-19, 23-24). In 1 and 2 Kings are reports of the life stories of
kings who repeatedly failed God in their leadership, which led to Israel and Judah going
into captivity in Assyria (722 BC) and Babylon (586 BC) respectively. The priests could
not live to expectation to warn the people for their sin against God’s instituted commands
and ordinances. The priests were only interested in capitalizing on the sin of the people to
amass wealth (Hos. 4:8), and they continued to dishonor God (Mal. 1:6-7).

The priesthood, the monarchy, and the prophetic offices became so corrupt that,
in Ezek. 34:7-18, the spirit of the narrative suggests that God promised that he would
come himself to shepherd his people. Grindheim gives a clear picture of the situation:

After they had entered the promised land, the failure of the people was magnified
by the failure of their rulers. The kings in Israel did not accept the God-ordained
limits to their power. They used their position to take advantage of those less
privileged and to enrich themselves at their expense. Israel’s kings were supposed
to be instruments of God’s rule, but they sought other counsel and followed the
ways of their pagan neighbors. By the sixth century BCE, Israel had definitively
turned away from God and given their allegiance to idols and political alliances
with ungodly nations.115

What happened was that after David, and in line with the covenant God established with
the house of David, Solomon ascended the throne of his father David. Then Solomon’s
son, Rehoboam, succeeded him as king. The young king, as one of his first policies,
declared that he would not only continue the high taxes his father and predecessor had

imposed on the people, but he would increase them to compound the hardships. This resulted in a revolution in which the Northern tribes decided to break off, making Jeroboam their king. This left the Southern tribes of Benjamin and Judah for the Davidic line. The kingdom was thus divided into two, the Northern Kingdom (which is the ten tribes usually referred to as Israel) and the Southern Kingdom (usually referred to as Judah). Since the Temple was in the territory of Judah, Jeroboam feared that the people might go back to pay allegiance to the king of Judah if he allowed them to go to worship in Jerusalem of Judea. Wanting to solidify his hold on the throne, Jeroboam set up golden calves in Bethel and Dan, appointed priests, and led Israel astray into idolatry.

Consequently, the Northern Kingdom fell to the king of Assyria in 722 BC, and the people were carried and distributed to the vast provinces of the Assyrian empire. By 586 BC, the Southern Kingdom, under king Zedekiah, was also overpowered by the Babylonians. The walls of Jerusalem and the Solomon’s temple were destroyed, and the people were carried into exile in Babylon. The people in exile were hoping that it would not take long for them to return to their land. But by the prophecy of Ezekiel, they were made to understand that they would stay in exile for a long time. Ezekiel’s message was also a message of hope as he announced God’s comforting promise to “search for His sheep and look after them” (Ezek. 34:11).

Through the prophets, God therefore announced the coming of the true image-bearer, the seed of the woman, uncontaminated by the sin-infested seed of humankind, who would redeem humankind. This promised seed of the woman was called: 1) the Lamb of God because he would operate in the office of the priests and offer himself as the sacrificial lamb without blemish (Heb. *asam*) for the atonement of the sin of
humankind, 2) the Messiah and King because he would operate in the office of the kings to save humankind from Satan’s rule, establish the kingdom of God, and rule as King with the scepter of righteousness, and 3) the Prophet because he would operate in the office of the prophets and teach humankind the virtues of the kingdom of God.

_Prophetic Announcement: A New Era Coming_

God’s announcement of the coming of the Messiah through the prophets was his way of assuring humanity that he remained committed to faithfully fulfilling the promise he made in Gen. 3:15. It was also his response to Israel’s situation due to the failure of the kings, prophets, and priests. Further, the announcement was to prepare the people for the arrival of the new era, the arrival of the Messiah and King of the new order who would rule by the Spirit of God. The prophet Isaiah has this to say in 11:1-9 (emphasis added):

A shoot will come up from the stump of Jesse;
from his roots a Branch will bear fruit.
The Spirit of the Lord will rest on him—
the Spirit of wisdom and of understanding,
the Spirit of counsel and of might,
the Spirit of the knowledge and fear of the Lord—and he will delight in the fear of the LORD.
He will not judge by what he sees with his eyes,
or decide by what he hears with his ears;
but with righteousness he will judge the needy,
with justice he will give decisions for the poor of the earth.
He will strike the earth with the rod of his mouth;
with the breath of his lips he will slay the wicked.
Righteousness will be his belt
and faithfulness the sash around his waist.
The wolf will live with the lamb,
the leopard will lie down with the goat,
the calf and the lion and the yearling together;
and a little child will lead them.
The cow will feed with the bear,
their young will lie down together,
and the lion will eat straw like the ox.
The infant will play near the cobra’s den,
and the young child will put its hand into the viper’s nest.
They will neither harm nor destroy
on all my holy mountain,
for the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the Lord
as the waters cover the sea.

Isaiah’s prophecy reaffirmed God’s faithfulness and commitment to the promise
he made to David that his dynasty would remain forever, which can be interpreted
theologically to mean that the promised “seed of the woman” would crush the head of the
serpent—the Messiah King who would come from the Davidic lineage. But the prophet
uses the image of a tree stump that has a shoot springing from it to describe the
genealogy of the Messiah King, as linked to Jesse, the father of David, the great King of
Israel. The biblical narrative supports this fact because after David, his son Solomon
reigned over Israel, but after Solomon the kingdom of Israel was divided into two, and
out of twelve only two tribes were left for the house of David to rule. This happened
during the reign of Rehoboam, Solomon’s son who succeeded him. Also, by 586 BC the
Babylonian army had attacked Jerusalem and taken Judah into exile. These historical
facts make the description of the Davidic dynasty as a tree stump vividly accurate.

Using this same image, the prophet proclaimed that out of the roots of this tree
stump a shoot would spring up and the new branch would bear fruit; thus, a new great
king like David would emerge. This new king would be anointed, and the Spirit of God
would be upon him. The Messiah King would rule with a scepter of righteousness and
pursue justice for the poor and needy. He would crush all anti-God’s righteous rule and
destroy the wicked. He would give no chance to any oppressor’s rule, and the kingdom of
God would be reestablished on earth. If this happened, the earth would be a wonderful place to live. Even carnivores would play with their prey and cease to tear them for food.

Ezekiel confirmed God’s promise to restore the Davidic dynasty as promised in the Davidic covenant in the following prophecy:

My servant David will be king over them, and they will all have one shepherd. They will follow my laws and be careful to keep my decrees. They will live in the land I gave to my servant Jacob, the land where your ancestors lived. They and their children and their children’s children will live there forever, and David my servant will be their prince forever. I will make a covenant of peace with them; it will be an everlasting covenant. I will establish them and increase their numbers, and I will put my sanctuary among them forever. (Ezek. 37:24-26)

This prophecy reiterates the unconditional term in the Davidic covenant that promises, “David would perpetually have a ‘seed’ to sit on the throne.”116 This was a message of hope to the people in exile because they were reassured that they would live in their native land once again.

Isaiah’s prophetic message in 27:1 may refer to the historical event recorded in 2 Kings 18:13–19:37, where after receiving a threatening letter from Sennacherib, Hezekiah prayed to God, who then delivered Judah from the Assyrian army. Either that or the prophet might have spoken of an historical event that is also symbolically pointing to how the seed of the woman would crush the head of the serpent: “In that day the Lord will punish Leviathan the fleeing serpent, with His fierce and great mighty sword, even Leviathan the twisted serpent; And He will kill the dragon who lives in the sea” (Isa. 27:1, NASB).

Those who oppose the righteous rule of God on earth, and those who oppress the poor are agents of the rule of Satan, the dragon and old serpent, all of whom will be
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destroyed. The Lord will destroy the oppressor’s rule because he will destroy
Sennacherib and his Assyrian army, who together with Nebuchadnezzar and Pharoah
(Ezek. 29:3) in their days were referred to as leviathan and the dragon, just like the way
Satan’s kingdom will be crushed by the promised son of the woman, the Messiah.

The prophet announces that the Messiah shall be the foundation stone and anyone
who will trust in him will not be ashamed (Isaiah 28:16); he will be reliable and
irreplaceable in the building of the kingdom of God, because he is the cornerstone. In Isa.
32:1, God promises that the coming “king will reign in righteousness and princes will
rule justly.” Although this promise may refer to king Hezekiah, if Isaiah 32 and 33 are
dated to have been delivered during the early days of the Prophet Isaiah’s ministry, it can
be said to refer theologically to the expected Messiah and King who will reign in
righteousness. This was corroborated by the prophecy of Jeremiah:

“The days are coming,” declares the Lord, “When I will raise up for David a
righteous Branch; a King who will reign wisely and do what is just and right in
the land. In his days Judah will be saved and Israel will live in safety. This is the
name by which he will be called: The Lord Our Righteous Savior. (Jer. 23:5-6)

God through the prophets kept announcing the coming of his kingdom and a king
who would be perfectly after his likeness, would uphold the values of his kingdom and
rule his people in righteousness. This project therefore seeks to teach and redirect the
people of God today to pursuing and establishing the values and principles of the
kingdom of God in our communities. For if the Messiah, the Christ, is the King who will
reign in righteousness, then we his followers are the princes who must “rule justly” (Isa.
32:1). Again, as a remedy to the abysmal performance of the kings, priests and prophets,
God submitted the new covenant terms as preparation for the coming of the promised son
of the woman, the Messiah, for the establishment of the righteous reign of God on earth.
God announced the new covenant terms in Jer. 31:31-34, which would engrave the laws on the tablets of the hearts of humankind, unlike the old covenant laws that were given to Moses on stone tablets. In this new covenant, the single human agent, the promised son of Eve, the Messiah, will hold the combined offices of prophet, priest, and king, and will be the only eternal mediator between God and humankind (1 Tim. 2:5).

Therefore, there will be no need for any other human agent to serve as an intermediary between God and humankind:

“The days are coming,” declares the L ORD, “when I will make a new covenant with the people of Israel and with the people of Judah. It will not be like the covenant I made with their ancestors when I took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt, because they broke my covenant, though I was a husband to them,” declares the L ORD. “This is the covenant I will make with the people of Israel after that time,” declares the L ORD. “I will put my law in their minds and write it on their hearts. I will be their God, and they will be my people. No longer will they teach their neighbor, or say to one another, ‘Know the L ORD,’ because they will all know me, from the least of them to the greatest,” declares the L ORD. “For I will forgive their wickedness and will remember their sins no more.” (Jer. 31:31-34)

What the announcement of the new covenant proclaimed by Jeremiah did not provide was how God would engrave his laws on the hearts of humankind. In his prophecy below, the prophet Joel explained how God was going to do this:

And afterward, I will pour out my Spirit on all people. Your sons and daughters will prophesy, your old men will dream dreams, your young men will see visions. Even on my servants, both men, and women, I will pour out my Spirit in those days. (Joel 2:28-29)

Joel explains that God will put his Spirit on all humankind so that by the workings of his Spirit the people may discern between good and evil. Thus, the activities of the Spirit of God in the lives of the people will teach them the principles and values of the kingdom. The Spirit’s presence will enable the people of the kingdom to do kingdom business,
it is this enabling presence of the Spirit that will accompany the Messiah and King. This is captured beautifully in the book of Isaiah: 117

The Spirit of the Sovereign Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me to proclaim good news to the poor. He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim freedom for the captives and release from darkness for the prisoners, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor and the day of vengeance of our God, to comfort all who mourn, and provide for those who grieve Zion—to bestow on them a crown of beauty instead of ashes, the oil of joy instead of mourning, and a garment of praise instead of a spirit of despair. They will be called oaks of righteousness, a planting of the Lord for the display of His splendor. They will rebuild the ancient ruins and restore the places long devastated; they will renew the ruined cities that have been devastated for generations. (Isa. 61:1-4)

The first two verses seem to be referring to a particular individual, the Messiah, for whom the prophet is speaking prophetically. This individual, the Messiah, will be empowered by the Spirit of the sovereign Lord to bring restoration, healing, and justice to the weak, the oppressed, and the suffering. Verses 3-4 refer to the beneficiaries, “oaks of righteousness,” of the ministry of the Messiah whose life will be transformed by his ministry, and who in turn must transform their communities and their environment. The lifestyle and activities of the “oaks of righteousness” must reveal the glory of God and emit a refreshing aroma that will spread from city to city, and to the outermost part of the world. This is the core objective of this project.

Daniel’s Prophecy: “The Kingdom that Will Never Be Destroyed.”

As discussed above, the Southern Kingdom was conquered by King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, and the people of Judah were carried off to Babylon. Daniel
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was among those who went into exile in Babylon, and he was selected to serve in the king’s personal service. One night, Nebuchadnezzar had a dream that troubled him so that he could not sleep. The king called all his wisemen and demanded that they tell him the dream and its interpretation, but they were not able to do so. The king instructed that those who could not tell the dream and give its meaning should be executed. When Daniel got to know of the king’s decree, he elected to both tell and interpret the king’s troubling dream. He said to the king,

As for the mystery about which the king has inquired, neither wise men, conjurers, magicians nor diviners are able to declare it to the king. However, there is a God in heaven who reveals mysteries, and He has made known to King Nebuchadnezzar what will take place in the latter days. (Dan. 2:27-28)

So, Daniel stood before the king and told him both the dream and its meaning. He revealed to the king that each of the four different metals that form part of the statue he saw in his dreams, the gold, silver, bronze, and iron, represented four different kingdoms. The first kingdom was Babylon, of which Nebuchadnezzar was the king. After the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, three other kingdoms would follow, and they would have similar influence and domination as the Babylonian kingdom. Daniel added that there would be yet another kingdom, “a kingdom that will never be destroyed” (Dan. 2:44). The following is how Daniel described this last kingdom: “In the time of those kings, the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that will never be destroyed, nor will it be left to another people. It will crush all those kingdoms and bring them to an end, but it will itself endure forever” (Dan. 2:44).

The “kingdom that will never be destroyed” is the kingdom of God, which will reign forever and ever. This coming kingdom and the nature of its authority, glory, and power were later revealed to Daniel in a vision. In his vision, he saw four beasts coming
out of the sea, which symbolized confusion and everything that stands in opposition to
the kingdom of God. After the fourth beast, Daniel saw the Ancient of Days who sat on
his glamorous throne in heaven with thousands of attendants. Then he continued to look,
and recorded that:

I looked, and there before me was one like a son of man, coming with the clouds
of heaven. He approached the Ancient of Days and was led into his presence. He
was given authority, glory, and sovereign power; all nations and peoples of every
language worshiped him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion that will nor
pass away, and his kingdom is one that will never be destroyed. (Dan. 7:13-14)

One like the son of man was given authority and power to have everlasting dominion, and
his kingdom would never be destroyed. According to Swanson and Williams, “With
Daniel’s prophecy, the stage was set for this coming King and His Kingdom.”[118]

The Coming Kingdom Post-Exilic Prophetic Proclamations

When the exile period came to an end, the remnant of the community of God’s
people who had been scattered came back to their homeland, but they faced many
difficulties. Zerubbabel was appointed governor, and he teamed up with the high priest,
Joshua, to help find solutions to some of the problems the people were facing, one of
which was the wall of Jerusalem and the Temple needed reconstruction. Together, they
negotiated for solutions to many of the challenges of their post-exilic life amidst strong
opposition. It was during this time that Zechariah made some prophetic proclamations to
courage the returnees to work hard to rebuild the Temple despite the many difficulties.
Finally, around 515 BC, the Temple was completed. This was the beginning of something
great in expectation; the prophets were expecting the coming in full of the kingdom of
God. Zechariah prophesied, “The Lord will be king over the whole earth. On that day
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there will be one LORD, and his name the only name” (Zech. 14:9). The promised king was to be king over the whole earth, from east to west and north to south. The prophet foretells what will become one of the cardinal signs to identify this king: “Rejoice greatly, Daughter Zion! Shout, Daughter Jerusalem! See, your king comes to you, righteous and victorious, lowly, and riding on a donkey, on a colt, the foal of a donkey” (Zech. 9:9, emphasis added). The king will be a shepherd who will endanger his life for the flock and even suffer for the weak and lowly (Zech. 13:7).

John the Baptist as Forerunner to Messiah King

The prophetic writings not only revealed information about the coming Messiah King and the kingdom of God, but they also vividly described the curtain raiser and the man to introduce the Messiah—John the Baptist. In Isa. 40:3, the prophet describes him as “a voice of one calling in the wilderness,” adding that his message and ministry were to “prepare the way for the Lord.” John the Baptist indeed came to prepare the way for the Messiah King. At the beginning of Mark’s gospel, Isaiah’s prophecy was quoted in reference to John the Baptist, and the evangelist went on to narrate the historical story that confirms him as the one who came to fulfil Isaiah’s prophecy concerning the forerunner of the Messiah King. In Mal. 3:1, AMP, the scripture reads: “Behold, I am going to send My messenger, and he will prepare and clear the way before Me. And the Lord [the Messiah], whom you seek, will suddenly come to His temple; the Messenger of the covenant, in whom you delight, behold, He is coming.”

The ministry of John the Baptist was a significant promise fulfilment and progressive nodal point of the biblical narrative because it signaled the nearness of time for the coming of the long-awaited Messiah King. God, who inspired the prophets,
considered the ministry of the forerunner of the Messiah King pivotal, so he made sure there were prophetic messages that could be used to determine the authenticity of the person and his ministry. Again, we are told by the prophet Malachi that the messenger referred to in Elijah 3:1 must come before the great day of the Lord comes:

See, I will send the prophet Elijah to you before that great and dreadful day of the Lord comes: He will turn the hearts of the parents to their children, and the hearts of the children to their parents; or else I will come and strike the land with total destruction. (Mal. 4:5-6)

Although John the Baptist himself denied that he was Elijah (John 1:21), Jesus confirmed that John the Baptist was the Elijah who was to come, as prophesied by the prophet Malachi (11:14, AMP), “And if you are willing to accept it, John himself is [the fulfillment of] Elijah [as the messenger] who was to come [before the kingdom].”

This view is supported by all four gospel writers. John looked much like Elijah; even his choice of dress was exactly like Elijah.\(^{119}\) Now if John the Baptist was the one to come in the spirit of Elijah just before the coming of the Messiah King and the kingdom of God, then his arrival surely was an indication that the kingdom of God was near, as recorded in the gospels:

In those days John the Baptist came, preaching in the wilderness of Judea and saying, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near.” This is he who was spoken of through the prophet Isaiah: “A voice of one calling in the wilderness, ‘prepare the way for the Lord, make straight paths for him.’” (Matt. 3:1-3)

John called on the people to change their way of thinking and way of doing things, and to put on the values of the kingdom of God in preparation for the coming kingdom that he said was near. Here again, subscribing to the principles and values of the kingdom of God clearly is key in its establishment. John pushed for the reevaluation of
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who was qualified to be in the kingdom. He made it clear that just being descendants of Abraham by physical birth was not enough to qualify one as a member of the kingdom. A complete change of the plausibility structure and worldview of the people to make the principles and values of God the default operative code of conduct was a basic requirement for kingdom membership. All who sought admission into the kingdom needed to renew their minds and subscribe to live by kingdom principles, whether Jew or Gentile; and they needed to confess their sins and be baptized: “And so, John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness, preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. The whole Judean countryside and all the people of Jerusalem went out to him. Confessing their sins, they were baptized by him in the Jordan River” (Mark 1:4-5).

John preached that the kingdom of God was at hand, and he insisted that whosoever was willing to embrace it must change their worldview; that is, they must format their mind’s hard disk and reprogram it with the principles and values of the kingdom of God. Not knowing what the principles and values of the kingdom of God were, the people asked him to show them what exactly they should do. John then took the opportunity to explain to them the paradigm shifts in attitudes and worldview that were required:

“What should we do then?” the crowd asked. John answered, “Anyone who has two shirts should share with the one who has none, and anyone who has food should do the same.” Even tax collectors came to be baptized. “Teacher,” they asked, “What should we do?” “Don’t collect any more than you are required to,” he told them. Then some soldiers asked him, “And what should we do?” He replied, “Don’t extort money and don’t accuse people falsely—be content with your pay.” (Luke 3:10-14)

Clearly, John was showing the people to be concerned about the plight of their weaker and underprivileged neighbors—love for neighbors. These social-justice concerns
practicalized by visible deeds and tangible acts of love, are the transformation this project seeks to inculcate in the church to make her the true kingdom agent she is. When this awareness is created and the church marches forward with practical acts of love as their weapon, they will conquer their neighboring communities and transform the reality around them to conform to kingdom realities. Sharing what one has with others who do not have is an act of love; treating people fairly, by not accusing them falsely and not extorting money from them, is clearly the practical manifestation of the administration of social justice. John the Baptist’s demand that we practicalize love by translating it from the realm of the intangible to the realm of the tangible is a sure way to transform any cultural values to conform to kingdom values. It ensures the needed balance in the employment of the two most important arsenals of the kingdom—word and deed—in conquering our world. Thus, the gap between spirituality and public acts is bridged by practical acts of love. By insisting that we should “be content with [our] pay” (Luke 3:14), John seems to suggest that intrinsic values and public ethics are not mutually exclusive.

The apparent dichotomy between personal inward piety and social public action is the mischief this project seeks to cure to trigger transformation in churches, which in turn will trigger transformation of communities. The panacea to this malady is to heed John the Baptist’s admonition to “produce fruit in keeping with repentance” (Luke 3:8) through practical acts of love—a balanced combination of the church’s words and deeds, which comprise salient kingdom arsenals. This will cure the imbalanced focus on personal piety and one’s inward life at the expense of social public life. There must be some consistency between our personal, intrinsic spiritual life and our extrinsic social
life. There must always be a balanced focus on our internal and personal relationships among the community of faith and our relationships with the public or community—loving God and neighbor. The shalom of God for a community cannot be achieved with an overdose of concerns with self (which leads to greed) or internal piety at the expense of systemic rot in the community. Perrin nailed it as he links this to true worship: “a community that has freed itself from greed and demonstrates as much through ongoing acts of generosity and hospitality is a community poised to worship the one God as one people—the central Kingdom concern.”

John the Baptist’s ministry was massive, and many trooped to him for confession of sins and baptism. Perrin quoted the Jewish historian Josephus to show that John the Baptist’s ministry was widely accepted as authentic and that his fame was not only recorded in the pages of scripture, but also in extra-biblical historical writings. Many thought that John was the long-awaited Messiah, but he insisted that he was not the Messiah; rather, that he had been sent as a forerunner of the Messiah King (John 1:25-28; 3:28; Luke 3:15-17). He openly said to the people that there was one who would come after him who was greater than him: “After me comes the one more powerful than I, the straps of whose sandals I am not worthy to stoop down and untie. I baptize you with water, but he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit” (Mark 1:7-8).

---


121 Josephus’s writings quoted is as follows: “Now some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod’s army came from God, and that very justly as a punishment of what he did against John, that was called the Baptist; for Herod slew him, who was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness toward one another, and piety toward God, and so to come to baptism; for that the washing [with water] would be acceptable to him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away [or the remission] of some sins [only, but for the purification of the body: supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness” (Josephus, Ant. 18.5.2).

John used every opportunity with the people to direct their attention to the one who would come after him, the expected Messiah and King. He told the people that he was nothing compared to the one who would come after him; he exalted the Messiah far above himself:

You yourselves can testify that I said, “I am not the Messiah but am sent ahead of him.” The bride belongs to the bridegroom. The friend who attends the bridegroom waits and listens for him and is full of joy when he hears the bridegroom’s voice. That joy is mine, and it is now complete. He must become greater; I must become less. (John 3:27-30)

John thus uses these series of public statements that he was not the Messiah and the associated exaltation of the one to come after him to introduce the pure image-bearer of God and true kingdom-bearer who would come to usher in the reign of God. John finally confirmed that Jesus of Nazareth is the long-awaited Messiah King when the former baptized the latter, during which the heavens were rent open, and God spoke from heaven to emphatically endorse Jesus of Nazareth as his beloved son:

At that time Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee and was baptized by John in the Jordan. Just as Jesus was coming up out of the water, he saw heaven being torn open and the Spirit descending on him like a dove. And a voice came from heaven: “You are my Son, whom I love; with you I am well pleased.” (Mark 1:9-11).

Thus, Jesus’s identity was made unambiguously clear by the Spirit of God. This singular witness confirmed, with the divine seal of the Holy Spirit, that Jesus of Nazareth was the messianic King and hope of Israel. The expected son of the woman who would recapture the authority and dominion over God’s earthly kingdom given to humankind. The divine voice announced and referred to Jesus as the son of the Father, the son of God. Thus, the divine witness establishes directly that Jesus is the son of God. The term
“son of God” connotes the same meaning as the “Messiah,” and it was usually used interchangeably.

As Perrin puts it, “In the first-century world, the term “Son of God” was sometimes a circumlocution for Messiah.”

Perrin went deeper to demonstrate that the divine witness in Mark 1:11, when broken into two parts “you are my Son, whom I love” and “with you I am well pleased,” can be linked to a combination of the messianic Psalm 2:7, “You are my son; today I have become your father,” and the last part of 2 Sam. 22:20, “he delighted in me.” Perrin explained that the evangelist might have imported those pieces of scripture to show to his hearers that Jesus was the Messiah of the Davidic order, the shepherd-king who would have a perpetual seed to sit on the throne as king of the kingdom of God. Again, Perrin pointed out that the word of the divine witness resonated with the call of Moses in Exod. 4:22-23:

> You are my Son, whom I love (ho huios mou ho agapetos) (Mark 1:11a)
> Then say to Pharaoh, “This is what the Lord says: Israel is my firstborn son (Septuagint, LXX: huios prototokos mou)” (Ex. 4:22; emphasis added). The Gospel of Mark has a “beloved” (agapetos) son; the book of Exodus, a “firstborn” (prototokos) son. Interesting ancient Jewish interpreters seem to have considered the two terms to be virtually interchangeable.

In another development, Perrin connects the Jesus described in Mark’s gospel as “son” (huios) and beloved (ho agapetos) to Isaac who was described in similar fashion in Gen. 22:2a, as “your son” (ton huion sou), “your only son” (ton agapeton), and “whom you love” (hon agapesas). With various inferences and scripture connections and matching of
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scriptural images and interpretation of symbols, he links Jesus to David, Moses, Israel, and Isaac. These are all messianic figures representing the roots from which the promised son of Eve would come, the one who would conquer the serpent. Thus, the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan River by John the Baptist and the accompanying divine witness revealed him as the Messiah-King of the kingdom of God.

The Inaugural Speech of the Messiah-King of the Kingdom of God

After God introduced Jesus Christ during his baptism in the Jordan River by John the Baptist, he gave an inaugural speech (Luke 4) to announce that the kingdom of God had commenced. Bright described it this way:

When Jesus, in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke:16-21), read from the book of Isaiah one of the Servant passages (Isa. 61:1-2), and then said (vs. 21) “Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing,” he announced not that the final act of the drama would one day begin, or that it was about to begin; he declared that it had, in truth, already begun: the Servant is here and has begun his work. The New Testament saw Jesus—as, we believe, he saw himself—as the Christ, the promised Messiah, who has come to set up his Kingdom. It hailed him as the hope of Israel, in all its variegated patterns, had found its realizations in Christ and his Kingdom.\footnote{Bright, The Kingdom of God, 198.}

In Jesus’s inaugural speech, he established the fact that the kingdom of God, of which he was king, would operate to take dominion of the earth in two important modes: proclamation and demonstration—word and deed. Christ’s inaugural speech in Luke 4 was a quote from Isaiah 61 that highlighted the two salient aspects of the modus operandi of the kingdom:

1. Word—“The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because He has anointed me to preach the good news to the poor” (Isa. 61:1). This refers to the proclamation aspect of the kingdom strategy; and

   2. Deed—The inaugural speech referred to two aspects of deed:
a. “He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted . . . and provide for those who grieve in Zion to bestow on them a crown of beauty not ashes, the oil of joy instead of mourning, and garment of praise instead of a spirit of despair” (Isa. 61: 1-3). This refers to providing for the social, emotional, and physical nourishment and empowerment of the people.

b. “They will be called oaks of righteousness, a planting of the Lord for the display of His splendor. They will rebuild the ancient ruins and restore the places long devastated; they will renew the ruined cities that has been devastated for generations” (Isa. 61: 3-4). This refers to “the transformed people of the Kingdom,“127 the community of faith, the church, who will practically rebuild their communities to transform the reality around them. In another place, the prophet Isaiah referred to the transformed people of the kingdom as “repairers of broken walls”: “Your people will rebuild the ancient ruins and will raise up the age-old foundations; you will be called Repairers of Broken Walls, Restorer of Streets with Dwellings” (Isa. 58:12).

Thus, Jesus set out clearly the modus operandi or strategy of the kingdom. First, preaching the word of God, which at all material times in history, has not gotten lost on the body of Christ. Second, helping the poor, marginalized, disenfranchised, weak, and sufferers, and building the community to restore non-kingdom realities to kingdom standards. This project sought to draw attention to this second important kingdom strategy, which seems to have gotten lost on the community of faith. A combination of the word and deed (the gospel as a whole) ammunition must be employed to conquer many territories to manifest the kingdom of God.

The Gospel as a Whole

In Acts 10:36-38, Jesus ministered to the people in two distinct ways: 1) He announced the good news of peace, and 2) he went around doing good and healing

127 Swanson and Williams, To Transform a City, 72.
people. Thus, “the life and ministry of Jesus were absolutely transformational.”\textsuperscript{128} He not only preached about the kingdom of God through his evangelistic ministry, but he also ministered to the needs of those who were in some sort of distress, providing a one-time and on-the-spot solution to the needs of the people in what Timothy Keller refers to as “ministries of mercy” in his book by that title.\textsuperscript{129} He permanently healed those with all sorts of infirmities, thereby empowering them for life, which was a “ministry of empowerment.”\textsuperscript{130} Thus, his ministry was a manifestation of the love and power of God through the effective combination of words and deeds—he applied “the gospel as a whole.” Therefore, the church must emulate the head of the church, Jesus, to engage the world in such a holistic ministry by employing the arsenal of the whole gospel—the effective combination of word and deed—to transform their communities. The church must live up to what her name implies and imitate Christ as the salt and light of the world. This is done through both the proclamation of the word and acts of love and social services aimed at empowering the poor and marginalized to transform the communities around them.

God’s Concern for the Poor

Ministering to the poor and marginalized is one of the most important hermeneutical issues at the core of this project, a direct reflection of God’s great concern for the poor, needy, weak, and marginalized. Scripture is filled with so much flavor of

\textsuperscript{128} Swanson and Williams, \textit{To Transform a City}, 127.
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God’s concern for least of those among us (e.g., Matt. 5:19; 25:40). According to Jimmy Dorrell, “There are more Bible verses about wealth and poverty than most of all other subjects of the Bible.”\(^{131}\)

For instance, there are numerous pro-poor principles in the Torah, the wisdom literature, and the prophets. In the law, if a person has one coat, is unable to put food on the table for his family, and unable to provide some of the most basic things of life for his family that day, then he is considered poor.\(^ {132}\) In Deut. 15:7-11, God commands that his people should not harden their heart or shut their hand against their poor brother; rather, they are to open their hand to lend graciously and sufficiently to the needs of the poor. He further admonishes that:

> When you are harvesting in your field and you overlook a sheaf, do not go back to get it. Leave it for the alien, the fatherless and the widow, so that the LORD your God may bless you in all the work of your hands. When you beat the olives from your trees, do not go over the branches a second time. Leave what remains for the alien, the fatherless and the widow. When you harvest the grapes in your vineyard, do not go over the vines again. Leave what remains for the alien, the fatherless and the widow. (Deut. 24:19-21)

Proverbs 14:31 says that “whoever oppresses the poor shows contempt for their maker, but whoever is kind to the needy honors God.” Proverbs 19:17 adds that, “whoever is kind to the poor lends to the Lord, and He will reward them for what they have done.” Again, Prov. 17:5 shows how God identifies with the poor by saying “whoever mocks the poor shows contempt for their maker.” In Ps. 72:12-13, God says, “He will deliver the needy who cry out, the afflicted who have no one to help. He will take pity on the weak and the needy and save the needy from death.” Psalm 12:5 says,


\(^{132}\) Ibid., 80.
“Because of the oppression of the weak and the groaning of the needy, I will now arise, says the LORD, I will protect them from those who malign them.” In Amos 4:1, the prophet did not hesitate to point out and warn Israel of the injustices meted out to the poor. He lamented that the poor are oppressed and the needy are crushed. The prophet Isaiah hits the nail right on the head when he says:

Is not this the kind of fasting I have chosen: to lose the chains of injustice and untie the cords of the yoke, to set the oppressed free and break every yoke? Is it not to share your food with the hungry and to provide the poor wanderer with shelter—when you see the naked, to clothe him, and not to turn away from your own flesh and blood? (Isa. 58:6-7)

The New Testament is also full of teachings on how taking care of the poor is the most honorable and godly way of the Christian life. James agrees with the prophet Isaiah to submit, “Religion that God our Father accepts as pure and faultless is this: to look after orphans and widows in their distress and to keep oneself from being polluted by the world” (James 1:27). He further teaches that if a man comes into your meeting wearing gold ring and fine clothes, and a poor man in shabby clothes also comes in. If you show special attention to the man wearing fine clothes and say, “Here’s a good seat for you,’ but say to the poor man, “You stand there” or “Sit on the floor by my feet,” have you not discriminated among yourselves and becomes judges with evil thoughts? Listen, my dear brothers: Has not God chosen those who are poor in the eyes of the world to be rich in faith and to inherit the kingdom He promised those who love Him? But you have insulted the poor. Is it not the rich who are exploiting you? Are they not the ones who are dragging you into court? (James 2:2-6).

1 John 3:17-18 says, “If anyone has material possessions and sees his brother in need but has no pity on him, how can the love of God be in him? Dear children, let us not love with words or tongue but with actions and in truth.” All the above are what the whole project is about, which is “love in action” rather than mere lip service. Rather, it is about
genuine love for the community, especially the poor, needy, weak, marginalized, and the whole creation.

The Mandate to Care for God’s Creation

Genesis 1 establishes clearly that God is the creator of the universe. Psalm 33:6, 9 says,

By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, Their starry host by the breath of his mouth . . . For he spoke, and it came to be; He commanded, and it stood firm.” Creation clearly shows the greatness, power, glory, splendor, and majesty of God. As it is written, “O Lord, how manifold are your works! In wisdom you have made them all; the earth is full of your creatures.” (Ps. 104:24)

God then decided to create persons who would be at the same moral level with him, so that he could have fellowship with them and put them in charge of creation. He made a male and a female human after his own likeness. He created humankind and chose to make them, out of all his creation, the managers of the earth—the only creatures given the responsibility of taking care of the earth. Genesis 1:28 states, “God blessed them and said to them, be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky and over every living creature that moves on the ground.” According to Andrew Kirk, humankind became God’s image bearers and “God’s first word to his image bearers concerns nature (Gen. 1:28). The words used here—‘subdue’ (kabash) and ‘have dominion over’ (radah)—are forceful images meaning ‘cut a path through’ (dense undergrowth) and ‘stamp flat’ (e.g., an anthill or a tin can).”

Thus, God mandated humankind to care for creation, control it, tend it, and put it in order. Again, according to Kirk, “‘Subdue’ and ‘dominion over’ are qualified by two further verbs: ‘to till’ (abad) and ‘to keep’ (shamar) (Gen 2:15). The root of the first means ‘to serve’ and the root of the second ‘to preserve.’”\(^{134}\) That means humankind had the mandate to perform duties that preserved the earth. This was in line with Jesus’s teaching that the one who serves is the greatest.

Unfortunately, humankind disobeyed God and fell short of the glory of God. Since then, “the creation waits in eager expectation for the children of God to be revealed . . . in hope that creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the freedom and glory of the children of God” (Rom. 8:19-21). The children of God are children of the kingdom of God, those who have accepted through faith in Jesus Christ to be instruments of righteousness on earth, to allow the will of God to be done on earth through them. The community of faith, the body of the son of God, which is the church, must both announce herself and demonstrate through works of service to restore the earth and the environment. The world must both hear and see the revealed sons of God as we serve the world to preserve and care for God’s creation. This responsibility is part of the mission of the church, which must work toward healing the brokenness that came with the fall of humankind. The church must work to restore all non-kingdom realities in their communities, including care for the environment.

This hermeneutical understanding is vital for this project because a clean environment depicts the outlook of the kingdom of God, and our commitment to care for creation is an act of worship. David Greenlee et al. put it like this:

Caring for creation is an act of worship. Our concern for creation is an act of obedience to God and participation in his work of reconciling all things to himself. Community development approaches that demonstrate good stewardship of the environment help promote the care of creation among the communities we serve.\textsuperscript{135}

The Bible gives detailed descriptions of the physical outlook of the kingdom of God; the values, principles, mental state, presuppositions, and worldview of the citizens of the kingdom of God, as well as the cultural practices and everyday way of life of her citizens.

**Historical Evidence**

The first century community of faith lived in an era when the world was under the rule of the Roman empire. They were seriously in the minority, but they resolved to live like aliens just making transit in this world; in other words, they were in the world but “not of the world” (John 17:16). They chose to live as peculiar people whose lives presented a “new social option”\textsuperscript{136} to the world. They chose “to bear faithful, public, and embodied witness to God’s reign.”\textsuperscript{137} They met regularly to fellowship and break bread, and “all the believers were together and had everything in common” (Acts 2:44). Thus, their core practices included what Bryan Stone referred to as “economic sharing into a distinctive people in the world, a new social option, the body of Christ.”\textsuperscript{138} Their trademark was love: “The church was loving even to pagans, hospitable to strangers, and generous to the poor.”\textsuperscript{139} Their corporate life was an alternative public and a challenge to
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the status quo. In their life together, they announced the shalom of God to the world in a manner that was both invitational and subversive. Consequently, they were persecuted because of the subversive nature of the “new and alternative public” that they presented to the world.

Despite their persecution and numerous social disadvantages, the population of the community of faith grew greatly because their way of love was invitational, and their invitational baits were acts of love and service. The embodied witness of the early believers was effective because it combined words and deeds. Rodney Stark describes the whole drama of acts of disinterested benevolence, generosity, and compassionate social services as efficacious, which succeeded to revitalize life in the Roman empire:

I will examine how Christianity served as a revitalization movement that arose in response to the misery, chaos, fear, and brutality of life in the urban Greco-Roman world. In anticipation of those discussions, let me merely suggest here that Christians revitalized life in Greco-Roman cities by providing new norms and new kinds of social relationships able to cope with many urgent urban problems. To cities filled with the homeless, impoverished, and strangers, Christians offered an immediate basis for attachments. To cities filled with orphans, and widows, Christians provided a new and expanded sense of family. To cities torn by violent ethnic strife, Christians offered a new basis for social solidarity . . . And to cities faced with epidemic, fires and earthquakes, Christians, offered effective nursing services.

Stark refers to this approach of a new religion, Christianity, which was gaining ground and moving from the point of marginality through their response to social crises, which were “revitalization movements.” He applies this term to new religions that shoot up in
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times of crisis through their contributions toward the mitigation of problems. Such contributions “‘revitalize’ the capacity of a culture to deal with its problems.”

As a foundation of the project, I find this term applicable to the response of the local church to the needs of their community, which will surely strengthen the ability of the community to deal with the identified problems. This resonates well with the kingdom approach to Christian ministry, with which this project is much concerned—“revitalization” is what I call “transformation.” Thus, when a church gains a theological insight and resolves to revitalize or transform her community, the church herself is said to have been transformed, and the same has become a kingdom agent in her community. Any church that comes to the realization that she is an agent of transformation in her community has received a theological breakthrough; and this leads to the revival, revitalization, and transformation of the community. It is only a transformative church that can serve as a true kingdom agent in a community to revitalize or transform the community.

Historical evidence abounds to support the fact that the early believers transformed their communities by solving problems through acts of love, disinterested benevolence, and social services. This fact is supported by the church father Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, as stated in his Easter letter: “Christian values of love and charity had, from the beginning, been translated into norms of social service and community solidarity.” He complemented the love and care that the community of faith showed to
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those who were struck with the epidermic that broke out in the Roman empire a century after the great epidemic of the second century:

Most of our brother Christians showed unbounded love and loyalty, never sparing themselves and thinking only of one another. Heedless of danger, they took charge of the sick, attending to their every need and ministering to them in Christ, and with them departed this life serenely happy; for they were infected by others with the disease, drawing on themselves the sickness of their neighbors and cheerfully accepting their pains.\textsuperscript{145}

Whereas the pagans were avoiding contact with their family members for fear of contracting the contagious disease and they put them out on the streets,\textsuperscript{146} the Christians out of love and compassion endangered their lives to take care of the sick and the sufferers. By this, they demonstrated the highest level of love to their community. Thus, they presented the kingdom message to the people of their community through social services and acts of love. This characteristic behavior of the community of faith challenged the status quo. There is enough evidence that the selfless social services rendered by the followers of Christ were rare and subversive but, at the same time, served as their invitational bait as it presented an alternate social option to the community.

History has it that after many years, the Roman emperor, Julian, was forced to introduce a social policy in his attempt to match the Christians. It is said that in 362 AD, Julian reported to the high priest of Galatia that they (the pagans) must do something to match the charity works of the Christians, because he alluded that the high rate of Christian growth was due to such works. The emperor wrote to another pagan priest and
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said, “I think that when the poor happened to be neglected and overlooked by the priests, the impious Galileans observed this and devoted themselves to benevolence.” In another place he wrote, “The impious Galileans support not only their poor, but ours as well, everyone can see that our people lack aid from us.” Although the emperor disliked “the Galileans” (i.e., Christians) he could not help but admit that their *modus operandi*, acts of love, and social service were efficacious. The community of faith presented a new alternative public that could not be ignored: a voice loud enough in the ears of even the Roman emperor. Tertullian was therefore right when he said, “It is our care of the helpless, our practice of loving kindness that brands us in the eyes of many of our opponents. ‘Only look,’ they say, ‘look how they love one another!’”

The leaders of the church continued to teach biblical principles that were in support of love in action through compassionate services and ministries of mercy. For instance, one of the renowned church fathers, Augustine of Hippo (354–430 AD), both taught and lived the principles that supported benevolence to the poor. He sold his property that was bequeathed to him by his father and gave out the proceeds to the poor. In one of his famous sermons, he addressed the rich (the “haves”) and taught that the excess wealth that we greedily accumulate belongs to the poor and the needy (the “have-nots”):

That bread which you keep, belongs to the hungry; that coat which you preserve in your wardrobe, to the naked; those shoes which are rotting in your possession, to the shoeless; that gold which you have hidden in the ground, to the needy.
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Wherefore, as often as you were able to help others, and refused, so often did you do them wrong.\textsuperscript{150}

This teaching is in line with the admonition in James 5:1-6, which issues a warning to the rich for oppressing the poor, meting out injustice to the marginalized, and for hoarding wealth instead of using what God had given them to help the poor, “your gold and silver are corroded. Their corrosion will testify against you and eat your flesh like fire. You have hoarded wealth in the last days” (James 5:3). Another church father, Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (ca. 300 AD), also submitted a message that admonishes the rich on how not to allow wealth to enslave them:

The property of the wealthy holds them in chains . . . which shackle their courage and choke their faith and hamper their judgment and throttle their souls. They think of themselves as owners, whereas it is they rather who are owned: enslaved as they are to their own property, they are not the masters of their money but its slaves.\textsuperscript{151}

The proper way to be the master of wealth is to use wealth to help the poor and needy. A record of the biography of Cyprian as reported by Pontianus has this to say about how the Bishop of Carthage admonished his parishioners:

The people being assembled together, he first of all urges on them the benefits of mercy. . . . Then he proceeds to add that there is nothing remarkable in cherishing merely our own people with the due attentions of love, but that one might become perfect who should do something more than heathen men or publicans, one who, overcoming evil with good, and practicing a merciful kindness like that of God, should love his enemies as well. . . . Thus the good was done to all men, not merely to the household of faith.\textsuperscript{152}
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This is kingdom thinking. John Chrysostom, another church father (347–407 AD), submitted that “The rich are in possession of the goods of the poor even if they have acquired them honestly or inherited them legally.” These teachings of the church fathers were carried into the Middle Ages, where many became poor in the aftermath of the “Black Death” plague that killed millions. Consequently, giving aid to the poor was seen as a mark of holiness.

Also, around this period, those who were rich were considered holier, but the opposite was true for the community of faith; in fact, poverty was considered a sign of holiness. For instance, the Franciscans led an austere life as against the affluent Bishops. The monastic orders emphasized moderate living and generosity. Being a monk was an opportunity to be completely dedicated to God and reject the love for worldly possessions. St. Anthony (252–356 AD) was a good example of the ideals of monasticism. Even though he came from a rich home and was raised by noble parents, he decided to obey Christ’s teaching, “If you want to be perfect, go, sell your possessions, and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come follow me” (Matt. 19:21). So, he sold all his possessions, distributed them to the poor, and gave up his taste for worldly goods; then he signed up for a life of simplicity and solitude. He is considered the patron of the Orthodox Church.

Similarly, St. Francis of Assisi (1181–1226), who lived in the late Middle Ages, was a monk par excellence whose lifestyle of simplicity and voluntary poverty influenced many Christians. He taught his followers to live a life of one day at a time: they were taught not to keep food overnight as the next day’s meal, if they were not hungry that
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meal must be given to someone who is hungry. They lived by wandering and begging.

The life of Ignatius of Loyola (1491–1564) is another example of voluntary poverty. He was also born to wealthy parents but decided to renounce his noble life and subscribe to a lifestyle of poverty. He was the leader of the Society of Jesus (also known as the Jesuits). Some of their chief objectives were to love God and find companionship among themselves and care for the poor. They chose the lifestyle of poverty as a virtue to emulate from our Lord Jesus Christ, who led a life of simplicity and generosity.

Before Ignatius was yet another perfect example of a man who lived a life of chosen poverty, Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274). He also was born to wealthy parents but consciously chose to subscribe to a lifestyle of poverty. His parents were people with great possessions and power, but he renounced all that. Although he agreed with the great philosopher Aristotle that the goal of life is happiness, he also believed that we would find this happiness in the life hereafter. He taught that the highest virtue is love—charity. Love is the only way to fulfill the greatest commandment—love God and neighbor. He admonished people to give generously to support the necessities of life and even, as far as they could, the extreme needs of the poor. According to him, such a lifestyle brings true joy. He pointed out that although money seems to be associated with power and some semblance of happiness, it is also associated with an insatiable desire for more than one needs, which amounts to covetousness, and hence it is the root of all vices. Thus, history is filled with records of many holy men and women of God who challenged the status quo with not only their words but their deeds and lifestyle—they loved God and neighbor.
Sadly, in the era between 1096 and 1291, the crusades that took place did not follow the trend; Christ’s admonishing that we should love our neighbor as ourselves and even love our enemies was ignored. At least eight crusades were fought during the period with accompanying brutalities, and some were church sanctioned. For instance, the Christian crusades on the Muslims were sanctioned by the church and Pope Urban II, who even encouraged the soldiers from the pulpit, erroneously teaching that it was the will of God to recapture Jerusalem from the control of the Muslims. He even added that the crusade must be considered as part of a Christian pilgrimage experience that come with the graces of forgiveness of sins. He further assured the crusaders that God was on their side and gave them permission to plunder their vanquished foes. This was a sharp deviation from the long-standing teachings and practices of the early Christians and the church fathers.

Conclusion

The purpose and workings of God throughout history have been to reestablish the kingdom and save humankind from Satan’s rule and death. Jesus Christ is the promised son of Eve who would crush the head of the serpent to wrestle the authority, power, and governance of the earth from Satan’s hand. This was achieved not through violence but rather through the suffering, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, who after his conquest gave to his disciples and all who would believe in his name afterward (children of the kingdom of God) the power and authority over Satan, who through deceit took the same from humankind.

All who gain the power to become the children of God through Christ are expected to stand as agents of God’s kingdom to practically exhibit its virtues and
principles here on earth. These kingdom virtues and principles may be countercultural, but at the same time they portray the community of faith as peculiar people. The community hears, sees, and is influenced by the deeds and character of the people of God, both as individuals and especially as a corporate body. Though the principles of the kingdom may be countercultural, it is at the same time invitational as it presents an alternate social public to the community. The main invitational bait of the people of the kingdom is love. In their life together, the church as kingdom agents must do kingdom business in their communities. Thus, the kingdom agents as a community are to work to change the non-kingdom realities around them, not through violence nor force, but through the demonstration of love and service.
CHAPTER 3:  
METHOD

Introduction

Throughout the world, churches have always been challenged to respond positively to the Great Commission:

All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Therefore, go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely, I am with you always, to the very end of the age.” (Matt. 28:18-20)

In attempt to obey this command, some churches do well in sharing the word of God but with the intent to win souls to fill the pews in their churches. Some others tend to concentrate on their intra-church businesses while they completely neglect the needs of the community. The church seems to focus on quantitative growth, as in the former scenario, and their internal affairs only, as in the later scenario. Such a ministry perspective cannot be described as a kingdom-minded ministry. The mandate of the church as kingdom agent is not being fulfilled with such an intrinsic focused approach. They must be kingdom minded by focusing on the transformation of their communities. The church must be “an embodied witness”\(^1\) to the gazing world. They must not only tell but also demonstrate the love of God to the world; “the real gospel is two-sided—it’s truth and proof.”\(^2\) Thus, the church must both tell and show, word and deed, to witness to the community. The church today seems to be doing well with the “tell” part (i.e., word)
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but the “show” part (i.e., deed) is rare to find. Consequently, the influence of the church in the community has waned drastically. To resolve this problem, “we need to be like Jesus. Like him, we need to be out in our communities, connecting with people through acts of amazing love . . . while connecting them to a God of amazing grace. Now that’s good news!”3 The purpose of this project was to demonstrate that the church could be an “embodied witness”4 in their communities by employing social services and acts of love to both tell and show the love of God to their communities. If the church could do this there would be significant transformation in the community and the kingdom of God would be revealed in the community. Through a series of teachings at the workshops, specially organized to enhance the understanding of the local church concerning the kingdom of God, and a practical engagement of the local church with the community through acts of love and social services, the study explored and measured the impact on both the church and the community.

**Research Questions**

The focus of the project was driven by one major question and a subset of supporting questions that provided the needed indicators that informed the design of the study.

1. Major Question
   a. Does the church's involvement in social services in a community influence the transformation of the community and the local church?
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2. Supporting Questions

a. Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?

b. Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry?

c. Does the life together of the community of faith, the church, portray a peculiar people?

d. Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community?

e. Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?

3. Other Supporting Questions

a. Does serving people speak the language of love?

b. Does the ministering to the needs of people demonstrate the love of God to the people, open doors for the gospel, and affect one’s vertical relationship with God, and the horizontal relationships with others and creation?

c. Does sharing the gospel message in the community help to draw the heart of people towards God and affect one’s vertical relationship with God, and the horizontal relationships with others and creation?

Hypothesis and Description of Research Method

The project tested the hypothesis that if the church would be an embodied witness in their communities by employing social services and acts of love to both tell and show the love of God to their communities, then there would be significant transformation in the community and the church, and the kingdom of God would be revealed in the community. It was my supposition that by practically demonstrating the love of God to the people through service and disinterested benevolence along with the proclamation of the word of God, there would be significant transformation in the community. Thus, the expectation was that there should be a transformation or improvement in the extent of the
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local church’s engagement with the community and the understanding of the local church concerning the kingdom of God. Also, there should be transformation or improvement in the outlook of the community and the character/behavior of the people in the community in their relationship with God, with one another, and with the environment (God’s creation).

To do this, a three-sectional approach was employed: 1) Initial assessment of the church’s understanding of the kingdom of God, the existing practices of evangelism and service in the community by the church, and the condition of the community, 2) Design and application of interventions, and 3) Final assessment of the impact of the interventions on the church and the community.

Each section contributed to measure the impact of the intervention on both the local church and the community. So, there was assessment of the local church’s understanding of the kingdom of God and the extent of their engagement with the community before and after the application of the appropriate intervention; and the assessment of the change in outlook of the community and the character/behavior of members of the community in terms of the area of the community life this project targeted to change—which in this case, as will be discussed below, was a change in where and how the people of the community ease themselves.

The extent of engagement of the local church with the community was assessed, and the appropriate intervention was designed and applied. The intervention comprised of a teaching component and a practical component. The teaching component was done indoors (at a neutral ground, not on the premises of any of the partnering churches). A neutral ground was selected as the venue for the workshops as a measure to minimize
undue influence and coercion of participants. If the workshops were to happen on the premises of any of the partnering churches, the members of that church might have felt coerced to participate. The practical component was done within the Maame Dede community (on the streets and in the houses of the people in the community). Thus, a necessary part of the application of the intervention to bring changes in the local church’s understanding of the kingdom of God and the way they engaged the community was done through training for the church. Thus, the church at the workshop participated in a well-designed training program aimed at equipping participants to practically and intentionally employ the use of both the propagation of the gospel and social services to engage the community. Consequently, the local church was led to engage the community practically and intentionally through the application of the gospel and social services. This served as intervention for the community; and the impact of this intervention was also measured. This means that there were two separate packages of intervention, one for the church and the other for the community, and one flowed into the other.

The research approach for this project involved three ministerial approaches, “Incarnational Ministry,”5 “Missional Leadership,”6 and “Servolution”7; and three research methodologies: pre-and post-intervention surveys, interviews, and direct observation.
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Initial Assessment: Local Church’s Understanding of the Kingdom of God

*Initial direct observation.* The initial direct observation or pre-intervention direct observation research method was employed to initially collect data to give evidence of the situation of the church before the application of the intervention (the innovative solution that was generated out of dialogue with the church) to solve the identified problems.

First, the intervention team was formed. The team was made up of selected members of Doxa Baptist Church commissioned to participate in the project and other professionals who were employed for their professional services. Together, the media and protocol team, the prayer and outreach team, the transport and distribution team, and the data collection team were formed to execute the project. These were the people who helped in the data collection, the distribution and transport, the ministries of mercy, the ministering of the word, and healing ministry, and more. Later, some members of the partner churches were recruited to be part of the team.

Second, the team was sent to Maame Dede, a village in the Nsawam-Adoagyiri Municipal Assembly, to comb the village to identify a local church or churches to partner for the project. The main criteria considered to guide the choice of the church to partner were: 1) the willingness of the pastors and leaders of the local church to partner with the researcher, and 2) denominational affiliation and the type of church governance or polity devoid of long bureaucracies that could delay approval by overseers, and so on. After a thorough search, four local churches (hereinafter referred to as the “partner churches or partnering churches”) were selected. Four teams of adult Christians were formed with at least twenty people (excluding children) in each group. All four churches then signed the
Research Agreement (Appendix A) with me. Then with the help of the pastors, an arrangement was made to meet the congregation in each of the partner churches to court their consent by reading and explaining the Consent Form in English and Twi (the local Ghanaian dialect). The congregation was allowed to ask questions and even request further information that was not originally stated on the Consent Form (Appendix A2).

Third, the team started to do the initial assessment of the churches before the application of the intervention. The team visited the partner churches and employed the direct observation research method to observe the dynamics of the following indicators (see Appendix B, Direct Observation Indicators—Church):

1. The practices and the attitude of the church toward the people in the community and their needs,
2. The church’s willingness and ability to give witness and service to the needs of the people in the community; and
3. How the church engaged with the community as a corporate body of Christ.

The data was collected in the form of scripted notes, still pictures, audio, and video recordings.

*Initial Survey.* The team visited the partner churches and used the initial survey or pre-intervention survey research method to randomly distribute questionnaires (see Appendix C1, Pre-Intervention Questionnaire—Church) to the members and collected responses from them to find out their understanding of the kingdom of God and their assessment of the church’s performance when it came to their engagement with the community. The initial survey asked the members of the partner churches a series of structured questions to assess and measure the extent of the church’s understanding of the kingdom of God and their engagement with the Maame Dede community. This initial
survey served as a baseline to compare the final survey data to measure the extent of the impact of both the teaching and practical components of the intervention applied to the partner churches. Thus, the initial survey made it possible for a similar final survey to be conducted to measure the impact of the teachings on the kingdom of God, at both the workshops and teaching services, and the effect on the church of the practical training of performing acts of love and social services in the community.

*Initial Interview.* The team visited the partner churches and used the initial interview or pre-intervention interview research method to randomly select some of the members to interview them to find out their understanding of the kingdom of God and their assessment of the church’s performance regarding their engagement with the community (see Appendix D1, Pre- and Post-intervention Interview Questions—Church). The data was collected through audio and video recordings. Also, specific people were interviewed such as the pastors, deacons, church leaders, and other opinion leaders.

**Application: Teaching Component of Intervention to the Church**

The teaching component of the intervention package was rolled out in three weeks through teaching services and workshops designed in a dialogue format that allowed for questions and answers. The workshops were on Saturdays 8am–6pm, and Sundays 3pm–6pm. During the workshops, breakfast and lunch were served on Saturdays while dinner was served on Sundays. On Saturdays, breakfast was served at 10 am and lunch at 2 pm (see Appendix G1 for the program outline of the Saturday and Sunday workshops). Apart from the first week’s meals that were ordered from Legon Hall Restaurant, all other meals were prepared and cooked by participants on the church premises. Group 1 and Group 2 (the formation of the groups is explained below) oversaw cooking the second
week meals while Group 3 and Group 4 took charge of the third week meals. On Sundays, dinner was served at 6pm. This was done to encourage them to own the project and invoke total participation for all attendees. The resource persons made use of teaching aids and allowed time for reflection and decisive resolutions. There were discussion sessions where the resource person asked specific questions on the presentations and allowed the participants to make contributions. This was to emphasize the important points in the presentations and cultivate the atmosphere for discussion.

Following are the titles of the topics covered: 1) Understanding the Kingdom of God, 2) Biblical Analysis of God’s Concern for the Poor, 3) Biblical Analysis of Care of the Environment, 4) Mission that Transforms Principles, Methods, and Theology, 5) How to Bear Witness to Christ, 6) How to Design Interventions, and 7) Ministries of Mercy. I prepared all the scripts and PowerPoint presentations for the workshops were prepared. All interactions and discussions were made mainly in Twi. Some statements were made in English first and then translated to the local Ghanaian language.

As part of the workshop, the participants were mixed up and categorized into four groups. Thus, heterogenous groups (i.e., the groups were not made up of only participants belonging to a particular church) were formed. The four groups were asked to choose their own names for their group: Group One chose Emmanuel, Group Two chose El-Shaddai, Group Three chose Ebenezer, and Group Four chose Adonai. The groups were also asked to choose their leaders, which they did. The four group leaders were then charged with leading their groups in the practical aspect of the intervention. The four groups were taught how to share their personal testimonies, narrate biblical stories, and share the gospel message. They were taught how to pray for the various needs of the
people; and those with spiritual gifts, especially the healing gift, were encouraged to use their gift to help the people. The groups were also trained in how to do interviews, surveys, and direct observation during the workshop. I designed and printed copies of the questionnaire (see Appendix E1, Pre-intervention Questionnaire—Community) and gave them to the group leaders, which were then distributed to the members. Selected members of the groups were taught how to conduct interviews. I gave them the interview questions (see Appendix F1, Pre-intervention Interview Questions—Community) and taught them how to ask the questions from understanding and in the local dialect. Each group was attached with an experienced research assistant who supervised the collection of data as evidence of the condition of the community before the application of the intervention.

Again, as part of the workshop, the groups, led by their group leaders, were sent out to the community to observe, and identify non-kingdom realities that needed to be addressed. Each group was then tasked to prepare a Mini Seed Project (MSP) by using the identified non-kingdom reality in the community and designing a project intervention to attempt to cure the mischief. Also, each group was given the opportunity to do a presentation of their MSP proposal. The proposals were vetted and graded, and the best MSP proposal was selected and modified by the whole assembly. The selected MSP proposal of Group Two, El-Shaddai, was selected, which then became the intervention that was applied to the community. The selected MSP proposal was thus implemented by all the partner churches put together and was led by Group Two, El-Shaddai, the group that proposed it. Thus, the implementation of the modified MSP provided the platform for the practical component of the intervention for the church and at the same time was
applied as the intervention for the community. The selected and modified MSP included, among other issues, the proposal to build a public toilet to solve the problem of lack of places of convenience in the community.

Initial Assessment: Needs and Condition of the Community

“Incarnation” Ministry Approach. As explained above, as part of the practical component of the intervention applied to the church, the members were tasked to go into the community to identify non-kingdom realities and design MSPs to change the situation. The chosen MSP presented the members with the opportunity to assess the needs of the community. Therefore, the assessment of the needs of the community was done by the members of the partner churches, in the Maame Dede village. Most of the members of the partner churches were the indigenes and people who had been living in the Maame Dede community before the start of this project. Since these people lived among the people and worked with the people in the community, their ministry among the people had an “incarnational” ministry character. The project therefore could be said to have employed the incarnation ministry approach because the members of the local churches were also members of the community, and they were the same people who designed and implemented the MSP in the community.

“Missional Leadership” Approach. The Missional Leadership approach can also be referred to as “the emergent leadership” approach; and this is the kind of
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leadership where the leader does not impose solutions on the people but skillfully cultivates the environment for conversation to identify the needs of the people and the major problems of the community, and then generates innovational solutions from among the indigenous people. Since most of the members of the partner churches were either indigenes or people who lived in the community, the emergent leadership method could be said to have been used in this project.

"Servolution." As articulated by Dino Rizzo, the principles of servolution were applied to this project. The local churches allowed God to use them as instruments of righteousness to change the life of the people of their community through acts of love and social services to establish the kingdom of God in the community. The local church thus launched a revolution in the community through serving in line with the definition and meaning of servolution: “This is a revolution of serving others... soldiers are followers of Christ... and the weapons are towels of service.” The intervention applied to the community was designed in the spirit of the concept of servolution. The MSP that was vetted and graded as the best was presented as the platform for the practical aspect of the intervention applied to the partner churches, and which also became the intervention that was applied to the community. This MSP was designed to unleash soldiers in the army of the Lord to “attack” the community with the “weapons” of service and acts of love.
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After the best MSP was selected and modified, the team was tasked to go back to the community and measure the condition of the community that the intervention (i.e., the selected and modified mini project) was targeted to heal before the application of the intervention using survey, interview, and direct observation research methods. This was done to double check the data submitted by El-Shaddai as evidence of the condition of the community they identified and sought to influence through their proposed MSP.

Community Initial Direct Observation. Before the application of the intervention (the innovative solution that would be generated out of dialogue with the indigenes of the community), the initial direct observation or pre-intervention direct observation research methods were employed by the team to collect data to give evidence of the situation of the community regarding solving the identified problems. After the group meetings, led by their group leaders, had done the assessment and presented their MSP, El-Shaddai’s MSP was selected and modified as the intervention to be applied to the community. Before the intervention was applied, the team went into the community and used direct observation to collect data as evidence of the condition of the community. The team went round the community to 1) watch where and how people ease themselves (i.e., looking for patterns of behavior toward defecation), and 2) observe to find out whether there were sufficient places of convenience (public toilets) in the community. The data was collected in the form of still pictures, audio, and video recordings.

Community Initial Survey. The team used the initial survey or pre-intervention survey research method by randomly distributing questionnaires (see Appendix E1, Pre-Intervention Questionnaire—Community) to the people of the community. Before the application of the intervention, some went house-to-house, and some stood by the
roadside and other public places to distribute and collect responses from the members of the community to find out whether it was difficult to find a place of convenience in the community, and whether there was the need for the construction of a public toilet in the community. People were also asked whether they agreed or not that the construction of the public toilet would be a solution to the problem and their assessment of the extent of the problem. The pre-intervention survey asked the community a series of structured questions to assess and measure the extent of the identified non-kingdom reality the selected MSP or community intervention sought to cure—in this case open defecation, defecation at the refuse dump site, lack of places of convenience, and so on. This pre-intervention survey served as a baseline to compare the post-intervention survey data to measure the extent of the community intervention impact. Thus, the community initial survey made it possible for a similar community final survey to be conducted to measure the impact of the intervention on the community.

*Community Initial Interview.* The team used the initial interview or pre-intervention interview research method by randomly selecting some members of the community to interview (see Appendix F1, Pre-intervention Interview Questions—Community) to find out whether it was difficult to find a place of convenience in the community, and whether there was the need for the construction of a public toilet in the community. People were also asked whether they saw the construction of the public toilet as a solution to the problem and their assessment of the extent of the problem, the data from which was collected through audio and video recordings. Also, specific people or groups of people were interviewed, and these included members from the Traditional
Council, the Unit Committee Chairman, the Assembly Man of the area, and other opinion leaders.

Application: Community Intervention

The application of the community intervention presented the platform for the sleeves on training of the partner churches in the ministry of towels of service\(^{17}\) and servolution.\(^{18}\) As indicated above, the selected and modified MSP was implemented as the intervention for the community. This was done in five weeks instead of the estimated four weeks.

*Description of the Community Intervention.* The MSP was designed to combine the propagation of the word of God along with social services. There were four components of the community intervention: Witnessing, ministry of mercy, serving people, and community work.

*Witnessing.* House-to-house witnessing was chosen as the means to share the word with the community. Participants were organized and paired to form teams of two and three to go out into the homes to share the gospel. They were charged to preach about the kingdom of God, the salvation story, and their personal testimony. In all, about fifty-three teams (some were made up of two or three participants) witnesses went out.

*Ministry of Mercy.* Gift items made up of used clothing, shoes, food stuff, hot meals, stationery, and more were distributed by the participants to the people in the community, especially the poor and needy. We intentionally made sure not to mix the

\(^{17}\) Rizzo, *Servolution*, 16.

\(^{18}\) Ibid.
distribution of gift items with the house-to-house witnessing. This was done to avoid the ethical issues raised by Stone in his book *Evangelism after Christendom*.19 The gifts were given to express the token of our love for the people in the community because the church should “exist to love our city [village] into relationship with Jesus Christ.”20 Apart from the mass distribution, some of the gifts were packaged nicely and delivered to specific people identified by the participants to be in need of them.

*Serving People.* Participants offered to render service for free to people in the community who had need for such services “just to show . . . [them] the love of Christ.”21 Some participants visited some elderly ladies who lived alone in the community to fetch water (to fill their storage tanks) for them, clean their compound, do their laundry, and so on, for free. Some of the participants who knew how to barber visited the homes of some single parents to barber their wards who needed free haircuts. Some also helped to dispose of garbage for some people who were too weak to do those things for themselves. Thus, the people of God, the soldiers of Christ, were unleashed into the community to attack them with the weapons of love and service. This is what Rizzo refers to as servolution.22

*Community Work.* Communal labor was organized by the four partnering churches to clean the community and construct a public toilet for the community. The young men cleared some of the major footpaths and busy areas in public places of weeds, while the women swept and collected the garbage. The main street that runs across the
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village was cleared of weeds and garbage. Some also worked on the garbage dump site, pushing all the garbage into the pit, weeding the environs of the dump site, and clearing weeds from the footpaths leading to the dumpsite.

The handymen (masons, carpenters, plumbers, electricians et al.) among them also volunteered to build the public toilet for free as the churches provided the funds for materials. With my support and that of the partnering churches, a special fund-raising program in aid of the construction of the public toilet was organized. The proceeds were used to construct an eight-cubicles toilet facility (four for males and four for females) for the community. It took about four weeks to complete the construction of the public toilet. Most of the people of the community volunteered to work on the toilet project. The women fetched water for the construction, some carried sand and stone in head pans, and the men pushed wheelbarrows. The chiefs and elders of the traditional council got involved, providing the land for the construction and food for the volunteers. It became a community project.

Final Assessment: Local Church’s Understanding of the Kingdom of God

Church Final Survey. After the application of the intervention to the church, the team visited the partner churches and used the final survey or post-intervention survey research method by distributing questionnaires (see Appendix C, Post-Intervention Questionnaire—Church) to the members and collected responses from them to find out their understanding of the kingdom of God and their assessment of the church’s performance when it came to their engagement with the community.

Church Final Interview. The team visited the partner churches and used the final interview or post-intervention interview research method by selecting some of the
members to interview them to find out their understanding of the kingdom of God and their assessment of the church’s performance when it comes to their engagement with the community (see Appendix D1, Pre- and Post-intervention Interview Questions—Church). The data was collected through audio and video recordings. In addition, some specific people like the pastors, deacons, church leaders, and other opinion leaders were interviewed.

Final Assessment: Needs and Condition of the Community

*Community Final Direct Observation.* After the application of the intervention, to attempt to change where and how the people in the community eased themselves, the final direct observation or post-intervention direct observation research method was employed by the team to collect data to give evidence of the situation of the community. After the construction and commission of the public toilet, the team went round the community: 1) to watch where and how people eased themselves (i.e., looking for a change in the patterns of behavior toward defecation), and 2) observe to find out whether the construction of the public toilet in the community had been helpful. The data was collected in the form of still pictures, audio, and video recordings.

*Community Final Survey.* The team used the final survey or post-intervention survey research method by randomly distributing questionnaires to the people of the community (see Appendix E2, Post-Intervention Questionnaire—Community). After the application of the intervention—to find out whether there had been a change in the pattern of behavior toward defecation in the community, and whether the construction of the public toilet in the community had been helpful—some went house-to-house, and
some stood by the roadside and other public places to collect responses from the members of the community.

_Community Final Interview._ The team used the final interview or post-intervention interview research method by randomly selecting some members of the community to interview (see Appendix F2, Post-intervention Interview Questions—Community) to find out whether there had been a change in the pattern of behavior toward defecation in the community, and whether the construction of the public toilet in the community had been helpful. Here again, some specific people were interviewed, and these included members from the Traditional Council, the Unit Committee Chairman, the Assembly Man of the area, and other opinion leaders.

**Role of the Researcher**

I participated in the project as the principal investigator, participant, resource person, and an observer. As the principal investigator, I was responsible for the design of the study. I designed and supervised the distribution of the pre- and post-intervention questionnaire, and the pre- and post-intervention interview questions. I designed the intervention for the churches and cultivated the environment for discussion to identify non-kingdom realities in the community to generate solutions from among the indigenes. As a resource person, I trained the team members, prepared all the PowerPoint presentations, and provided the theological foundation and funding for the project. As a participant, I functioned in many ways, including supervising the delivery of the PowerPoint presentations, registration of participants, installation of needed gadgets, collection and evaluation of data, assessing the impact of the interventions on both the church and the community, and more. I also served as a participatory observer through
my role as the cameraman for the recording of the interactions and discussions at the workshops and field work.

Subject Selection and Recruitment

I contacted pastors and leaders of all the churches in the Maame Dede community, and four churches agreed to partake in the study. These four partnering churches agreed to partner with me in the study. A research agreement (Appendix A) was executed with the churches who agreed to be part of the study. The individual adult members, 18 years and older, were encouraged to participate if they so wished. The agreement with the leadership of the churches to partner the researcher was not in any way an obligation on the members to participate and did not take away the autonomy, or free will, of any of the individual church members who decided not to participate. An average of 120 adults participated in the workshops.

Inclusion Criteria. The units of analysis were the church and the community (i.e., the village). All adult church members, 18 years and older, who were willing to participate in the project were included. Also, there were random samplings of some adult members of the community who were not members of the partnering churches, to answer questionnaires as part of the research methods to assess the condition of the community before and after the application of the intervention. The team stood by the main road and solicited passers to respond to the questionnaire. Also, the team went from house to house to get people to respond to the survey. Some leaders of the community were interviewed.

Exclusion Criteria. There were no eligibility criteria for participation in this research. Thus, people did not need to possess any special qualities to participate. They
did not need to be literate and or speak English to qualify to participate in this research; however, only adult participants were chosen. Provision was made to accommodate and refresh minor children who for various reasons accompanied their parents to the workshops and teaching services, but they did not participate in the research study. Apart from children, no specific groups were excluded.

Consent Process and Procedures. The consent process began with me contacting the churches in the Maame Dede community. An appointment was made to meet with the pastors and leaders of each of the churches in Maame Dede to discuss the possibility of the church partnering with me to conduct the study. Discussed at these meetings were the objectives and activities involved in the study, my responsibilities as researcher, and what I expected from the churches. They were allowed to ask questions and request explanation or clarification, and they were given enough time to think about it and get back to me when they had been able to reach a decision after consultations with all who mattered. A Research Agreement (Appendix A) was duly documented, signed, and sealed with the four churches, who through their pastors and leaders came to a decision to partner with me in the study.

Afterward, with the help of the pastors and leaders, a meeting with the congregation of each of the churches was organized to seek the consent of the members for their participation. At this meeting, I read the consent sheet (Appendix A2) to the potential participants in English and then translated to the local dialect, Twi. The consent sheet essentially explained the objectives and activities of the study. It also explained my responsibilities and the role of the individual participants and partnering churches. The congregation (i.e., the potential participants) were given the opportunity to ask questions
and/or request more information. Also, it was explained to them that they could choose
not to participate in the study, and even if they chose to participate, they could decide to
discontinue attending the workshops and teaching services at any time during the study.
They were made to understand that anyone who chose to attend the workshops and
teaching services on Saturday mornings and Sunday afternoons, respectively, had by their
participation given their consent to be part of the study. Again, they were told that those
who did not want to be part of the study could simply not attend the workshops and
teaching services; and even those who started to participate and later wished to withdraw,
at any time and for any reason, could simply discontinue to attend. In addition, it was
made clear to them that no matter what they decided, there would be no penalty or loss of
benefit to which they were entitled. They were told, however, that if they decided to
withdraw from participating in the project, the information they had provided (their
response to questionnaires and interviews, and contributions to discussions at the
workshop et al.) would not be deleted but would be kept confidential, even though no
identifiable information was collected.

To minimize undue influence, there was no monetary reward for either the
participating churches or their members. Each participant, however, was given one NIV
translation Bible as part of the workshop materials. As part of measures to minimize
coercion, the workshops and teaching services took place at a place and time different
from the normal meeting place and time of the churches; also, no potential participant
was contacted to attend the workshop or teaching service except for the announcement
that was made at each session of the workshop and the teaching service to remind
participants of the program line-up for the next day or weekend.
Data Collection

Data collection was done using three methods: survey, interview, and direct observation. These methods were employed before and after the implementation of the intervention. My team and I visited the partnering churches to observe their activities (see Appendix B, Direct Observation Indicators—Church) before the workshops began. The data was collected in the form of scripted notes, still pictures, audio, and video recordings. Then at each of the partnering churches, members who were willing were encouraged to wait after service. For those who waited, I distributed hard copies of the pre-intervention questionnaire, pencils, and erasers. I read and explained the instructions and each question to them in English and then in Twi. Respondents were asked to select their response after each question had been read in English and then in Twi. The questions were structured, and respondents only had to mark (circle, tick, or underline) their choices. The responses to the questionnaire were collected for data processing and analysis.

Then, the pastors, leaders, and some members were interviewed (see Appendix D1, Pre- and Post-intervention Interview Questions—Church). The data was collected in the form of audio and video recordings.

After the intervention for the community had been generated and designed, the team and I went into the community to assess how easy, or otherwise, it was to find a place of convenience in the community. First, the team went round the community to: 1) watch where and how people eased themselves (i.e., looking for patterns of behavior toward defecation), and 2) observe to find out whether there were places of convenience
(public toilets) in the community. The data was collected in the form of still pictures, audio, and video recordings.

Second, the team distributed questionnaires (see Appendix E1, Pre-Intervention Questionnaire—Community) to the people of the community. To measure the difficulty of finding a place of convenience in the community, and whether there was the need for the construction of a public toilet in the community, some went house-to-house, and some stood by the main road and others public places to distribute and collect responses from the members of the community. The pre-intervention survey was made up of structured questions.

Third, the team randomly selected for interviews some members of the community who did not participate in the workshops (Appendix F1), including members from the Traditional Council, the Unit Committee Chairman, the Assembly Man of the area, and other opinion leaders. The data was collected through audio and video recordings.

In the same way, the team and I used surveys, interviews, and direct observation methods to evaluate the impact of the interventions on the church and community. While the pre- and post-intervention interview questions for the church were the same, questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 24, 25, and 45 of the pre-intervention questionnaires were slightly modified (in structure but not in content) to construct the post-intervention questionnaire. Thus, nine of fifty-one questions were restructured but the ideas and content remained the same (see Appendix C3, Post-intervention Questionnaire—Church). Seven more questions were added to the pre-intervention questionnaire for the community to construct the post-intervention questionnaire (Appendix E2).
Data Management

I made sure that the information resulting from the interviews, direct observation notes, and responses to the questionnaires were documented, processed, stored, and made available for data analysis. These were necessary for the success of the project. They served as the pivotal issues about which the data management of this project was concerned. I addressed these data management issues by adhering to the following measures to ensure that the data was handled with care and produced results as soon as practicable:

Identification of Assessment Materials. The recorded interviews were properly titled and stored on an external storage device. Each assessment phase was properly labeled; thus, the pre- and post-intervention phase interviews for the various churches, which were recorded and stored on the external hard drives, were labeled accordingly. The responses to the questionnaire for each respondent were labeled with the name of the respondent’s church, and a non-coded identification number on all pages of each set of the questionnaires. The identification number was not linked in any way to the identifiable details of the respondents (N.B., the identifiable details of participants or respondents were not collected), so it cannot be decoded to identify the respondent or participant. This was because a set of the questionnaire had six pages. Though the sheets were stapled together, not all could remain together, and we anticipated that some of the pages could become detached, which was what happened. The identification on each
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sheet linked that sheet with the rest of the sheets in a particular set.

**Data Checking.** The raw data from the responses to the questionnaires and the interviews was organized to make it easy to analyze. In the process of organizing the data, some mistakes were made. So, I used data checking at each stage of the data processing steps to go over the data entry. For instance, the entries of the responses to the questionnaire into Excel files to create a frequency distribution table were double checked for errors. Also, for the interview data, the responses of the interviewees to the questions were developed into a chart to display the data in the light of the research questions and matrix. This helped to show the varying perspectives of the respondents about the various research questions in the research matrix. Again, the entry of the interview data to develop the chart and concept tables for each research question in the research matrix was double checked at each stage for quality assurance. Going back to do “data checking” of all entries, at various stages of the data processing, was vital since the quality of the analysis and the conclusions reached depended on the accuracy of the data entry.

**Dealing with Missing Data.** I did everything possible to investigate and solicit information to clear up uncertainties in the answers provided by the respondents. The follow-up questions that needed to be answered included whether the respondents knew how to answer certain questions or that certain questions were not applicable to them.

**Handling Identifiable Information.** While no identifiable information was
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collected, for some reason, some interviewees by mistake mentioned their names; these recordings were edited to delete the names before storage. There was one instance where the mistake came from the interviewer; leading questions were erroneously asked that pushed the interviewee to mention his name (which was not needed in this study); the name was subsequently deleted.

Data Processing and Analysis

The data analysis was conceptualized at the design stage and carefully interwoven within the project design and selected research methods. The data analysis strategy influenced the design and was in turn influenced by the design.29 The strategies employed for data analysis included the following:

Stage-wise and Expeditious Analysis Strategy. As part of the analysis strategy, the data collected was not allowed to pile up before analysis was done; rather, they were analyzed as and when they were collected. This helped to ensure that the final analysis was not an arduous task. Thus, the data analysis began immediately after collecting data by direct observation, then after each of the pre-intervention interviews and surveys. All these analyses influenced the decision of how the gradually emerging conclusions were tested.30

Categorizing Strategy. This strategy mainly involved coding. The goal of coding as employed in this study was to “fracture” the collected data and organize it into a form that could be easily analyzed.31 This was done in a manner such that the data was

29 Bickman and Rog, eds., Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods, 89.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
categorized under each of the research questions, as indicated in the interview matrix (see Appendix D2) and the survey matrix (see Appendices C2 and C4), to facilitate comparison between the pre- and post-intervention data.

In addition, though the study is qualitative research, some quantitative research coding was employed giving it a mixed methods flavor. The qualitative data was transformed into numeric representation at some point, or “quantitizing.”32 The interview data was converted into rating scales to give a sense of magnitude. The same set of categories (see Appendices C2, C4 and D2) used in the qualitative research coding was used to generate frequency counts of the number of those whose response skewed to either the right or left side of “an evaluative continuum.”33 The qualitative data was then linked with the quantitative data to compensate for each other and strengthen the analytical conclusions. Thus, the categorizing strategy helped to measure the situation of the church and the community before and after the application of the intervention.

*Contextualizing Strategy*. The contextualizing strategy was employed to deal with the possible problems associated with fracturing and categorizing data. The contextualizing analysis helped to comprehend the data within the context.34 It also helped in processing direct observation, survey, and interview data at the same time, allowing data from all three research methods to interact, to accurately evaluate the variables. The Church Data Processing Chart (Figure 3.1) below shows the data processing stages and how conclusions were made. Data from the interviews, direct
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observation, and surveys were processed, allowed to interact, and presented in a way that could be analyzed and conclusions made.

*Church Survey Data Processing.* The raw data from the survey data port (i.e., responses to the questionnaires) were used to construct a frequency distribution table showing the number of respondents who selected each response for each of the questions. Then using the frequency distribution table, the modal responses for each question were identified. Each of the modal responses to each survey question were placed on an evaluation continuum (i.e., 1-5 scale), where Option 1 = Strongly Disagree/Low = 20%; Option 2 = Disagree/Moderately low = 40%; Option 3 = Even/Moderate=60%; Option 4= Agree/Moderately high = 80%; and Option 5= Strongly Agree/High = 100%. The corresponding magnitude (Mₜ) of each modal response on the evaluation scale were assigned (i.e., quantitizing) to each of the survey questions.

Each of the survey questions and the corresponding assigned magnitudes (Mₜ) were categorized under the appropriate supporting research question in the survey matrix (Appendices C2 and C4). The survey matrix average (aVₘ) of the assigned magnitude (Mₜ) under each of the supporting research questions in the survey matrix were calculated (see par. 14 of Figure 3.1 Code below). This average (aVₘ) indicated the level of understanding of each church for each of the supporting research questions in the survey matrix (Appendices C2 and C4). Then in the all-data processing chamber (ADPC), survey matrix average (aVₘ) for each of the supporting research questions were compared with and made to interact with processed data from the interviews and direct observation (i.e., contextualizing) to generate the all-data matrix average (aVₘₙ) (see Appendix I). The overall level of understanding of each church in the same category
under each of the supporting research questions in the matrixes (LKG) were then calculated (see Appendix K).

*Church Interview Data Processing.* The raw data from the interview data port (i.e., the audio/video recordings of the interviews) were transcribed and translated to English. Each answer to the interview questions was placed on evaluation continuum (i.e., 1-5 scale) where Strongly Disagree/Low = 1 = 20%; Disagree/Moderately low = 2 = 40%; Even/Moderate =3 =60%; Agree/Moderately high = 4 = 80%; and Strongly Agree/High = 5 = 100%. Then the corresponding magnitude (m_i) of each answer to the interview questions on the evaluation scale was assigned (i.e., quantitizing) to that interview question. The interview question average (a_{V_{iq}}) for each interview question for all the interviewees was calculated (see paragraph 12 of Figure 3.1 Code below). Each of the interview questions and the corresponding computed averages a_{V_{iq}} were categorized (i.e., categorizing) under the appropriate supporting research question in the interview matrix (Appendix D2).

Then the interview matrix average (a_{V_{im}}) of the computed and categorized (a_{V_{iq}}) under each of the supporting research questions in the interview matrix was calculated (see para. 16 of Figure 3.1 Code below). This average (a_{V_{im}}) indicated the level of understanding of each church for each of the supporting research questions in the interview matrix (Appendix D2). Here again, each interview matrix average (a_{V_{im}}) was moved to the all-data processing chamber (ADPC). The interview matrix average (a_{V_{im}}) for each of the supporting research questions was compared with the survey matrix average (a_{V_{sm}}) and the direct observation adjustment (a_{do}), i.e., contextualizing, to generate the all-data matrix average (a_{V_{sid}}).
The overall level of understanding of each church in the same category under each of the of the supporting research questions in the matrixes (LKG) was then calculated (see para. 32 of Figure 3.1 Code below and Appendix I). At this stage, the processed data was contextualized to eliminate blinders that might have resulted from categorizing, quantitizing, and the use of averages. Thus, with the help of the direct observation data, the contextualizing process was done to cure the effect of blinders and inaccurate responses. The 1-5 scale was used, where 1 = Strongly Disagree/Low = 20%; 2 = Disagree/Moderately low = 40%; 3 = Even/Moderate = 60%; 4 = Agree/Moderately high = 80%; and 5 = Strongly Agree/High = 100%.

The all-data matrix average \( (aV_{sid}) \), which was the combined effect of processed data from all three research methods, was calculated for each variable or each supporting research question (i.e., \( (aV_{sid}) = 1/3[(aV_{sm}) + (aV_{im}) + (a do)] \)). The overall average, the level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKG), was then calculated. i.e.,

\[
LKG = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{n}(aV_{sid})}{n}, \text{ where } n = \text{number of variables or research questions measured.}
\]

The pre-intervention (or initial) and post-intervention levels of understanding of the kingdom of God indicators (LKG\textsubscript{initial}) and (LKG\textsubscript{final}), respectively, were calculated, compared, and conclusions drawn as follows:

a. Change in LKG (\( \Delta \text{LKG} \)) = LKG\textsubscript{final} – LKG\textsubscript{initial}.

b. Now if \( \Delta \text{LKG} = (+ \text{ ve}) \), then there has been a positive change which implies transformation.

c. When \( \Delta \text{LKG} = 0 \), then there was no change.

d. On the other hand, when \( \Delta \text{LKG} = (− \text{ ve}) \), then there has been a negative change which implies deterioration.
**Figure 3.1. Church Data Processing Chart**

**INTerview Data (I)**

1. Transcribe and translate into English.
2. Place each answer on the Evaluation continuum (i.e., 1-5 scale)
3. Quantizing: assign magnitude (m)
4. Calculate Interview Question Average (\(\bar{V}_{im}\))
5. Categorizing: use the Interview Matrix
6. Calculate Interview Matrix Average (\(\bar{V}_{im}\))

**Direct ObservatioN Data (D)**

1. Construct frequency
2. Identify each modal response and calculate their frequency %ages
3. Place each modal response on the Evaluation Continuum
4. Quantizing: assign magnitude (Ms)
5. Use the Survey Categorizing: Matrix

**Survey Data (S)**

1. Calculate the Survey Matrix Average (\(\bar{V}_{sm}\))

**ALL DATA PROCESSING CHAMBER (DPC).** Compare \(\bar{V}_{im}\) and \(\bar{V}_{sm}\) and allow the data to be informed by the Direct Observation Data (D) by contextualizing for any needed adjustment (\(a_{ad}\)).

**ADPC**

- COMPUTATION: Calculate the All-Data Matrix Average (\(\bar{V}_{ad}\))

**LKG**

- Calculate the Overall Average (LKG) and the Change in LKG (\(\Delta LKG\)) = \(LKG_{\text{final}} - LKG_{\text{initial}}\)
Figure 3.1 Code:

1. \(I\) = Interview Data Port.

2. \(D\) = Direct Observation Data Port.

3. \(S\) = Survey Data Port.

4. \(I_1, I_2, I_3, \ldots I_6\) = Interview Data Processing Stage 1, 2, 3, \ldots 6.

5. \(S_1, S_2, S_3, \ldots S_5\) = Survey Data Processing Stage 1, 2, 3, \ldots 6.

6. \(ADPC\) = This is the All-Data Processing Chamber (Contextualizing and Evaluation of Processed Interview Data, Direct Observation Data, and Survey Data, etc., takes place here).

7. \(C\) = Computation Chamber.

8. \(LKG\) = Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God Index.

9. \(LKG_{\text{final}}\) = Final Level of the church’s Understanding of the Kingdom of God Index.

10. \(LKG_{\text{initial}}\) = The Initial Level of the church’s Understanding of the Kingdom of God Index.

11. \(m_i\) = Assigned Magnitude to each answer to the Interview Questions.

12. \(aV_{iq}\) = Average of the Assigned Magnitude (or interview question average) to the Interview Data for each question: 
\[
aV_{iq} = \frac{\sum_{ni=1}^{ni}(mi)}{niq}
\]
where \(niq\) = number of interviewees.

13. \(M_s\) = Assigned Magnitude to each modal response.

14. \(aV_{sm}\) = Survey Matrix Average – average of the Assigned Magnitudes (\(M_s\)) to each modal response : 
\[
aV_{sm} = \frac{\sum_{nsm=1}^{nsm}(Ms)}{nsm}
\]
where \(nsm\) = number of survey questions in each port of the Research Questions in the Survey Matrix.

15. \(aV_{im}\) = Interview Matrix Average is the average of all the interview question averages (\(aV_{iq}\)) for each of the Supporting Research Questions in the Interview Matrix. 
\[
aV_{im} = \frac{\sum_{nim=1}^{nim}(aV_{I})}{nim}, \ n_{im} = \text{number of interview questions in each port of the Interview Matrix.}
\]
16. Survey Data Processing Stage 1 (S1): The raw data from the survey data port (i.e., responses to the questionnaire) were used to construct a frequency distribution table showing the number of respondents who selected each response for each of the questions.

17. Survey Data Processing Stage 2 (S2): Using the frequency distribution table, the modal responses for each question were identified or estimated.

18. Survey Data Processing Stage 3 (S3): Each of the modal responses to each Survey Question were placed on evaluation continuum (i.e., 1-5 scale), where Option 1 = Strongly Disagree/Low = 20%; Option 2 = Disagree/Moderately low = 40%; Option 3 = Even/Moderate = 60%; Option 4 = Agree/Moderately high = 80%; and Option 5 = Strongly Agree/High = 100%.

19. Survey Data Processing Stage 4 (S4): Quantitizing – the corresponding magnitude (Ms) of each modal response on the evaluation scale were assigned to each Survey Question.

20. Survey Data Processing Stage 5 (S5): Categorizing – each of the Survey Questions and the corresponding Assigned Magnitudes (Ms) were categorized under the appropriate Supporting Research Question in the Survey Matrix (Appendices C2 and C4).

21. Survey Data Processing Stage 6 (S6): The Survey Matrix Average (aVsm) of the Assigned Magnitude (Ms) under each of the Supporting Research Questions in the Survey Matrix was calculated. This average (aVsm) indicated the level of understanding of each church for each of the Supporting Research Questions in the Survey Matrix (Appendices C2 and C4).

22. All Data Processing Chamber (ADPC): Contextualizing – the Survey Matrix Average (aVsm) for each of the Supporting Research Questions, were compared with the Interview Matrix Average (aVim), and the Direct Observation Adjustment (ado) to generate the All-Data Matrix Average (aVsid) = 1/3[(aVsm) + (aVim) + (ado)]. The overall level of understanding of each church in the same category under each of the of the Supporting Research Questions in the matrixes (LKG) was then calculated as shown in paragraph 31 below.

23. Interview Data Processing Stage 1 (I1): The raw data from the interview data port (i.e., the audio/video recordings of the interviews) were transcribed and translated to English.

24. Interview Data Processing Stage 2 (I2): Evaluation – each answer to the interview questions were placed on evaluation continuum (i.e., 1-5 scale) where strongly Disagree/Low = 1 = 20%; Disagree/Moderately low = 2 = 40%; Even/Moderate = 3 = 60%; Agree/Moderately high = 4 = 80%; and Strongly Agree/High = 5 = 100%.
25. Interview Data Processing Stage 3 (I₃): Quantitizing – the corresponding magnitude (mᵢ) of each answer to the interview questions on the evaluation scale were assigned to that interview question.

26. Interview Data Processing Stage 4 (I₄): The interview question average (aVᵢq) for each interview question for all the interviewees was calculated.

27. Interview Data Processing Stage 5 (I₅): Categorizing – each of the Interview Questions, and the corresponding computed average (aVᵢq), were categorized under the appropriate Supporting Research Question in the Interview Matrix (Appendix D2).

28. Interview Data Processing Stage 6 (I₆): The Interview Matrix Average (aVᵢm), of the computed and categorized aVᵢq, under each of the Supporting Research Questions in the Interview Matrix, were calculated. This average (aVᵢm) indicated the level of understanding of each church for each of the Supporting Research Questions in the Interview Matrix (Appendix D2).

29. All Data Processing Chamber (ADPC): Contextualizing – the Interview Matrix Average (aVᵢm), for each of the Supporting Research Questions, were compared with the Survey Matrix Average (aVₘₐ) and the Direct Observation Adjustment (aₜₜ) to generate the All-Data Matrix Average (aVₘᵋ) = 1/3[(aVₘₐ) + (aVᵢm) + (aₜₜ)]. The overall level of understanding of each church in the same category under each of the of the Supporting Research Questions in the matrixes (LKG) is then calculated as shown in paragraph 31 below. At this stage the processed data was contextualized to eliminate blinders which might have resulted from categorizing, quantitizing, and the use of averages. Thus, with the help of the direct observation data the contextualizing process was done to cure the effect of blinders and inaccurate responses. The 1-5 scale was used, where 1 = Strongly Disagree/Low = 20%; 2 = Disagree/Moderately low = 40%; 3 = Even/Moderate = 60%; 4 = Agree/Moderately high = 80%; and 5 = Strongly Agree/High = 100%.

30. Computation (C): Calculate the All-Data Matrix Average (aVₘᵋ) = 1/3[(aVₘₐ) + (aVᵢm) + (aₜₜ)]. The All-Data Matrix Average (aVₘᵋ) takes into consideration data from interviews, surveys and direct observation.

31. Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God indicator (LKG): The overall average (LKG) was then calculated: LKG = \( \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} (aVₘᵋ)}{n} \), n = number of variables or research questions measured.

32. The pre-intervention (or initial) and post-intervention Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God indicator (LKG_initial) and (LKG_final), respectively, were compared:

   e. Change in LKG (ΔLKG) = LKG_final – LKG_initial.
f. Now if $\Delta \text{LKG} = (+ \text{ ve})$, then there has been a positive change which implies transformation.

g. When $\Delta \text{LKG} = 0$, then there was no change.

h. On the other hand, when $\Delta \text{LKG} = (- \text{ ve})$, then there has been a negative change which implies deterioration.

*Community Survey Data Processing.* The community data from the interviews and survey were processed and presented in a way that could be analyzed and conclusions made. The raw data from the survey data port (i.e., responses to the questionnaires) were used to construct a frequency distribution table showing the number of respondents who selected each response for each of the questions. Then using the frequency distribution table, the modal responses for each question were identified. Each of the modal responses to each community survey question was placed on an evaluation continuum (i.e., 1-5 scale), where Option 1 = Strongly Disagree/Low = 20%; Option 2 = Disagree/Moderately low = 40%; Option 3 = Even/Moderate=60%; Option 4= Agree/Moderately high = 80%; and Option 5= Strongly Agree/High = 100%. The corresponding magnitude ($M_s$) of each modal response on the evaluation scale was assigned (i.e., quantitizing) to each of the survey questions.

*Community Interview Data Processing.* The raw data from the interview data port (i.e., the audio/video recordings of the interviews) were transcribed and translated to English. Each answer to the interview questions was placed on an evaluation continuum (i.e., 1-5 scale) where Strongly Disagree/low = 1 = 20%; Disagree/Moderately low = 2 = 40%; Even/Moderate =3 =60%; Agree/Moderately high = 4 = 80%; and Strongly Agree/High = 5 = 100%. Then the corresponding value of magnitude ($m_i$) of each answer to the interview questions on the evaluation scale was assigned (i.e., quantitizing) to that
interview question. The interview questions average ($aV_{iq}$) for each interview question for all the interviewees was calculated.

Community All-Data Average. The community all-data average ($aV_{si}$) of the interview questions average ($aV_{iq}$) and the assigned magnitude ($M_s$) from the survey data were computed. This was computed by calculating the average for the assigned magnitude ($M_s$) from the survey data and the interview questions average ($aV_{iq}$), i.e., $aV_{si} = \frac{1}{2}[(M_s) + (aV_{iq})]$ (see Appendix J). On the 1-5 scale stated above, the closest response to the overall average ($aV_{si}$) both represented and described the situation on the ground for the social determination of that inquiry.

Data Reporting

The interview data, survey data, and the direct observation data are fully presented in Chapter 4. The conclusions arrived at from the analysis of the collected data and the implications of the findings in this project to practical ministry context are reported in Chapter 5. As well, Chapter 5 touches on the theological insight and new knowledge unearthed and the benefits to Christian ministry context.

Recommendations for practical re-engineering of the ecclesiological structures in the church to accommodate embodied witness and extrinsically focused ministry are offered in Chapter 5. Also hinted on are possible future research opportunities in the transformative church serving as kingdom agents.

Conclusion

This research project aimed at demonstrating that a combination of both the proclamation of the gospel and the demonstration of the word through acts of love and
service by the church in a community is an effective tool for the transformation of both
the church and the community. Most churches do well in the proclamation of the gospel
but usually fall short when it comes to being an embodied witness in their community.
This project sought to help the church to see herself as a kingdom agent, identify her
mandate as God’s representatives on earth, and challenge her to discharge her God-given
responsibilities according to her God-given strength and abilities. The teaching
component of the intervention to the church helped participants to understand the
kingdom of God and reflect on their responsibilities as agents of the kingdom. They
discussed both their role as individual members of the kingdom and that of the church as
a vehicle for transformation in their community. The following chapter presents a
summary of the data collected and the conclusions drawn from them.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

Introduction

As revealed by the Messiah King in his inaugural speech recorded in Luke 4, the modus operandi of the kingdom seems to support the combination of “proclamation” and “demonstration” for engagement with the world. The latter strategy, demonstration, seems to have gotten lost on the church. The partial use of the dual kingdom arsenal seems to have had a toll on the effectiveness of the agents of the kingdom in our outings. This decoupled approach to kingdom business has weakened the influence of the community of faith on the people of the world, almost making them irrelevant in this postmodern era. The objective of this project was to prove that if the community of faith would engage the world with a combination of proclamation and demonstration, there would be significant transformation in the community and the kingdom of God would be revealed among many cultures. This project investigated the effectiveness of the use of the word and deed approach, including the employment of social services and acts of love to influence the transformation of both the church and her communities.

The project was steered by a major research question and five supporting research questions that served as the indicators (variables) for the study. The major research question was, “Does the church’s involvement in social services in a community influence the transformation of the community and the local church?” The supporting research questions included:

1. Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?
2. Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry?

3. Does the life together of the community of faith, the church, portray a peculiar people?

4. Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community?

5. Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?

The design incorporated a teaching component and field work that aimed at helping the church to improve on her understanding of the kingdom of God, and at the same time engaging the community with the coupled arsenal of proclamation of the word and the demonstration of the gospel through acts of love and service. The impact of these interventions on both the church and the community was measured and conclusions were drawn.

Three research methods were employed to measure the impact on the church and the community. Each research method recorded the initial and final values, and their differences gave the quantum of the extent of change in the prior situation of the church and the community. Thus, the pre- and post-intervention surveys, interviews, and direct observation served as the data collection implements that allowed the researcher to determine whether the proposed intervention had any impact on the two units of analysis—the church and the community.

The following sections provide reports of the findings from the pre- and post-intervention surveys, interviews, and direct observation.
Pre- and Post-Intervention Findings—Church

Appendix I, Church All-Data Processing Chamber, provides the combined processed survey, interview, and direct observation data reporting on both the pre- and post-intervention findings on the partnering churches as follows:

1. Tables 5.1.1A and 5.1.1B reported on the pre- and post-intervention findings, respectively, of the Jesus Mission Church (JM).

2. Tables 5.1.2A and 5.1.2B reported on the pre- and post-intervention findings, respectively, of the Awake Chapel International (AC).

3. Tables 5.1.3A and 5.1.3B reported on the pre- and post-intervention findings, respectively, of the Jesus Mission Church (APG).

4. Tables 5.1.4A and 5.1.4B reported on the pre- and post-intervention findings, respectively, of the Charismatic Evangelistic Ministry (CEM).

Each of the tables listed here indicates the pre-intervention survey matrix average (PRE aV\textsubscript{sm}), post-intervention survey matrix average (POST aV\textsubscript{sm}), pre-intervention interview matrix average (PRE aV\textsubscript{im}), post-intervention interview matrix average (PRE aV\textsubscript{im}), and the direct observation adjustment (a\textsubscript{do}) factor for each of the five indicators or supporting research questions (Q). Also, the tables in Appendix I indicate the all-data pre-intervention average (aV\textsubscript{sid}) for each of the five indicators. Finally, the pre- and post-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicators (LKG\textsubscript{initial}) and (LKG\textsubscript{final}), respectively, are also included on the tables in Appendix I.

All the values obtained were interpreted by placing them on the evaluation continuum (i.e., 1-5 evaluation scale) where Strongly Low = 1 = 20%; Moderately Low = 2 = 40%; Moderate =3 =60%; Moderately High = 4 = 80%; and Strongly High = 5 = 100%
Pre-intervention Findings on Jesus Mission Church (JM)

Table 5.1.1A provides the processed data reporting on the pre-intervention findings on JM. Table 5.1.1A shows that the all-data pre-intervention average \( (aV_{sid}) \) for the supporting research questions (Q1–5), “Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?” was 1.15. This means that the level of involvement of JM in social services in the community, before the intervention, was closer to “strongly low” on the evaluation continuum. The \( aV_{sid} \) for Q2 and Q3 follows the same trend with 1.18 and 1.35 respectively. The all-data pre-intervention average \( (aV_{sid}) \) of 1.18 for Q2 shows that the church’s external ministry and activities in the community were very low, i.e. closer to “strongly low” on the evaluation continuum—they were mostly internally focused. In same way, the all-data pre-intervention average \( (aV_{sid}) \) of 1.35 for Q3 was closer to “strongly low,” which shows that there was little peculiarity about the church’s life-together in the community. The people could not see any special character or culture of the church that made them different from the rest of the community. The all-data pre-intervention average \( (aV_{sid}) \) for Q4 and Q5 were 2.06 and 1.94 respectively. These figures are closer to “low” on the evaluation continuum. What these figures mean is that the church’s relevance to the community’s development was significantly low (i.e., for Q4); and that the church’s partnership with other churches for the purpose of achieving kingdom objectives was also low.

Even though sometime in the year 2014, the church teamed up with the local authorities to dig boreholes to help solve the water problems of the community, the people felt that was a one-time intervention that did not continue so it could be used to describe the character of the church. Since then, almost a decade after, they had nothing
to show suggesting they were interested in issues of community concern. There was some sort of partnership with the Awake Chapel International (AC), but the purpose of the partnership was not to achieve some pressing kingdom objectives. It was for solidarity; they invited each other to their annual fundraising programs. These explain why, unlike Q1, Q2, and Q3, the scores for Q4 and Q5 were not close to “strongly low” but were a step better, i.e., “low.”

The resultant effect of the pre-intervention all-data average (aVₙₙₙ) for each of the indicators (or supporting research questions) was estimated as the pre-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKG_initial), which was found to be 1.54. The level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKG_initial) was therefore closer to 2.00 on the evaluation scale so it was described as “low.”

Pre-intervention Findings on Awake Chapel International (AC)

Table 5.1.2A provides the processed data reporting on the pre-intervention findings on AC. Table 5.1.2A shows that the all-data pre-intervention average (aVₙₙₙ) for the supporting research questions (Q1), “Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?” was 1.11. This means that the level of involvement of AC in social services in the community before the intervention was closer to “strongly low” on the evaluation continuum. Q2 follows the same trend with aVₙₙₙ value of 1.46. The all-data pre-intervention average (aVₙₙₙ) of 1.46 for Q2 shows that the church’s external ministry and activities in the community were very low, i.e. closer to “strongly low” on the evaluation continuum. This implies that they were mostly internally focused. The all-data pre-intervention average (aVₙₙₙ) for Q3 is 1.51, which is closer to 2.00 on the evaluation scale. This means that the church’s life-together as a community of faith in the
community did not present a significantly different culture from that of the community people; however, the people could point to their prayer life (or prayer ministry). They noted that the Awake Chapel community prayed a lot. When one of the leaders was asked, during the pre-intervention interview, “How distinct is this church from the community or the rest of the world?” his response was “we pray.” This pronounced prayer culture may account for the slight move of the aVsid value closer to 2.00 (i.e., from “strongly low” to “low”). The aVsid for Q4 was 1.72 and this figure was closer to “low” on the evaluation continuum. What it means is that the church’s relevance to the community’s development was low (i.e., for Q4). The all-data pre-intervention average (aVsid) for Q5 is 1.39, which was closer to “strongly low” on the evaluation continuum. This means that the church’s partnership with other churches for the purpose of achieving kingdom objectives was very low (i.e., “strongly low”). The occasional partnership with Jesus Mission Church (JM) could not push it to the next step on the scale because the sort of partnership that AC and JM was engaged in was not aimed at achieving kingdom objectives in the community. It was clear that the pastors of the two churches, AC and JM, were friends and their cooperation with each other was meant to extend friendship courtesies.

The resultant effect of the pre-intervention all-data average (aVsid) for each of the indicators (or supporting research questions) was estimated as the pre-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKG_initial), which was found to be 1.44. The level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKG_initial) was therefore closer to 1.00 on the evaluation scale so it can be described as “strongly low.”
Pre-intervention Findings on Apostolic Church, Ghana (ACG)

Table 5.1.3A provides the processed data reporting on the pre-intervention findings on ACG. Table 5.1.3A shows that the all-data pre-intervention average \( (aV_{sid}) \) for the supporting research questions (Q1), “Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?” was 1.00. This means that the level of involvement of AC in social services in the community, before the intervention, was “strongly low” on the evaluation continuum. Q2 follows the same trend with a\( V_{sid} \) value of 1.44. The all-data pre-intervention average \( (aV_{sid}) \) of 1.44 for Q2 shows that the church’s external ministry in the community was very low (i.e. “strongly low” on the evaluation continuum). This implies that the activities of the church were heavily skewed toward intra-church activities; they were mostly intrinsically focused. The all-data pre-intervention average \( (aV_{sid}) \) for Q3 is 1.33, which was closer to 1.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “strongly low” on the evaluation continuum). This means that the church’s life-together as a community of faith in the community did not present a significantly different culture from that of the community people. The \( aV_{sid} \) for Q4 is 1.50 and this figure was closer to “low” on the evaluation continuum. What it means is that the church’s relevance to the community’s development was low (i.e., for Q4). The all-data pre-intervention average \( (aV_{sid}) \) for Q5 is 1.33 which was closer to “strongly low” on the evaluation continuum. This means that the church’s partnership with other churches for the purpose of achieving kingdom objectives was very low (i.e., “strongly low”).

The resultant effect of the pre-intervention all-data average \( (aV_{sid}) \) for each of the indicators (or supporting research questions) was estimated as the pre-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKG\textsuperscript{initial}), which was found to be 1.32.
The level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKG\textsubscript{initial}) was therefore closer to 1.00 on the evaluation scale so it can be described as “strongly low.”

Pre-intervention Findings on Charismatic Evangelic Ministry (CEM)

Table 5.1.4A provides the processed data reporting on the pre-intervention findings on CEM. Table 5.1.4A shows that the all-data pre-intervention average (aV\textsubscript{sid}) for the supporting research questions (Q1), “Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?” was 1.10. This means that the level of involvement of CEM in social services in the community, before the intervention, was “strongly low” on the evaluation continuum. Q2 follows the same trend with aV\textsubscript{sid} value of 1.39. The all-data pre-intervention average (aV\textsubscript{sid}) of 1.39 for Q2 shows that the church’s external ministry in the community was very low (i.e. “strongly low” on the evaluation continuum). This implies that the activities of the church were heavily skewed towards intra-church activities; they were mostly intrinsically focused. The all-data pre-intervention average (aV\textsubscript{sid}) for Q3 was 1.37, which was closer to 1.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “strongly low” on the evaluation continuum). This means that the church’s life-together as a community of faith in the community did not present a significantly different culture from that of the community people. The aV\textsubscript{sid} for Q4 is 1.50 and this figure was closer to “low” on the evaluation continuum. What it means is that the church’s relevance to the community’s development was low (i.e., for Q4). The all-data pre-intervention average (aV\textsubscript{sid}) for Q5 is 1.67, which was closer to 2.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “low,” on the evaluation continuum). This means that the church’s partnership with other churches for the purpose of achieving kingdom objectives was low.
The resultant effect of the pre-intervention all-data average ($aV_{sid}$) for each of the indicators (or supporting research questions) was estimated as the pre-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator ($LKG_{initial}$), which was found to be 1.41. The level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator ($LKG_{initial}$) was therefore closer to 1.00 on the evaluation scale so it can be described as “strongly low.”

**Overview of Pre-intervention Findings on All Four Churches**

The pre-intervention findings show that the level of understanding of the kingdom of God was generally very low (i.e., “strongly low” for AC, ACG, and CEM; and “low” for JM). The churches generally did very little to influence the culture of the community. They did not play significant roles in the development of the community, except for the one-time intervention by JM about a decade ago, when they helped dig boreholes to provide water for the community. Most of the people in the community did not see the church as vital to the development of the community; hence, they did not consider the church as relevant. The love of God, which is a key characteristic of the kingdom of God, was not being demonstrated to the community by the life-together of the church.

**Post-intervention Findings on Jesus Mission Church (JM)**

Table 5.1.1B provides the processed data reporting on the post-intervention findings on JM. Table 5.1.1B shows that the all-data pre-intervention average ($aV_{sid}$) for the supporting research questions Q1 is 4.62. This means that the level of involvement of JM in social services in the community, after the intervention, was closer to “strongly high” on the evaluation continuum. The church had improved their involvement in social services in the community. During the post-intervention interview, when one of the
interviewees was asked, “Is your church involved in solving issues of community concern?” His response was, “Now the church’s Evangelism and Missions Committee has as part of its mandate to identify issues that are of community concern which they must submit a proposal to deal with the issues with an attached budget. So, yes, we are now involved in a more structured and consistent way.” The \( aV_{sid} \) for Q2 was 4.57, which also places closer to 5.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “strongly high” on the evaluation continuum). Thus, it was found that the external activities of the church had become as important as the internal programs. The church had interwoven their community ministry in the church structures and consciously allocated a budget to it. This showed a great improvement. The \( aV_{sid} \) for Q3 is 4.44, which places closer to 4.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “high” on the evaluation continuum). This means that the people could see a distinct culture about JM that seemed to influence the prevailing culture of the community. The all-data pre-intervention averages (\( aV_{sid} \)) for Q4 and Q5 were 4.50 and 4.67 respectively. These figures were closer to 5.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “strongly high” on the evaluation continuum). What these figures mean is that the church’s relevance to the community’s development had improved greatly (i.e., for Q4). One of the interviewees, in his response to the question, “If tomorrow your church relocates to another town will the community notice your absence and miss you?” said “Yes, because we have taken control of the community: we clean, we repair broken down public places, and we care for the aged and the poor.” It was found that the people considered the church vital to the development of the community. Also, the church’s partnership with other churches for the purpose of achieving kingdom objectives was “strongly high” (i.e., for Q5). In responding to the question, “Does your church partner
with other churches to change undesirable situation(s) in the community?” one of the interviewees said, “We used to do a lot of partnership programs with Awake Chapel during annual harvest but now we have extended the partnership to almost all the churches and our objectives usually cover issues that are of community concern.” Thus, the church’s cooperation with other churches to solve problems in the community had improved greatly after the intervention.

The resultant effect of the post-intervention all-data average (aV_{sid}) for each of the indicators (or supporting research questions) was estimated as the post-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKG_{final}) that had been found to be 4.56. The level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKG_{final}) was therefore closer to 5.00 on the evaluation scale so it could be described as “strongly high.”

Post-intervention Findings on Awake Chapel International (AC)

Table 5.1.2B provides the processed data reporting on the post-intervention findings on AC. Table 5.1.2B shows that the all-data pre-intervention average (aV_{sid}) for the supporting research questions Q1 was 4.10. This means that the level of involvement of AC in social services in the community, after the intervention, was closer to “high” on the evaluation continuum—the church had improved their involvement in social services in the community. During the post-intervention interview, when one of the interviewees was asked, “Does the church lead community service or communal labor to care for the environment and God’s creation?” his response was, “Yes, the church has been organizing communal labor, the sanitation measures in the church have now been extended to the community. We no longer wait for the Assembly man and the chief to
organize communal labor for us to attend.” The $a_{sid}$ for Q2 was 4.56, which placed closer to 5.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “strongly high” on the evaluation continuum). Thus, it was found that the church no longer focused on their intra-church activities only, but they also were externally focused. They had included their external ministry on their church calendar and had allocated a budget for it. The $a_{sid}$ for Q3 is 4.40, which places closer to 4.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “high” on the evaluation continuum). This means that the people could see a distinct culture about AC that seemed to influence the prevailing culture of the community. The $a_{sid}$ for Q4 was 4.00, which can be rated “high” using the evaluation scale. This means that the church’s relevance to the community’s development had significantly improved (i.e., for Q4). The all-data pre-intervention average ($a_{sid}$) for Q5 is 4.67, which was closer to 5.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “strongly high” on the evaluation continuum). This means that the church’s partnership with other churches for the purpose of achieving kingdom objectives was “strongly high” (i.e., for Q5). In responding to the question, “Does your church partner with other churches to change undesirable situation(s) in the community?” one of the interviewees said, “Before the workshops we did some partnership with Jesus Mission Church to raise funds during our annual thanksgiving service but now we have brought in all the other churches with the aim of solving problems in the community.” Thus, the church’s partnership with other churches to solve problems in the community had improved greatly after the intervention.

The resultant effect of the post-intervention all-data average ($a_{sid}$) for each of the indicators (or supporting research questions) was estimated as the post-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator ($LKG_{final}$), which had been found to be
4.35. Therefore, the level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKG_{final}) was closer to 4.00 on the evaluation scale so it can be described as “high.”

Post-intervention Findings on Apostolic Church, Ghana (ACG)

Table 5.1.3B provides the processed data reporting on the post-intervention findings on AC. Table 5.1.3B shows that the all-data pre-intervention average (aV_{sid}) for the supporting research questions Q1 was 4.60. This meant that the level of involvement of AC in social services in the community, after the intervention, was closer to “strongly high” on the evaluation continuum. This shows an improvement in the church’s involvement in social services in the community. During the post-intervention interview, when one of the interviewees was asked, “Does the church lead community service or communal labor to care for the environment and God’s creation?” her response was, “Yes, we do it, we used to attend the communal labor individually whenever the Assemblyman called for it, but now we organize it ourselves.” The aV_{sid} for Q2 was 4.55, which places closer to 5.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “strongly high” on the evaluation continuum). Thus, it was found that the church was not only intrinsically focused but also extrinsically focused. They had a budget for their community ministry; and they had a quarterly planned program for it on the church calendar. The aV_{sid} for Q3 was 4.32, which placed closer to 4.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “high” on the evaluation continuum). This meant that the people could see a distinct culture about AC that seemed to influence the prevailing culture of the community. The aV_{sid} for Q4 was 4.50, which places closer to 5.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “strongly high” on the evaluation continuum). This means that the church’s relevance to the community’s development had greatly improved. The all-data post-intervention average (aV_{sid}) for Q5 was 4.33, which
was closer to 4.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “high” on the evaluation continuum). This meant that the church’s partnership with other churches for the purpose of achieving kingdom objectives was “high.” In responding to the question, “Does your church partner with other churches to change undesirable situation(s) in the community?” one of the interviewees said, “Yes! We come together to organize communal labor, open air crusades, fund raising for community work, etc.” Thus, the church’s partnership with other churches to solve problems in the community had improved after the intervention.

The resultant effect of the post-intervention all-data average ($aV_{\text{sid}}$) for each of the indicators (or supporting research questions) was estimated as the post-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator ($LKG_{\text{final}}$), which was found to be 4.46. Therefore, the level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator ($LKG_{\text{final}}$) was closer to 4.00 on the evaluation scale so it can be described as “high.”

Post-intervention Findings on Charismatic Evangelistic Ministry (CEM)

Table 5.1.4B provides the processed data reporting on the post-intervention findings on AC. Table 5.1.4B shows that the all-data pre-intervention average ($aV_{\text{sid}}$) for the supporting research questions Q1 was 4.48. This meant that the level of involvement of CEM in social services in the community, after the intervention, was closer to “high” on the evaluation continuum. The church had improved their involvement in social services in the community. During the post-intervention interview, when one of the interviewees was asked, “Does the church lead community service or communal labor to care for the environment and God’s creation?” his response was, “Yes, we no longer wait for the Assemblyman to organize communal labor for the members to participate, rather now the church takes the lead to organize community service.” The $aV_{\text{sid}}$ for Q2 was
4.61, which places closer to 5.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “strongly high” on the evaluation continuum). Thus, it was found that the church did not focus on their intra-church activities only, but they also were externally focused. They had included their external ministry on their church calendar and had allocated a budget for it. The \( \text{aV}_{\text{sid}} \) for Q3 was 4.24, which places closer to 4.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “high” on the evaluation continuum). This meant that the people could see a distinct culture about CEM that seemed to influence the prevailing culture of the community. The \( \text{aV}_{\text{sid}} \) for Q4 was 4.48, which places closer to 4.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “high” on the evaluation continuum). This meant that the church’s relevance to the community’s development had significantly improved. The all-data post-intervention average (\( \text{aV}_{\text{sid}} \)) for Q5 was 4.67, which was closer to 5.00 on the evaluation scale (i.e., “strongly high” on the evaluation continuum). This meant that the church’s partnership with other churches for the purpose of achieving kingdom objectives was “strongly high.” Thus, the church’s partnership with other churches to solve problems in the community had improved greatly after the intervention.

The resultant effect of the post-intervention all-data average (\( \text{aV}_{\text{sid}} \)) for each of the indicators (or supporting research questions) was estimated as the post-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (\( \text{LKG}_{\text{final}} \)), which was found to be 4.50. Therefore, the level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (\( \text{LKG}_{\text{final}} \)) was closer to 5.00 on the evaluation scale so it can be described as “strongly high.”

**Overview of Post-intervention Findings on All Four Churches**

The post-intervention findings show that the level of understanding of the kingdom of God was at least high (i.e., strongly high” for JM and CEM; “high” for AC
The churches generally improved in their effort to influence the culture of the community, and they played vital roles in the development of the community. The people in the community saw the church as vital to the development of the community; hence, they considered them as relevant. They demonstrated the love of God to the community through acts of love and social service.

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Intervention Findings—Church

Appendix K, Church All-Data Comparative Table, provides data on the comparison between the pre- and post-interventions of the combined processed data on the partnering churches as follows:

1. Table 5.3.1 reported on the comparison between the pre- and post-intervention findings on the Jesus Mission Church (JM).

2. Table 5.3.2 reported on the comparison between the pre- and post-intervention findings on the Awake Chapel International (AC).

3. Table 5.3.3 reported on the comparison between the pre- and post-intervention findings on the Apostolic Church – Ghana (ACG).

4. Table 5.3.4 reported on the comparison between the pre- and post-intervention findings on the Charismatic Evangelistic Ministry (CEM).

Each of the tables listed here indicates the all-data pre-intervention average (PRE $aV_{sid}$), all-data post-intervention average (POST $aV_{sid}$), the change in all-data average ($\Delta aV_{sid}$) for each supporting research question, the pre-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator interview ($LKG_{initial}$), the post-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator ($LKG_{final}$), and the change in the level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator ($\Delta LKG$).
Table 5.3.1 provides the processed data reporting on the change in all-data average ($\Delta aV_{sid}$) for each of the supporting questions (i.e., Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, and Q5). Table 5.3.1 shows that the change in all-data average ($\Delta aV_{sid}$) for the supporting research questions (Q1), “Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?” was +3.47. The change in all-data average ($\Delta aV_{sid}$) for Q1 being positive meant that there had been transformation (i.e., positive change) in the level of involvement of JM in social services in the community. The change in all-data average ($\Delta aV_{sid}$) for Q2, Q3, Q4, and Q5 followed the same trend with +3.39, +3.09, +2.44 and +2.73, respectively. Thus, there was positive change for all the five variables or indicators.

The difference between the pre-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator ($LKG_{initial}$) and the post-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator ($LKG_{final}$) was computed and presented as the change in the level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator ($\Delta LKG$), which was found to be +3.02. Positive $\Delta LKG$ means that there was transformation in JM’s level of understanding of the kingdom of God.

Table 5.3.2 provides the processed data reporting on the change in all-data average ($\Delta aV_{sid}$) for each of the supporting questions (i.e., Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, and Q5). Table 5.3.2 shows that the change in all-data average ($\Delta aV_{sid}$) for the supporting research question (Q1), “Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?” was +2.99. The change in all-data average ($\Delta aV_{sid}$) for Q1 being positive meant that there was transformation (i.e., positive change) in the level of involvement of AC in
social services in the community. The change in all-data average (Δ aVsid) for Q2, Q3, Q4, and Q5 followed the same trend with +3.10, +2.89, +2.28 and +3.28, respectively. Thus, there was positive change for all the five variables or indicators.

The difference between the pre-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKGinitial) and the post-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKGfinal) was computed and presented as the change in the level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (Δ LKG), which was found to be +2.91. Positive Δ LKG meant that there was transformation in AC’s level of understanding of the kingdom of God.

**ACG All-Data Pre- and Post-Intervention Averages Compared**

Table 5.3.3 provides the processed data reporting on the change in all-data average (Δ aVsid) for each of the supporting questions (i.e., Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, and Q5). Table 5.3.3 shows that the change in all-data average (Δ aVsid) for the supporting research question (Q1), “Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?” was +3.60. The change in all-data average (Δ aVsid) for Q1 being positive meant that there was transformation (i.e., positive change) in the level of involvement of ACG in social services in the community. The change in all-data average (Δ aVsid) for Q2, Q3, Q4, and Q5 followed the same trend with +3.11, +2.82, +3.00 and +3.00, respectively. Thus, there was positive change for all the five variables or indicators.

The difference between the pre-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKGinitial) and the post-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKGfinal) was computed as the change in the level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (Δ LKG), which was found to be +3.14.
Positive \( \Delta \) LKG meant that there was transformation in ACG’s level of understanding of the kingdom of God.

**CEM All-Data Pre- and Post-Intervention Averages Compared.**

Table 5.3.4 provides the processed data reporting on the change in all-data average (\( \Delta aV_{sid} \)) for each of the supporting questions (i.e., Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, and Q5). Table 5.3.4 shows that the change in all-data average (\( \Delta aV_{sid} \)) for the supporting research question (Q1), “Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?” was +3.38. The change in all-data average (\( \Delta aV_{sid} \)) for Q1 being positive meant that there was transformation (i.e., positive change) in the level of involvement of CEM in social services in the community. The change in all-data average (\( \Delta aV_{sid} \)) for Q2, Q3, Q4, and Q5 followed the same trend with +3.22, +2.87, +2.98 and +3.00, respectively. Thus, there was positive change for all the five variables or indicators.

The difference between the pre-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKG\text{initial}) and the post-intervention level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (LKG\text{final}) was computed as the change in the level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (\( \Delta \) LKG), which was found to be +3.09. Positive \( \Delta \) LKG meant that there was transformation in CEM’s level of understanding of the kingdom of God.

**Overview of All Four Churches**

Appendix L, Overview of All Four Churches’ Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God, provides data on reporting the change in the level of understanding of the kingdom of God indicator (\( \Delta \) LKG) for all the four churches in Table 5.4.
Table 5.4 shows positive $\Delta$ LKG for all the four churches. Positive change in the level of understanding of the kingdom of God Indicator ($\Delta$ LKG) implies transformation in all the churches. The greater the $\Delta$ LKG, the higher the extent of the transformation. Thus, ACG with $\Delta$ LKG of +3.14 was the highest, followed by CEM ($\Delta$ LKG = +3.09), and then JM ($\Delta$ LKG = +3.02), and AC ($\Delta$ LKG=2.91), in that order. Thus, there was positive change for all the four churches in all the five variables (the five supporting questions). This meant that there was transformation in the areas of the churches’ involvement in social services in the community, their external ministries, their influence on the people due to their peculiar culture, their relevance and contribution to the development of the community, and their partnership endeavors with other churches for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective.

**Pre- and Post-Intervention Findings—Community**

Appendix J, Community All-Data Processing Chamber, provides the combined processed survey and interview data reporting on the findings on the conditions before and after the application of the intervention in the community. Tables 5.2A and 5.2B report on the pre- and post-intervention findings in the community (COM).

Table 5.2A and 5.2B indicate the pre- and post-intervention survey assigned magnitude ($M_s$), the pre- and post-intervention interview question average ($aV_{iq}$), and the community all-data average ($aV_{si}$). All the values indicated on Table 5.2A and 5.2B were interpreted by placing them on the evaluation continuum (i.e., 1-5 evaluation scale) where Option 1 = Strongly Disagree/Low = 20%; Option 2 = Disagree/Moderately low = 40%; Option 3 = Even/Moderate=60%; Option 4= Agree/Moderately high = 80%; and Option 5= Strongly Agree/High = 100%.
Pre-intervention Findings on the Community

As stated above, Table 5.2A provides the processed data reporting on the pre-intervention findings on the community. Table 5.2A shows that the community all-data average \( (aV_{si}) \) for the community pre-intervention survey and interview questions 1, 2, and 3 are 1.00, 5.00, and 5.00, respectively. The 1.00 community all-data average \( (aV_{si}) \) for the community pre-intervention survey and interview question 1 meant that, before the application of the intervention, when respondents were asked, “How easy is it to find a place of convenience (i.e., public toilet) in the community?” most indicated that it was “very difficult” to find a place of convenience in the community. This was evident in the fact that most of the people in the community did not have toilets in their homes. Going round the community, we found that most of the people did ease themselves in their backyard, refuse dump sites, gutters, uncompleted buildings, and so on, and open defecation was the norm for both young and old. Some others would ease themselves in containers and plastic bags (i.e., polythene bags) and dump them in gutters, at refuse dump sites, and other open spaces. It was observed that the unbridled open defecation culture had polluted the environment and caused health problems for the community. The contamination of the local environment by fecal matter posed a health hazard to the people in the community, and diarrhea diseases such as cholera and typhoid were rampant in the community.

Also, the 5.00 community all-data average \( (aV_{si}) \) for the community pre-intervention survey and interview question 2 means that when respondents were asked, “How easy would it be for people in the community to change their current place of convenience for a public place of convenience?” most of respondents indicated that it
would be “very easy” for the people to stop open defecation in bushes and to use a public toilet. According to them, they resorted to open defecation because there was no public toilet in the community.

Again, the 5.00 community all-data average (aVsi) for the community pre-intervention survey and interview question 3, meant that most of respondents indicated that a public toilet was “extremely needed” in the community when they were asked, “To what extent will the construction of a new public toilet be needed in the community?” Therefore, public toilets were inarguably one of the major needs of the community. The environmental pollution and the associated health problems were of great concern to the community.

Post-intervention Findings on the Community

Table 5.2B provides the processed data reporting on the post-intervention findings on the community. Table 5.2B shows that the community all-data average (aVsi) for all ten of the community post-intervention survey and interview questions was 5.00.

The 5.00 community all-data average (aVsi) for the community post-intervention survey and interview question 1, meant that after the application of the intervention, when respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or otherwise with the statement “It is easy to find a place of convenience (i.e., public toilet) in the community” most of respondents indicated that it was now “very easy” to find a place of convenience in the community. This was because the partnering churches had come together to construct a public toilet in the community. In the same way, the 5.00 community all-data average (aVsi) for the community post-intervention survey question 2, meant that when respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or otherwise with the statement, “The
newly constructed public toilet has come to serve a dire need in the community,” most of respondents indicated that they “highly agreed” to the statement that the newly constructed public toilet served a dire need in the community. It was obvious that the newly constructed public toilet served most of the people in the community. It was observed that many people queued during the rush hours, early morning hours, of the day, to use the public toilet. The community all-data average ($aV_{si}$) for the community post-intervention survey question 3 was also 5.00; this meant that when respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or otherwise with the statement, “By building the public toilet the church has shown that they love the community” most of respondents indicated that they “highly agreed” to the statement that the church had shown that they loved the community by constructing a public toilet in the community.

As shown in Table 5.2B, the community all-data average ($aV_{si}$) for all the rest of the community post-intervention survey questions was 5.00. This meant that most of the people “strongly agreed” with the statements made in the questions. Thus, most of the respondents strongly agreed to the following statements: that the people saw the church doing some of what Jesus would have done for the community, such as giving out gift items to people in the community, and cleaning and taking care of the environment in the community. They saw these efforts as important to the development of the community, as contributing to the transformation of the community, as having influence on the people in the community, and that what the church was doing in the community could attract people to Jesus.
Conclusion

The project intervention accomplished its set objectives. It brought a theological breakthrough to the partner churches, who in turn influenced the development of the community positively. The intervention triggered the understanding and awareness the church needed to refocus on their mandate as kingdom agents. The church realized that their jurisdiction and territory extended beyond the boundaries of the church premises; and that they were to take care of God’s creation (Gen. 2:15), including the people in the community and the environment. The pre-intervention survey and interview responses helped to effectively measure how they understood the kingdom business before the application of the intervention. The data showed that all the four churches were found to have scored very low or low (i.e., “strongly low” or “low”) on the indexes for all the five indicators or variables (i.e., the supporting research questions). The churches were not externally focused and their contributions to the development of the community were infinitesimally small. Also, there was little or no partnerships among the churches in the community for the purposes of solving problems that were of community concern. Again, non-church members were not factored in their welfare programs; the poor, the aged, and the vulnerable were not cared for in the community.

The post-intervention survey and interview responses, however, showed evidence of positive change in the level of understanding of the kingdom of God in all the four participating churches. The intervention served as a wake-up call to all the participating churches to be intentional in their engagement with the community. Consequently, the churches decided to make it one of their core business objectives to be intentionally externally focused. The intervention provoked the churches to take a second look at their
church structures. As a result, they restructured and reengineered the ecclesiological structures of their churches to accommodate community focused ventures. They included their community focused activities in their church calendars and interwove them into their weekly programs. They also made allocations for the community focused activities in their church budget. Furthermore, they intentionally and consciously decided to be an embodied witness to the community. They intentionally designed ways to demonstrate the love of God to the people in the community. They remembered the poor and opened their arms to the aged and the vulnerable. They intentionally decided to influence the people of the community to consider changing their cultural presuppositions or worldviews to embrace the principles and values of the kingdom of God. Thus, the theological breakthrough manifested as a real and observable change in their practices and activities within the community. There were tangible and observable transformations in all the four participating churches at the end of the project.

The activities of the transformed churches within the community resulted in a change in a situation that previously had been a community health hazard due to open defecation. The lack of the availability of a place of convenience was resolved through the partnership ventures of the partner churches. Together, they constructed a public toilet for the community and influenced the people to desist from open defecation. The partnering churches organized several communal labor programs that also helped to improve the sanitation situation in the community. This area of community life was transformed; thus, both the church and the community were transformed.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND REFLECTION

Summary of Significant Findings

This Culminating Project aimed at proving that if the church will be an “embodied witness”\(^1\) in their communities by employing social services and acts of love to both tell and show the love of God to their communities, there will be significant transformation in the community and the kingdom of God will be revealed in the community. The underlying theology was the overarching biblical theme “the kingdom of God.” The project focused on bringing the church to a deep and broad understanding of the kingdom of God. The participating churches became acquainted with the concept of the kingdom of God through their involvement in both the teaching and practical components of the workshop intervention. The workshop created a conducive environment for conversation about the kingdom of God and the role of the church as kingdom agents.

The project was driven by one major research question and five supporting research questions that served as the indicators (variables) for the study. The major research question was, “Does the church’s involvement in social services in a community influence the transformation of the community and the local church?” The supporting research questions were:

1. Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (Q1)

2. Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (Q2)

\(^{1}\) Stone, *Evangelism after Christendom*, 183.
3. Does the life together of the community of faith, the church, portray a peculiar people? (Q3)

4. Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community? (Q4)

5. Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective? (Q5)

The initial level of understanding of the partnering churches was measured by employing three research methods—survey, interview, and direct observation—before the application of the intervention. The processed data of the pre-intervention produced results that confirmed that the church’s activities did not flow from the broader understanding of the kingdom of God that spells out the roles and responsibilities of the people of God. The pre-intervention survey and interview responses coupled with data from direct observation served as effective tools to measure how the church understood kingdom work before the application of the intervention. The processed data shows very low or low (i.e., “strongly low” or “low”) indexes on all the five indicators or variables (i.e., the supporting research questions) for all four churches. This means that the churches were not externally focused and their contributions to the development of the community were negligible. The same was true for partnership among the churches in the community for the purposes of solving problems that were of community concern. They did not include non-church members in their welfare programs; thus, the poor, the aged, and the vulnerable were not cared for in the community.

The intervention was then applied to cure these weaknesses. The intervention opened the eye of their understanding concerning the kingdom of God—there was a theological breakthrough. This triggered the awareness that the church needed to refocus
on their God-given mandate as kingdom agents. The church realized that their territory extends beyond their church premises; they broke boundaries. They began to integrate connections, communications, conversations, and the community into their plans and activities. This sort of paradigm shifts toward community-focused ministry began to yield results; the church started having a positive influence on the development of the community. They started to take care of God’s creation (Gen. 2:15), including people in the community and the environment.

The results of the impact of the intervention were evident in the post-intervention survey and interview responses. The data showed a positive change in the level of understanding of the kingdom of God in all four participating churches. Clearly, the intervention served as a wake-up call to the partner churches to be intentional in their engagement with the community. As a result, the churches decided to review their modus operandi and make it their objective to intentionally include externally focused ministry. They were provoked by the intervention to relook at their church ecclesiological framework. They realized that there was the need for restructuring and reengineering of the ecclesiological structures of their churches to include extrinsically focused ministry.

The church calendar was revised to include their externally focused activities by interweaving them into the fabrics of their weekly programs. The sodalities and modalities of the church were reconstructed to accommodate new auxiliary groups for purposes of engaging the community. They began to earmark funds for externally focused activities and made sure they were captured in their church budget. Also, the churches resolved to be an embodied witness to the community. They were intentional in their approach; they designed ways to demonstrate the love of God to the people in the
community. Each of the churches designed programs that aimed at helping the aged, the poor and the needy. In addition, they became intentional in their quest to influence the people of the community to embrace the principles and values of the kingdom of God. The church took practical steps to execute their God-given mandate as God’s representatives in the community. Thus, the theological breakthrough manifested as a real and observable change in their practices and activities within the community. By the end of the project, there were tangible and observable transformations in all four participating churches.

Through their external ministry in the community, the transformed churches brought a change in a situation that otherwise was a health hazard due to open defecation. Through the partnership of the participating churches, the lack of the availability of a place of convenience was resolved in the community. The transformed churches constructed a public toilet for the community and influenced the people to desist from open defecation. The partnering churches came together to organize several communal labor programs, which also helped to improve the sanitation situation in the community. The sanitation situation of the community was transformed—a transformed church transformed a community. Thus, it can be concluded that the project intervention was effective in bringing transformation in both the church and the community.

Theological Significance

As articulated in Chapter 2, a theological understanding of the kingdom of God is a necessary ingredient to help refocus humankind to their original God-given mandate of caring for God’s creation as managers and representatives of God on earth. The theology that flows from the biblical narrative that God created humankind in his own image and
gave them the responsibility of taking care of creation as his kingdom agents suggests
that any attempt to limit or narrow the jurisdiction of humankind to a small space or
territory amounts to an inconsistency with Bible teachings.

In the same way, when people do not understand the kingdom of God as “both”
future and present-day reality but conceive it as “either,” may in the practice of their faith
either lack the necessary hope needed for the anticipation of the future kingdom or
neglect the manifestation of the kingdom realities in this present age. The latter scenario
results in a people who do not care about what God cares about—his creation and the
people created in his own image. They only care about themselves and their
acquaintances, and as a result, they turn to neglecting their communities. This project has
shown that before the application of the intervention, the church’s understanding of the
kingdom of God was very low or low. This corresponded to their approach to ministry,
which basically neglected the concerns of the poor, aged, and the community. After the
intervention, the church’s understanding of the kingdom improved, and they showed
evidence of great interest in the development of the community and many other
externally focused ministry activities, such as caring for the aged, the vulnerable, and the
poor in the community. Therefore, transformation of communities is directly proportional
to a proper theological understanding of the kingdom of God.

Again, when our approach to the gospel is such that we partially apply the gospel
to everyday life challenges, we tend to be ineffective and irrelevant. The whole gospel
approach is one that combines both “word” and “deed.” As explained in the preceding
chapters, in the inaugural speech of the Messiah, Jesus Christ recorded in Luke 4, the
modus operandi of the kingdom of God is revealed. The Messiah showed that the best
The approach to the kingdom’s business is to employ a combination of “proclamation” and “demonstration” in our engagement with the world. Any attempt to decouple them renders our strategy ineffective. The results of this project showed that before the intervention, the people in the community did not consider the church as vital to the development of the community, but after the intervention the narrative changed positively. Therefore, this project has shown that the use of a combination of word and deed or proclamation and demonstration is an efficient and effective strategy in any attempt to transform our communities and reveal the kingdom of God to the world.

Furthermore, there is enough historical evidence that the early church employed the use of the dual kingdom arsenal, word and deed, or proclamation and demonstration, which proved to be effective even in a hostile environment. Historical evidence abounds to support the fact that the early believers transformed their communities by solving problems through acts of love, disinterested benevolence, and social services. In this project, the participating churches became relevant and effective in their engagement with the community after the intervention. This is because they followed the example of the early church and used a combination of both proclamation and demonstration. Thus, the historical facts were confirmed by the results reported in this project.

Practical Ministry Significance

Over time, the way we have done ministry has been focused on intra-church activities to the neglect of the community. The church has been overly intrinsically focused. Most of the church’s extrinsic activities involve the proclamation of the word, but not much can be said of the demonstration of the love of God and other principles and values of the kingdom of God. The results, analysis, and conclusions arrived at in this
project hopefully will provoke ministers and churches to relook at their approach to ministry and retrace their steps to the way of the early church to combine word and deed or proclamation and demonstration.

Also, in recent times, there seems to be a disconnection between faith as an inward virtue and the practice of faith as a social reality. This project has proven that the inclusion of the demonstration approach in the strategy of the church can minimize or eliminate this mischief. Ministers and churches who take a cue from the conclusions and recommendations of this project will be able to bridge the gap between faith and practice so their parishioners can express their faith in everyday life.

Again, this project has shown that there is the need for practical re-engineering and reconstruction of the ecclesiological structures—the sodalities and modalities—of the church to accommodate embodied witness and extrinsically focused ministry if the church wants to be effective and relevant in this postmodern era. The external activities of the church should be interwoven with the weekly intra-church activities and must be featured on the church’s calendar. Also, it is recommended that funds are allocated to the community focused ministry and must be included in the church budget.

Therefore, the theological bases established in this project are significant and relevant to ministers and churches because they provide a practical ecclesiological framework and strategy to an effective ministry that is both intrinsically and extrinsically focused.

Broader Significance

Although there have been projects that employ both evangelism and social action for community development, to my knowledge most of these projects were done in cities
but not in villages. The outcome of this project has proven that the principles of city
transformation (e.g., partnership) are also applicable to village settings. Thus, the
application of the whole gospel and social services with partnership can influence the
transformation of villages in Ghana and Africa in general. In the long run, the knowledge
of how such influence occurs will help the church in Ghana to turn to and or continue
serving their communities in more predictable and practical ways.

This project will benefit ministers and churches by providing a new way of
thinking about mission by emphasizing a new definition of evangelism and missions in
the context of both an intrinsically and extrinsically focused ecclesiological framework
that practically support the implementation of effective evangelism and missions policy
in the local church.

Future Research

The following research questions offer possible future research opportunities to
answer questions on how the transformative church can serve as kingdom agents to
reveal the kingdom of God in our communities. The first question is, “What are the
inherent structural and theological conceptions that inhibit the church from including
‘demonstration’ in the church’s approach to ministry?” The second question is, “What are
the factors that account for the neglect of ‘demonstration’ in the church’s approach to
ministry in this modern era?” The third question is, “What are the changes that are
needed to be done in the curriculum training ministers to focus on externally focused
ministries at the seminary?”

The time frame for the application of the intervention was eight weeks and the
waiting time for the measurement of the impact was also eight weeks. A longer period,
about six months, for the application of the intervention and the waiting time for the measurement of the impact would be helpful to impact additional areas of the community life. An extended timeline also would offer the opportunity to better assess the sustainability of the project principles.

Conclusion

A biblical understanding of the kingdom of God is vital for the context of the transformation of churches and communities. This is because it offers the opportunity to refocus the church on her God-given mandate. It also helps the church to identify issues that limit her to a smaller jurisdiction (church premises and church members issues) instead of the broader mandate to care for God’s creation. It serves as the theological underpinning that can push the church outward to engage with the world. The connection between the fact that God’s representatives must be God’s image bearers gives the confidence that regenerated souls who have been born again through faith in Jesus Christ are better placed to be God’s representatives on earth. This privileged position comes with responsibilities.

Scripture reveals that one of the best approaches to carry out these responsibilities to reveal the kingdom of God to the world is through a combination of word and deed or proclamation and demonstration.

This project set out to test its thesis on the ground by running a pilot project to find out if the application of kingdom mentality, whole gospel theology, externally focused ministry, and word and deed approach to ministry through acts of love and social services et al., may have a direct influence on the transformation of both the church and the community, especially in a village setting.
A project intervention was designed to achieve this objective. The initial situation of the units of analysis were measured before the application of the intervention. Then the impact of the intervention was measured using the same methods. It was found that the project intervention clearly was effective. It brought a theological breakthrough to the participating churches who in turn influenced the transformation of the community. The intervention provoked the church unto good works by opening their understanding and triggering the needed awareness of the church to focus on their mandate as kingdom agents. The results show evidence of positive change in the level of understanding of the kingdom of God in all four participating churches, all of which were transformed.

The activities of the transformed churches within the community resulted in a change in a situation that otherwise was a health hazard due to open defecation. Thus, the church and the community were both transformed.

Therefore, this project has proven that by employing ministerial principles and methods that have the right hermeneutics of the theology of the kingdom of God and the whole gospel of word and deed as its theological foundation, the church can influence the transformation of some of the prevailing conditions that do not merit the kingdom of God in a community.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A1:
Research Agreement with Partner Churches

This agreement is made on the …………………………………of ……………between 
Rev. Osnad Anim-Danso of House Number KB 8, KOANS Estate, Pampaso, Nsawam, 
Eastern Region, Ghana (hereinafter called “the Researcher”) on one part and (NAME 
OF THE CHURCH AND ADDRESS), Ghana represented by (NAME OF THE PASTOR/ 
LEADER) of (ADDRESS OF THE PASTOR/LEADER), Ghana (hereinafter called “the 
Church”) on the other part.

WHEREAS the Researcher makes the following claims with the firm promise that all 
are true and same can be relied upon by the Church:

a. That the Researcher is a doctoral candidate at the Baylor University at Waco, Texas, 
and as part of the fulfilment of the requirement for the honors of a Doctor of 
Ministry Degree he must do and complete a culminating project in Ghana.

b. That he needs to choose a local church in the community where the project will be 
executed to work with them.

c. That after many considerations he has identified and chosen to do the project at 
Maame Dede in the Nsawam Adoagyiri Municipality in the Eastern Region of the 
Republic of Ghana, and he is desirous to work with the (NAME OF THE CHURCH) 
which is a local church within this community.

AND WHEREAS the Church is a local church at Maame Dede in the Nsawam 
Adoagyiri Municipality in the Eastern Region of the Republic of Ghana:

d. The Church is willing to and has agreed to work with the Researcher.

THE PARTIES HEREBY AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

1. That the Church shall partner the Researcher and permit him to use the Church 
Premises for the project.
2. That the church shall work with the researcher towards the transformation of the 
church.
3. That the church shall accept the interventions designed for them and shall 
participate fully in the workshops and teaching services organized by the 
researcher.
4. That the researcher shall provide the resources which the church may not be able 
to provide but are needed for the project.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties have affixed their common seals and have set their hand hereto the day and year first written above.

Signed, Sealed and Delivered by
Rev. Osnad Anim-Danso (The Researcher) ______________________________

In the presence of ________________________________________________

Signed, Sealed and Delivered by ______________________________________
(Name of the Pastor/Leader)
Pastor-In-Charge, (Name of the Church)

In the presence of ________________________________________________
APPENDIX A2:  
Consent Form for Research

PROTOCOL TITLE: “The Transformative Church as a Kingdom Agent in a Village Setting.”

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Osnad Anim-Danso

Invitation and autonomy: Following the agreement with the leadership of the partnering churches, you are invited to be part of a research study. This consent form will help you, as an individual, to choose whether to participate in the study. The agreement with the leadership of your church is not in any way an obligation to participate and does not take away your autonomy (or free will) to decide not to participate. Thus, taking part in this research study is voluntary. In fact, you do not have to participate, and you can stop at any time. Again, feel free to ask if anything is not clear in this consent form (i.e., you may and can ask questions to clarify any doubt, misunderstanding or any issue of concern to you that has not been addressed on this form which has been read out and explained to you both in English and Twi language). You may freely express yourself in either Twi or English (or both).

Eligibility criteria: There are no eligibility criteria for participation in this research. Thus, people must not do anything or possess any special qualities in order to participate in this research. You don’t need to be literate and or speak English to qualify to participate in this research. However, only adults will participate in the study. Provision will be made to accommodate and refresh children (or minors) who for various reasons accompany their parents to the workshops and teaching services but will not be allowed to participate in the research study.

Purpose of the research: The purpose of this project is to find out whether the church's involvement in offering practical solutions and social services in a village community can influence the transformation of both the Church and the community and thereby determine if a combination of the word and deed is an effective modus operandi of the Kingdom of God.

Study activities: The churches who choose to be part of this project (the Partner Churches) may be required to allow their members to participate (and individual members have the right to choose not to participate) in a series of workshops, teaching services, complete questionnaires, and answer interview questions. All the questions that will be asked, in both the interviews and questionnaires, will be about the activities of the church and certain situations and conditions of the community. No personal questions about individuals will be asked. The workshops and teaching services will be organized on Saturdays and Sundays respectively. You will be allowed to ask questions and make contributions to the discussion (teaching session). All teaching principles will be drawn from the Bible. You will be given the opportunity (not as an individual but as a corporate church) to apply the lessons learnt in real life situations (practical session) in the
community as an intervention to influence the transformation of the community. The teaching section will be done in three weeks but the whole project will last for 8 weeks.

**Risks and Benefits:** The loss of confidentiality is the only risk I can, to the best of my knowledge, think of on the part of the Partner Churches, as corporate bodies, and the participating individual members (Participants) of the churches. Thus, the risks involved in this study, if any, are not greater than what is experienced in everyday life. The issue of loss of confidentiality is discussed below. Possible benefits include having the opportunity to contribute to the knowledge that the application of the gospel and social services with partnership can influence, or otherwise, the transformation of churches and village communities in Ghana. Participants may gain knowledge of how the Kingdom of God operates and the satisfaction that comes with service and benevolence to those who are in need. Others too may benefit from the findings that will come out of this project. The community will benefit from the “solutions” that will be provided to solve some of the problems in the community.

**Confidentiality:** Participating churches and their members stand the chance of a loss of confidentiality. The Loss of confidentiality may include sharing the information received with supervisors and other helping hands who may not be part of the Team directly in contact with the people on the field. The information received may also be shared accidentally with someone who is not on the Team and was not supposed to see or have access to the information or through the use of technology. However, authorized supervising professors, editors, transcribers, and the Team may review and or work on the project data and report for obvious purposes. This is how the researcher plans to protect the confidentiality of Participants: first, the identifiable details of the individual participants will neither be collected nor indicated in the responses to the questionnaire. However, the actual names of the Partner Churches (but not the individual participants) will be used in the reporting and analysis of data, but the Researcher will ensure confidentiality is maintained to the highest degree practicable. Second, the Researcher will keep the records of this project confidential by storing them on an external storage device (which will be kept securely under lock by the Researcher) and in the encrypted and password-protected laptop of the Researcher; and, whenever required it will be uploaded directly from the laptop to Canvas (Baylor’s platform for submission of reports). This will help minimize confidentiality issues associated with technology usage and data transfer. Even if it becomes necessary to make use of computer software like CAQDAS (Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software), the associated confidentiality issues will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used and this may not be more than the risk involved in a person’s everyday use of the internet.

**Compensation:** There will be no monetary reward for the participating churches and their members, but the equipment and logistics needed for the workshop which the churches do not have shall be provided for use during the period of the project. Also, meals for breakfast and lunch (on Saturdays) and Dinner (on Sundays) will be provided
for participants. Members of the community, who are non-church members, who will participate in the survey will also not be given any monetary reward. However, each of those who will participate in the workshop will be given one NIV translation Bible.

**Questions or concerns about this research study:** You may text and call (including WhatsApp call and text messages) or email the researcher with any concerns or questions about the research.

Principal Investigator
Rev. Osnad Anim-Danso
Institution(s): Baylor University and Doxa Baptist Church
Address: One Bear Place #98000 Waco, TX 76798-8000
Phone #: (201)895-9620
Email: osnad_anim-danso1@baylor.edu

Academic Supervisor
Michael Stroope, Ph.D.
Institution(s): Baylor University
Address: One Bear Place #97126 Waco, TX 76798-7126
Phone #: 254-710-6745
Email: michael_stroope@baylor.edu

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, or wish to obtain information, ask questions, or discuss any concerns about this project with someone other than the researcher or the Academic Supervisor, you may contact the Baylor University IRB through the Office of the Vice Provost for Research at 254-710-3708 or irb@baylor.edu.

Taking part in this project is your choice. You are free not to take part or to stop at any time for any reason. No matter what you decide, there will be no penalty or loss of benefit to which you are entitled. If you decide to withdraw from participating in this project, the information that you may have already provided will be kept confidential. Information already collected will not be deleted.

**By continuing with the project activities, you are providing your consent.**
APPENDIX B:
Direct Observation Indicators

Things to Look Out for Before the Intervention

1. SIGNAGE AND DIRECTIONS TO THE CHURCH
   a. Take pictures of the sign boards
   b. Take pictures of posters of the church
   c. Take pictures of directions to the church

2. GEOGRAPHIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH
   a. Take a video of the route to the church from the center of the community.
   b. Take a video of the route to the church from the East and West ends of the community.
   c. Take a video of the route to the church from the North and South ends of the community.

3. PLACE OF MEETING
   a. Take pictures/video of the meeting place of the church.
   b. Take pictures/video of other infrastructure at the church premises.
   c. Take pictures/video of the notice board at the church premises.

4. PEOPLE
   a. Take videos of people as you watch them come and leave the church.
   b. Take note (record) of their attitude toward time.
   c. What time does the service start?
   d. From where you stand how many people passed to the church before start of service
   e. How many passed after 30 minutes.
   f. Take note (record) of their attitude toward strangers.
g. Take note of their attitude toward community members who are not church members.

h. Listen to their conversation (record if possible) without engaging them.

i. Watch their dressing and body language (record if possible)

j. Count the people who attended the service just before the sermon.

5. ORDER OF WORSHIP SERVICE

a. Get a copy of the order of worship service if it is distributed (otherwise make notes and list the items and time spent)

b. Watch and take note of the number of people who lead the service.

c. Watch and take note of how the worship service is organized:
   i. Focused on only God.
   ii. Focused on the Pastor
   iii. Focused on entertaining members.
   iv. All the above

6. SERMON

a. Watch, listen and take note (record) whether the sermon:
   i. Is Bible based.
   ii. Offers practical illustrations.
   iii. Shows Kingdom mentality.
   v. Addresses internal church problems.
   vi. Provides solutions to community problems.
   vii. Encourages partnership with other churches.
   viii. Others (indicate)
b. Watch and note (record) people’s attitude and response (body language and verbal response) to the sermon.

c. Time spent on the sermon.

7. PRAYER

a. Listen and take note (record) of:

   i. Concern for the poor and needy.

   ii. Concern for the weak and suffering.

   iii. Concern for other churches.

   iv. Concern for community issues.

   v. Concern for national issues.

   vi. Concern for the government and leaders of the nation.

   vii. Concern for global issues.

8. ANNOUNCEMENT

a. Watch, listen and take note (record) of:

   i. The main issues emphasized in the announcement.

   ii. Community Service (or communal labor) issues.

   iii. Issues on aid to the poor and needy in the community.

   iv. Issues on helping the weak in the community through volunteer service.

   v. Issues concerning partnership with other churches.

   vi. Any other community concerned issues

   vii. Time spent on the announcement.
APPENDIX C1:
Pre-Intervention Questionnaire (Church)

Rate each statement that follows from 1 (the statement is not true of our church) to 7 (the statement is true of our church) by circling the appropriate response. Selecting 1 means “I strongly disagree,” selecting 2 means “I disagree,” selecting 4 means “I agree,” and selecting 5 means “I strongly agree.” Selecting 3 means “I don’t agree” and at the same time “I agree” (which can also mean “I don’t know”).

1. What the church expects from members is clearly stated and made known to all (i.e., responsibilities of membership are clearly communicated to all).
   1 2 3 4 5

2. We clearly communicate pathways to membership (i.e., what people should do to become members of the church is clearly communicated to all).
   1 2 3 4 5

3. Members hold one another accountable for fulfilling expectations (i.e., there is a system in place for appraisal of members).
   1 2 3 4 5

4. We communicate the benefits of membership (i.e., what people stand to benefit from because they are members are clearly made known to all).
   1 2 3 4 5

5. Significant numbers of pre-Christians identify us as their faith community (i.e., people who want to become Christians consider us as one of the best Christian communities to join).
   1 2 3 4 5

6. We have various entry points through which new members become part of our church (i.e., there are various classes and levels one can start in the journey of becoming a member).
   1 2 3 4 5

7. Nominal Christianity is abnormal in our church (i.e., we have a culture and a system to get everybody involved, everybody is coopted to participate in the ministry of the church).
   1 2 3 4 5

8. Our message is validated by our actions in the community (i.e., the community does not only hear us tell the gospel but also the see us doing the gospel).
   1 2 3 4 5
9. We show the community the love of Christ by practically demonstrating love through benevolence to the people in the community.

10. We show to the community that we care for God’s creation through our activities and community service.

11. We show compassion to the poor and needy in the community by giving them gifts and rendering service to them.

12. People in the community see our church as vital.

13. Members are incorporated into small groups for growth and accountability.

14. We prioritize member involvement with unchurched people.

15. We have a high regard for the Word of God.

16. Members are equipped to practice spiritual disciplines.

17. Our teaching ministries emphasize moving from Knowledge to obedience.

18. We partner new believers with existing members in learning relationships.

19. We challenge members to be responsible in their obedience to God.

20. We excel in equipping members to apply Bible knowledge to real-life situations.

21. We hold one another accountable for obeying God’s Word.
22. Our members consider themselves as missionaries.
   1 2 3 4 5

23. Members interpret contemporary culture through Biblical guidance.
   1 2 3 4 5

24. Our church is transforming the community in which we live.
   1 2 3 4 5

25. Members learn to establish and maintain authentic relationships with lost persons.
   1 2 3 4 5

26. Members are involved in leading the community to worship Christ.
   1 2 3 4 5

27. Members believe our church is making a major difference in the community and the world at large.
   1 2 3 4 5

28. Our church has a vital prayer ministry focusing on updated mission concerns (i.e., our prayer topics cover issues that are community concerns).
   1 2 3 4 5

29. Most members have identified their primary mission field.
   1 2 3 4 5

30. Most members have identified areas within the community where they want to influence the prevailing culture.
   1 2 3 4 5

31. Our life together as a church and a community of faith makes us distinct in the community.
   1 2 3 4 5

32. Our life together as a church and a community of faith presents an alternative way of living in the community.
   1 2 3 4 5

33. Our life together as a church and a community of faith presents an invitation to the people in the community to join us.
   1 2 3 4 5
34. Our life together as a church and a community of faith demonstrates the love of Christ through acts of love in the community.
   1 2 3 4 5

35. Our life together as a church and a community of faith demonstrates the love of Christ through social services in the community.
   1 2 3 4 5

36. The Church has strategies for reaching new people groups in the area.
   1 2 3 4 5

37. Our worship regularly emphasizes the member’s missionary involvement.
   1 2 3 4 5

38. Most of our members participate in short-term mission projects.
   1 2 3 4 5

39. Members are very clear about our church’s purpose.
   1 2 3 4 5

40. We calendar only events that help us accomplish our purpose.
   1 2 3 4 5

41. Our programs are flexible, leaving room for God to direct changes.
   1 2 3 4 5

42. We are good at celebrating the starting and closing of ministries.
   1 2 3 4 5

43. Items in our budget reflect our missional priorities.
   1 2 3 4 5

44. Our programs and ministries give evidence of our commitment to excellence.
   1 2 3 4 5

45. We consider it a blessing when we give members to start new churches or ministries.
   1 2 3 4 5

46. Our church equips disciples to serve as missionaries.
   1 2 3 4 5

47. Our church has an aggressive plan for starting new community ministries.
   1 2 3 4 5
48. Our actions evidence our partnership with Christian churches in our community.

49. We emphasize the communal as well as individual nature of salvation.

50. We intentionally partner with all believers in the work of the Kingdom.

51. In worship we regularly pray for other churches in our community.

52. We see ourselves as salt and light for the community.

53. We, as a church, see ourselves as responsible to institute the principles and values of God in the community.

54. Our members are involved in interdenominational ministries.
### APPENDIX C2:
Pre-Intervention Survey Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Number of Related Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?</td>
<td>Question numbers: 10, 11, and 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does understanding the Kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry?</td>
<td>Question numbers: 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, and 53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the life together of the community of faith, the Church, portray a peculiar people?</td>
<td>Question numbers: 5, 31, 32, 33, and 52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community?</td>
<td>Question numbers: 12 and 27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the Church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a Kingdom objective?</td>
<td>Question numbers: 48 and 54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the Church have a clearly stated expectation and high threshold for membership?</td>
<td>Question numbers: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 13, 18, 19, and 21.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C3:  
Post-Intervention Questionnaire

Rate each statement that follows from 1 (the statement is not true of our church) to 7 (the statement is true of our church) by circling the appropriate response. Selecting 1 means “I strongly disagree,” selecting 2 means “I disagree,” selecting 4 means “I agree,” and selecting 5 means “I strongly agree.” Selecting 3 means “I don’t agree” and at the same time “I agree” (which can also mean “I don’t know”).

1. Most members of the church know what is expected of them as people of the kingdom of God.
   1  2  3  4  5

2. What people stand to benefit as people of the kingdom are clearly made known to all members of the church.
   1  2  3  4  5

3. People who want to become Christians consider us as one of the best Christian communities to join.
   1  2  3  4  5

4. We have a culture and a system to get everybody involved, everybody is coopted to participate in the ministry of the church.
   1  2  3  4  5

5. Our message is validated by our actions in the community (i.e., the community does not only hear us tell the gospel but also see us doing the gospel).
   1  2  3  4  5

6. We show the community the love of Christ by practically demonstrating love through benevolence to the people in the community.
   1  2  3  4  5

7. We show to the community that we care for God’s creation through our activities and community service.
   1  2  3  4  5

8. We show compassion to the poor and needy in the community by giving them gifts and rendering service to them.
   1  2  3  4  5

9. People in the community see our church as vital.
   1  2  3  4  5

10. Members are incorporated into small groups for growth and accountability.
    1  2  3  4  5
11. We prioritize member involvement with unchurched people.
   1 2 3 4 5

12. We have high regard for the Word of God.
   1 2 3 4 5

13. Members are equipped to practice spiritual disciplines.
   1 2 3 4 5

14. Our teaching ministries emphasize moving from Knowledge to obedience.
   1 2 3 4 5

15. We partner new believers with existing members in learning relationships.
   1 2 3 4 5

16. We challenge members to be responsible in their obedience to God.
   1 2 3 4 5

17. We excel in equipping members to apply Bible knowledge to real-life situations.
   1 2 3 4 5

18. We hold one another accountable for obeying God’s Word.
   1 2 3 4 5

19. Our members consider themselves as missionaries.
   1 2 3 4 5

20. Members interpret contemporary culture through Biblical guidance.
   1 2 3 4 5

21. Our church is transforming the community in which we live.
   1 2 3 4 5

22. Members learn to establish and maintain authentic relationships with lost persons.
   1 2 3 4 5

23. Members are involved in leading the community to worship Christ.
   1 2 3 4 5

24. Members believe our church is making a major difference in the community.
   1 2 3 4 5

25. The prayer topics in our church prayer meetings cover issues that are community concerns.
   1 2 3 4 5

26. Most members have identified their primary mission field.
   1 2 3 4 5
27. Most members have identified areas within the community where they want to influence the prevailing culture.
   1  2  3  4  5

28. Our life together as a church and a community of faith makes us distinct in the community.
   1  2  3  4  5

29. Our life together as a church and a community of faith presents an alternative way of living in the community.
   1  2  3  4  5

30. Our life together as a church and a community of faith presents an invitation to the people in the community to join us.
   1  2  3  4  5

31. Our life together as a church and a community of faith demonstrates the love of Christ through acts of love in the community.
   1  2  3  4  5

32. Our life together as a church and a community of faith demonstrates the love of Christ through social services in the community.
   1  2  3  4  5

33. The Church has strategies for reaching new people groups in the area.
   1  2  3  4  5

34. Our worship regularly emphasizes the member’s missionary involvement.
   1  2  3  4  5

35. Most of our members participate in short-term mission projects.
   1  2  3  4  5

36. Members are very clear about our church’s purpose.
   1  2  3  4  5

37. We calendar only events that help us accomplish our purpose.
   1  2  3  4  5

38. Our programs are flexible, leaving room for God to direct changes.
   1  2  3  4  5

39. We are good at celebrating the starting and closing of ministries.
   1  2  3  4  5

40. Items in our budget reflect our missional priorities.
   1  2  3  4  5
41. Our programs and ministries give evidence of our commitment to excellence.
   1 2 3 4 5

42. We consider it a blessing when we give members to start new churches or ministries.
   1 2 3 4 5

43. Our church equips disciples to serve as missionaries.
   1 2 3 4 5

44. Our church has an aggressive plan for starting new community ministries.
   1 2 3 4 5

45. We partner other Christian churches (regardless of the denomination) to achieve an agreed purpose for the benefit of our community.
   1 2 3 4 5

46. We emphasize the communal as well as individual nature of salvation.
   1 2 3 4 5

47. We intentionally partner with all believers in the work of the Kingdom.
   1 2 3 4 5

48. In worship we regularly pray for other churches in our community.
   1 2 3 4 5

49. We see ourselves as salt and light for the community.
   1 2 3 4 5

50. We, as a church, see ourselves as responsible to institute the principles and values of God in the community.
   1 2 3 4 5

51. Our members are involved in interdenominational ministries.
   1 2 3 4 5
### APPENDIX C4:
Post-Intervention Survey Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Number of Related Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?</td>
<td>Question numbers: 7, 8, and 32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does understanding the Kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry?</td>
<td>Question numbers: 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, and 50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the life together of the community of faith, the Church, portray a peculiar people?</td>
<td>Question numbers: 3, 28, 29, 30, and 49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community?</td>
<td>Question numbers: 9 and 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the Church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a Kingdom objective?</td>
<td>Question numbers: 45 and 51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the Church have a clearly stated expectation and high threshold for membership?</td>
<td>Question numbers: 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 15,16, and 18.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D1:
Pre- & Post-intervention Interview Questions (Church)

1. What is your understanding of the kingdom of God?
2. What, to your understanding, is kingdom work or kingdom business?
3. How should the Church demonstrate the kingdom of God to the community?
4. How distinct is this church from the community (or the world)?
5. What does the church do that challenges the prevailing culture of the community?
6. How must the church engage the community?
7. Is the church involved in solving problems that are community concerns?
8. Does the church lead community service or communal labor to care for the environment and God’s creation?
9. What does the church do to help the poor and needy in the community?
10. Does the church render voluntary service to the weak in the community?
11. Does your church partner with other churches to change undesirable situation(s) in the community?
12. Can the people in the community describe the church as “people who love people”?
13. If tomorrow your church relocates to another town will the community notice your absence and miss you?
14. Do you think the people in the community see your church as vital?
### Supporting Research Questions (Q) vs. Related Interview Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Research Questions (Q)</th>
<th>Related Interview Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the church involve herself in social services in the community?</td>
<td>(6) How does the church engage the community? (7) Is the church involved in solving problems that are community concerns? (8) Does the church lead community service or communal labor to care for the environment and God’s creation? (9) What does the church do to help the poor and needy in the community? (10) Does the church render voluntary service to the weak in the community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry?</td>
<td>(1) What is your understanding of the kingdom of God? (2) What, to your understanding, is kingdom work or kingdom business? (3) How does the church demonstrate the kingdom of God to the community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the life together of the community of faith, the church, portray a peculiar people?</td>
<td>(4) How distinct is this church from the community (or the world)? (5) What does the church do that challenges the prevailing culture of the community? (12) Can the people in the community describe the church as “people who love people”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community?</td>
<td>(13) If tomorrow your church relocates to another town will the community notice your absence and miss you? (14) Do you think the people in the community see your church as vital?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the Church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?</td>
<td>(11) Does your church partner with other churches to change undesirable situation(s) in the community?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E1:
Pre-Intervention Questionnaire (Community)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>VERY DIFFICULT</th>
<th>DIFFICULT</th>
<th>NEITHER EASY NOR DIFFICULT</th>
<th>EASY</th>
<th>VERY EASY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How easy is it to find a place of convenience (i.e., public toilet) in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How easy would it be for people in the community to change their current place of convenience for a public place of convenience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To what extent will the construction of a new public toilet be needed in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>EXTREMELY NOT NEEDED</th>
<th>NOT NEEDED</th>
<th>CANNOT TELL</th>
<th>NEEDED</th>
<th>EXTREMELY NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How easy is it to find a place of convenience (i.e., public toilet) in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How easy would it be for people in the community to change their current place of convenience for a public place of convenience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To what extent will the construction of a new public toilet be needed in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E2:
Post-Intervention Questionnaire (Community)

Rate each statement that follows from 1 (the statement is not true of our church) to 7 (the statement is true of our church) by circling the appropriate response. Selecting 1 means “I strongly disagree,” selecting 2 means “I disagree,” selecting 4 means “I agree,” and selecting 5 means “I strongly agree.” Selecting 3 means “I don’t agree” and at the same time “I agree” (which can also mean “I don’t know”).

1. It is easy to find a place of convenience (i.e., public toilet) in the community.
   1                   2                  3                 4                 5

2. The newly constructed public toilet has come to serve a dire need in the community.
   1                   2                  3                   4                 5

3. By building the public toilet the church has shown that they love the community.
   1                    2                   3                   4                 5

4. The church has does not only talk about Jesus but also, we see them doing some of what Jesus would have done for the community.
   1                     2                  3                   4                 5

5. We sometimes see the church giving gifts to people to show God’s love to the people in the community.
   1                    2                   3                   4                 5

6. We sometimes see the church cleaning and taking care of the environment to show to the community that they care about God’s creation.
   1                    2                   3                   4                 5

7. The people in this community see the church as important.
   1                   2                    3                   4                 5

8. The church is contributing to the transformation of this community.
   1                   2                    3                   4                 5

9. The activities of the church within the community have influence on people.
   1                   2                    3                   4                 5

10. What the church is doing in the community can attract people to Jesus.
    1                   2                    3                   4                 5
APPENDIX F1:
Pre-intervention Interview Questions (Community)

1. How easy is it to find a place of convenience (i.e., public toilet) in the community?

2. How easy would it be for people in the community to change their current place of convenience for a public place of convenience?

3. To what extent will the construction of a new public toilet be needed in the community?
APPENDIX F2:
Post-Intervention Interview Questions (Community)

1. Has the newly constructed public toilet come to serve a dire need in the community?

2. How easy will it now be to find a place of convenience (i.e., public toilet) in this community?

3. Would you say that by building the public toilet the church has shown that they love the community?

4. Would you say that when the church gives gifts to people, they show God’s love to the people in the community?

5. Would you say that when the church cleans and takes care of the environment, the show to the community that they care about God’s creation?

6. Would you say that the people in this community see the church as important?

7. Would you say that the church is contributing to the transformation of this community?

8. Is it possible for the activities of the church within the community to have influence on the life of people?

9. Would you say that what the church is doing in the community can attract people to Jesus?
APPENDIX G1: Workshop

Saturday Program Outline

1. Registration of Participants ........................................ 8:00 – 8:30am
2. Opening Prayer ..................................................... 8:30 – 8:35am
3. Quiet Time .............................................................. 8:35 – 8:40am
4. Greetings ............................................................... 8:40 – 8:45am
5. Worship and Praises .................................................. 8:45 – 9:15am
6. Sermon ................................................................. 9:15 – 9:45am
7. Breakfast ................................................................. 9:45 – 10:45am
8. Praises (Song Ministration) ...................................... 10:45 – 11:00am
9. Presentation ............................................................. 11:00 – 1:00pm
10. Discussion .............................................................. 1:00 – 2:00pm
11. Lunch ................................................................. 2:00 – 3:00pm
12. Presentation .......................................................... 3:00 – 5:00pm
13. Discussion ............................................................ 5:00 – 6:00pm
14. Closing Prayer ......................................................... 6:00pm
# Sunday Program Outline

1. Registration of Participants .............................................. 2:00 – 2:30pm
2. Opening Prayer ................................................................. 2:30 – 2:35pm
3. Greetings ........................................................................... 2:35 – 2:40pm
4. Worship and Praises ........................................................... 2:40 – 3:00pm
5. Presentation ........................................................................ 3:00 – 5:00pm
6. Discussion ........................................................................... 5:00 – 6:00pm
7. Dinner .................................................................................. 6:00 – 7:00pm
8. Presentation ........................................................................ 7:00 – 8:00pm
9. Discussion ........................................................................... 8:00 – 9:00pm
10. Closing Prayer ................................................................. 9:00pm
# APPENDIX G2: Project Protocol 2023

## TIME | ACTIVITY | LEADER/REMARKS
--- | --- | ---
10:00am-6:00pm | **Week One Saturday** | Research Team

- **Field Visit to the Case Study Site – Maame Dede in Nsawam – Adoagyiri District.**
- Rehearse how the pre-intervention data on the church will be taken.
- Meeting with the Pastors of the Partner Churches.
- Execution of the Research Agreement.

10:00am-6:00pm | **Week One Sunday** | Research Team

- **Project Commissioning and Pre-Intervention Data Collection**

8:00am-5:00pm | **Pre-Intervention Direct Observation (Church)** | Follow the Pre-Intervention Direct Observation Guidelines in the Research Protocol Document.

- Observe all the Partner Churches: Capture data by taking video and audio recordings. Also take notes from what you observe and bring a program from the church.

- With the aid of the pastor(s) have all congregants seated at the end of the service: (i) Let the Pastor-in-Charge announce to the church their agreement to be part of the project (ii) Explain the role of the church in the project/research (iii) Distribute the pre-intervention Questionnaire (iv) explain it to them in the local dialect (v) direct them to make their responses (vi) collect all the responses (vii) Announce to the church about the workshop and briefly explain

- Make sure all recording gadgets are fully charged and made ready for operation.

- Arrange some Snack (Soft Drinks and meat pies or biscuits) for all the congregants because they will be hungry after staying extra hours to participate in the survey.
how things will be organized (start time, protocol arrangements, registration, presentations, discussions, refreshment, etc.).

Interview the pastors, selected church leaders and some selected members. Capture data by taking video and audio recordings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8:00am – 6:00pm</th>
<th>Week Two Saturday Workshop</th>
<th>Research Team &amp; Resource Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30</td>
<td>Registration of Participants</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-8:35</td>
<td>Opening Prayer</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35-8:40</td>
<td>Quiet Time</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40-8:45</td>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>M.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45-9:15</td>
<td>Praises and Worship</td>
<td>Praises &amp; Worship Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-9:45</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:45</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:00</td>
<td>Praises/Song Ministration</td>
<td>Praises &amp; Worship Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-1:00</td>
<td>Presentation – Paper One</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-2:00</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:00</td>
<td>Presentation – Paper Two</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-6:00</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Closing Prayer</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00pm – 6:00pm</td>
<td>Week Two Sunday Workshop</td>
<td>Research Team &amp; Resource Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:30</td>
<td>Registration of Participants</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-2:35</td>
<td>Opening Prayer</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:35-2:40</td>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>M.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40-3:00</td>
<td>Praises and Worship</td>
<td>Praises &amp; Worship Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:00</td>
<td>Presentation – Paper Three</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-6:00</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-7:00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-8:00</td>
<td>Presentation – Practical One</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formation of Groups</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brief the Groups their participatory</td>
<td>Divide the Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibilities: culinary responsibilities</td>
<td>into Three or Four Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g., each group will be responsible for</td>
<td>with at most 50 adults per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cooking for a particular week), outreach</td>
<td>group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibilities, service leader, praises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and worship, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:00</td>
<td>Group Discussion</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break into Groups</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let each group choose a group name and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their leaders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Closing Prayer</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00am – 6:00pm</td>
<td>Week Three Saturday Workshop</td>
<td>Research Team &amp; Resource Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30</td>
<td>Registration of Participants</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-8:35</td>
<td>Opening Prayer</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Organizer/Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35-8:40</td>
<td>Quiet Time</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40-8:45</td>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>Group 1 (M.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45-9:15</td>
<td>Praises and Worship</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-9:45</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:45</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Group 1 and Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group One (cook and serve tables)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:00</td>
<td>Praises/Song Ministration</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-1:00</td>
<td>Presentation – Paper Four</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-2:00</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:00</td>
<td>Presentation – Practical Two</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying Non-Kingdom Realities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-6:00</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break into Groups</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let each group identify non-kingdom realities (at least two) in the community (i.e., a problem or a situation in the community which does not befit the kingdom of God).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Closing Prayer</td>
<td>Group 1 Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2:00pm – 6:00pm Week Three Sunday Workshop Research Team & Resource Persons

2:00-2:30 Registration of Participants Media & Protocol Team
2:30-2:35 Opening Prayer Group 1
2:35-2:40 Greetings Group 1 (M.C.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:40-3:00</td>
<td>Praises and Worship</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-4:00</td>
<td>Presentation – Paper Five</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:30</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-5:30</td>
<td>Presentation – Paper Six</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30-6:00</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-7:00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-8:30</td>
<td>Presentation – Practical Three</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designing of Intervention (Mini Seed Project)</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:00</td>
<td>Group Discussion</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break into Groups</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let each group design an intervention to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cure the non-kingdom realities they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Components of the Intervention Design:**

(i) Witnessing (e.g., house-to-house witnessing)

(ii) Ministry of Mercy (e.g., giving out clothes as gifts to people)

(iii) Serving People (e.g., fetching water for an old lady)

(iv) Community Work (e.g., clearing a major footpath in the community)

<p>| 9:00         | Closing Prayer                             | Pastor                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00am –</td>
<td><strong>Week Four Saturday Workshop</strong></td>
<td>Research Team &amp; Resource Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30</td>
<td>Registration of Participants</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-8:35</td>
<td>Opening Prayer</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35-8:40</td>
<td>Quiet Time</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40-8:45</td>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>Group 2 (M.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45-9:15</td>
<td>Praises and Worship</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-9:45</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:45</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Group 2 and Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Two (cook and serve tables)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:00</td>
<td>Praises/Song Ministration</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-1:00</td>
<td>Presentation – Practical Four</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Presentation of Designed Intervention (Mini Projects) for Vetting</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Four Pastors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let each group present their mini seed project (MSP) for vetting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Research Team and the four Pastors will serve as the panel of judges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select the best mini seed project (MSP) to be adopted and modified for implementation in the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Combined Discussion

**Modification of the Selected Mini Seed Project (MSP)**

Lead the groups (all the groups together) to review (additions, improvement, etc.) the selected mini seed project (MSP) for implementation in the community.

**Components of the Modified MSP:**

(i) Witnessing (e.g., house-to-house witnessing)

(ii) Ministry of Mercy (e.g., giving out clothes as gifts to people)

(iii) Serving People (e.g., fetching water for an old lady)

(iv) Community Work (e.g., clearing a major footpath in the community)

| 1:00-2:00 | Lunch | Resource Person
|           |       | Research Team
|           |       | Group Leaders

| 2:00-3:00 | Group 2 and Media & Protocol Team |

| 3:00-5:00 | Resource Person Research Team Group Leaders |

**Presentation – Practical Five**

**Further Modification of the Selected Mini Seed Project (MSP) and Mobilization Plan**

Lead participants to list items that may be needed for the implementation of the selected mini seed project.
| 5:00-6:00 | Combined Discussion  
Mobilization of Resources |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let participants improve on the list of items and resources needed to implement the selected and modified mini seed project (MSP) in the community (try to list everything, whether little or big, that may be needed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add quantities needed to the listed items (where possible).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add unit price to the listed items (where possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ask participants to indicate which of the listed items they can provide from their own resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6:00 | Closing Prayer | Group 2 Leader |

| 2:00pm – 6:00pm | Week Four Sunday Workshop | Research Team  
Resource Persons  
Group Leaders |

<p>| 2:00-2:30 | Registration of Participants | Media &amp; Protocol Team |
| 2:30-2:35 | Opening Prayer | Group 2 |
| 2:35-2:40 | Greetings | Group 2 (M.C.) |
| 2:40-3:00 | Praises and Worship | Group 2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:00</td>
<td><strong>Presentation – Practical Six</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Organizing for Implementation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lead participants to identify areas that they may need to be responsible for or in-charge.&lt;br&gt;Lead participants to nominate people to be made responsible or in-charge of some areas or roles.&lt;br&gt;Allow participants to volunteer to take some responsibilities.&lt;br&gt;Form some committees and subcommittees for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-6:00</td>
<td><strong>Combined Discussion</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Further Organization for Implementation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Finalize the implementation plan; include time and monitoring controls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-7:00</td>
<td><strong>Dinner</strong>&lt;br&gt;Group 2 and Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-8:30</td>
<td><strong>Presentation – Practical Seven</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Measuring the Impact of Intervention</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lead participants to identify indicators that may signal change, improvement, etc., or otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:00</td>
<td><strong>Combined Discussion</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Announcement of Implementation Plan</strong>&lt;br&gt;Clearly brief the house how the plan will be rolled out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td><strong>Closing Prayer</strong>&lt;br&gt;Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00am-6:00pm</td>
<td><strong>Week Five Saturday</strong>&lt;br&gt;Initial Assessment before the Implementation of Intervention and Implementation of Intervention in the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30</td>
<td>Registration of Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-8:35</td>
<td>Opening Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35-8:40</td>
<td>Quiet Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40-8:45</td>
<td><strong>Greetings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45-9:15</td>
<td>Praises &amp; Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-9:45</td>
<td><strong>Sermon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:45</td>
<td>Breakfast&lt;br&gt;Group Three (cook and serve tables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:00</td>
<td>Praises/Song Ministration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation – Practical Eight

Pre-Intervention Community Data Collection

Select Some of the Participants to add to the Data Collection team and Lead them Out to the Community to Observe and Measure the Condition of the Community with Respect to the Aspects of the Community Life That Was Identified and Addressed in the Selected and Modified MSP.

Thus, the non-kingdom realities that need the light of Christ to be Transformed will be assessed/measured before the intervention is applied.

Use the three research methods (direct observation, survey, and interview) to assess/measure the condition of the community before the application of the intervention.

Organize participants in the best way to complete the assessment in the shortest possible time:

1. Select some of the participants to go out with the Research Team to do the community assessment.

2. Leave the rest at the meeting grounds to continue with the mobilization of resources and other preparations needed to be done for the implementation of the intervention. [AT LEAST ONE OR TWO OF THE RESEARCH TEAM MEMBERS SHOULD BE LEFT BEHIND TO SUPERVISE]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Team/Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:50-2:00</td>
<td>RETURN TO MEETING GROUNDS FOR LUNCH</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Group 3 and Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3:00-5:50| **Presentation – Practical Nine**<br>Implementation of the Selected and Modified Mini Seed Project (MSP) in the Community.  
 Lead participants to apply intervention in the community according to the Implementation Plan. | Resource Person, Research Team, Group Leaders, Pastors/Leaders |
| 5:50-6:00| RETURN TO MEETING GROUNDS                                                | Research Team                                            |
| 6:00     | Closing Prayer                                                            | Group 3 Leader                                            |
| 2:00pm – 7:15pm | **Week Five Sunday Workshop**  
 2:00-2:30 | Registration of Participants                                              | Media & Protocol Team                                     |
|          |                                                                           |                                                           |
|          |                                                                           |                                                           |
|          |                                                                           |                                                           |
|          |                                                                           |                                                           |
|          |                                                                           |                                                           |
| 2:40-3:00| Praises and Worship                                                       | Group 3                                                   |
| 3:00-5:50| **Presentation – Practical Ten**<br>Implementation of the Selected and Modified Mini Seed Project (MSP) in the Community.  
 Lead participants to apply intervention in the community according to the Implementation Plan. | Resource Person, Research Team, Group Leaders, Pastors/Leaders |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:50-6:00</td>
<td>RETURN TO MEETING GROUNDS FOR DINNER</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-7:00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Group 3 and Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-7:15</td>
<td>ANNOUNCEMENT</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>Closing Prayer</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00am-6:00pm</td>
<td><strong>Week Six Saturday</strong></td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of Intervention in the Community</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30</td>
<td>Registration of Participants</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-8:35</td>
<td>Opening Prayer</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35-8:40</td>
<td>Quiet Time</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40-8:45</td>
<td><strong>Greetings</strong></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45-9:15</td>
<td>Praises &amp; Worship</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-9:45</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:45</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Group 1 and Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Three (cook and serve tables)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:00</td>
<td>Praises/Song Ministration</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-1:50</td>
<td><strong>Presentation – Practical Eleven</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Application of Intervention in the Community</strong>&lt;br&gt;[Implementation of the Selected and Modified Mini Seed Project (MSP) in the Community]</td>
<td>Resource Person&lt;br&gt;Research Team&lt;br&gt;Group Leaders&lt;br&gt;Pastors/Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead participants to apply intervention in the community according to the Implementation Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50-2:00</td>
<td><strong>RETURN TO MEETING GROUNDS FOR LUNCH</strong></td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td>Group 1 and Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:50</td>
<td><strong>Presentation – Practical Twelve</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Implementation of the Selected and Modified Mini Seed Project (MSP) in the Community.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lead participants to apply intervention in the community according to the Implementation Plan.</td>
<td>Resource Person&lt;br&gt;Research Team&lt;br&gt;Group Leaders&lt;br&gt;Pastors/Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:50-6:00</td>
<td><strong>RETURN TO MEETING GROUNDS</strong></td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td><strong>Closing Prayer</strong></td>
<td>Group 1 Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00pm – 7:15pm</td>
<td><strong>Week Six Sunday Workshop</strong></td>
<td>Research Team&lt;br&gt;Resource Persons&lt;br&gt;Group Leaders&lt;br&gt;Pastors/Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:30</td>
<td><strong>Registration of Participants</strong></td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-2:35</td>
<td><strong>Opening Prayer</strong></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:35-2:40</td>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>Group 1 (M.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40-3:00</td>
<td>Praises and Worship</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3:00-5:50    | Presentation – Practical Fourteen Implementation of the Selected and Modified Mini Seed Project (MSP) in the Community.  
Lead participants to apply intervention in the community according to the Implementation Plan. | Resource Person  
Research Team  
Group Leaders  
Pastors/Leaders |
| 5:50-6:00    | RETURN TO MEETING GROUNDS FOR DINNER                                               | Research Team                          |
| 6:00-7:00    | Dinner                                                                             | Group 1 and Media & Protocol Team      |
| 7:00-7:15    | ANNOUNCEMENT                                                                       | Research Team                          |
| 7:15         | Closing Prayer                                                                      | Group 1                                |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:00am-6:00pm| Week Seven Saturday Implementation of Intervention in the Community               | Research Team  
Resource Person  
Group Leaders  
Pastors/Leaders |
<p>| 8:00-8:30    | Registration of Participants                                                       | Media &amp; Protocol Team                  |
| 8:30-8:35    | Opening Prayer                                                                     | Group 2                                |
| 8:35-8:40    | Quiet Time                                                                          | Group 2                                |
| 8:40-8:45    | Greetings                                                                          | Group 2                                |
| 8:45-9:15    | Praises &amp; Worship                                                                   | Group 2                                |
| 9:15-9:45    | Sermon                                                                              | Pastor                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:45</td>
<td>Breakfast Group Three (cook and serve tables)</td>
<td>Group 2 and Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:00</td>
<td>Praises/Song Ministration</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:00</td>
<td>Presentation – Practical Fifteen</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:50</td>
<td>Application of Intervention in the Community</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:50</td>
<td>[Implementation of the Selected and Modified Mini Seed Project (MSP) in the Community]</td>
<td>Group Leaders Pastors/Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50-2:00</td>
<td>RETURN TO MEETING GROUNDS FOR LUNCH</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Group 2 and Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:50</td>
<td>Presentation – Practical Sixteen</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:50</td>
<td>Implementation of the Selected and Modified Mini Seed Project (MSP) in the Community</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:50</td>
<td>Lead participants to apply intervention in the community according to the Implementation Plan.</td>
<td>Group Leaders Pastors/Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:50-6:00</td>
<td>RETURN TO MEETING GROUNDS</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Closing Prayer</td>
<td>Group 2 Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00pm – 7:15pm</td>
<td><strong>Week Seven Sunday Workshop</strong></td>
<td>Research Team, Resource Persons, Group Leaders, Pastors/Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:30</td>
<td>Registration of Participants</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-2:35</td>
<td>Opening Prayer</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:35-2:40</td>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>Group 2 (M.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40-3:00</td>
<td>Praises and Worship</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:50</td>
<td><strong>Presentation – Practical Seventeen Implementation of the Selected and Modified Mini Seed Project (MSP) in the Community.</strong> Lead participants to apply intervention in the community according to the Implementation Plan.</td>
<td>Resource Person, Research Team, Group Leaders, Pastors/Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:50-6:00</td>
<td>RETURN TO MEETING GROUNDS FOR DINNER</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-7:00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Group 2 and Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-7:15</td>
<td>ANNOUNCEMENT</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>Closing Prayer</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00am-6:00pm</td>
<td>Week Eight Saturday Post Implementation Assessment</td>
<td>Research Team, Resource Person, Group Leaders, Pastors/Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30</td>
<td>Registration of Participants</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-8:35</td>
<td>Opening Prayer</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:35-8:40</td>
<td>Quiet Time</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40-8:45</td>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45-9:15</td>
<td>Praises &amp; Worship</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-9:45</td>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:45</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Group 3 and Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-11:00</td>
<td>Praises/Song Ministration</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11:00-1:50| **Presentation – Practical Eighteen**  
**Final Assessment – After the Implementation of Intervention in the Community**  
**Lead Participants Out to the Community to Observe and Measure the Condition of the Community (after the application of intervention) with Respect to the Aspects of the Community Life That Was Identified and Addressed in the Selected and Modified MSP.**  
Use the three research methods (direct observation, survey, and interview) to assess/measure the condition of the community before the application of the intervention.  
Organize participants in the best way to complete the assessment in the shortest possible time. | Resource Person  
Research Team  
Group Leaders  
Pastors/Leaders |
<p>| 1:50-2:00 | <strong>RETURN TO MEETING GROUNDS FOR LUNCH</strong>                                    | Research Team                                      |
| 2:00-3:00 | Lunch                                                                    | Group 3 and Media &amp; Protocol Team                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:50</td>
<td>Presentation – Practical Nineteen Final Assessment – After the Implementation of Intervention in the Church Use the research methods (survey and interview) to assess/measure the condition of the church after the application of the intervention. Organize participants in the best way to complete the assessment in the shortest possible time. Let all participants get seated: (i) Distribute the Post-intervention Questionnaire (ii) explain it to them in the local dialect (iii) direct them to make their responses (iv) collect all the responses. (v) interview all the pastors, Church leaders, and Group leaders using the Post-intervention Interview Questions.</td>
<td>Resource Person Research Team Group Leaders Pastors/Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:50-6:00</td>
<td>Vote of Thanks</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Closing Prayer</td>
<td>Group 3 Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00pm – 7:15pm</td>
<td>Week Eight Sunday Workshop</td>
<td>Research Team Resource Persons Group Leaders Pastors/Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:30</td>
<td>Registration of Participants</td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-2:35</td>
<td>Opening Prayer</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:35-2:40</td>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>Group 3 (M.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40-3:00</td>
<td>Praises and Worship</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:50</td>
<td>Presentation – Practical Twenty</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUTREACH</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing the Gospel</td>
<td>Group Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lead participants to share the gospel in the community.</td>
<td>Pastors/Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:50-6:00</td>
<td>RETURN TO MEETING GROUNDS FOR DINNER</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-7:00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Group 3 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media &amp; Protocol Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-7:15</td>
<td>ANNOUNCEMENT</td>
<td>Research Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>Closing Prayer</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4.8.1 JESUS MISSION *PRE- & POST INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE COMPARED*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE ((\text{PRE } a_V^{sm}))</th>
<th>POST-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE ((\text{POST } a_V^{sm}))</th>
<th>CHANGE IN SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE ((\Delta a_V^{sm}) = (\text{POST } a_V^{sm}) - (\text{PRE } a_V^{sm}))</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? ((\text{PORT Q1}))</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>+3.67</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average ((\Delta a_V^{sm})) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? ((\text{PORT Q2}))</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>+2.78</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average ((\Delta a_V^{sm})) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? ((\text{PORT Q3}))</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>+2.90</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average ((\Delta a_V^{sm})) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>+2.00</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>PORT Q4</td>
<td>PORT Q5</td>
<td>((\Delta \mathbf{a}_{Vsm})) implies transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>+3.50</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average ((\Delta \mathbf{a}_{Vsm})) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{5} \mathbf{a}_{Vsm} = 7.54
\]

\[
LKG = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{5} \mathbf{a}_{Vsm}}{n}
\]

\(n = \text{number of supporting research questions} = 5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LKG</th>
<th>PORT Q5</th>
<th>PORT Q5</th>
<th>((\Delta \mathbf{a}_{Vsm})) implies transformation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.508</td>
<td>4.538</td>
<td>+3.030</td>
<td>Positive change in the Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</td>
<td>PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE (PRE $aV_{sm}$)</td>
<td>POST-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE (POST $aV_{sm}$)</td>
<td>CHANGE IN SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE ($\Delta aV_{sm}$) = (POST $aV_{sm}$) - (PRE $aV_{sm}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>+2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>+3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>+2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>+1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?  
(PORT Q5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>4.00</th>
<th>+3.00</th>
<th>Positive change in the survey matrix average $(\Delta aV_{sm})$ implies transformation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sum_{n=1}^{n=5} (aV_{sm})$</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$LKG = \dfrac{\sum_{n=1}^{n=5} (aV_{sm})}{n}$, $n = \text{number of supporting research questions} = 5$</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>4.178</td>
<td>+2.534</td>
<td>Positive change in the Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</td>
<td>PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE (PRE $a_{vm}$)</td>
<td>POST-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE (POST $a_{vm}$)</td>
<td>CHANGE IN SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE ($\Delta a_{vm}$) = (POST $a_{vm}$) - (PRE $a_{vm}$)</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>+4.00</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average ($\Delta a_{vm}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>+2.15</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average ($\Delta a_{vm}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>+2.80</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average ($\Delta a_{vm}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community?</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average ($\Delta a_{vm}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(PORT Q5)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ n=5 ] [ \sum_{n=1}^{\text{(a\text{(Vsm)}}} ]</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{LKG} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{5}(a_{Vsm})}{n} \]

\[ n = \text{number of supporting research questions} = 5 \]

Positive change in the Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG) implies transformation.

\[ \Delta a_{V_{sm}} \text{ implies transformation} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE (PRE $a_{sm}$)</th>
<th>POST-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE (POST $a_{sm}$)</th>
<th>CHANGE IN SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE ($\Delta a_{sm}$) = (POST $a_{sm}$) - (PRE $a_{sm}$)</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>+3.33</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average($\Delta a_{sm}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>+2.69</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average($\Delta a_{sm}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>+2.80</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average($\Delta a_{sm}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community?</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>+2.50</td>
<td>Positive change in the survey matrix average($\Delta a_{sm}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PORT Q4**

| Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective? | 2.00 | 4.50 | +2.50 | Positive change in the survey matrix average($\Delta \mathbf{aV}_{sm}$) implies transformation |

| \[ \sum_{n=1}^{5} (\mathbf{aV}_{sm}) \] | 8.91 | 22.73 |

| LKG = \[ \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{5} (\mathbf{aV}_{sm})}{n} \] | 1.782 | 4.546 | +2.764 | Positive change in the Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG) implies transformation |

$n = \text{number of supporting research questions} = 5$
### TABLE 5.1.1A JESUS MISSION ***PRE-INTERVENTION ALL DATA PROCESSING** *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE ((\text{PRE} , aV_{sm}))</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION INTERVIEW MATRIX AVERAGE ((\text{PRE} , aV_{im}))</th>
<th>DIRECT OBSERVATION ADJUSTMENT ((a_{do}))</th>
<th>ALL-DATA PRE-INTERVENTION AVERAGE ((aV_{sid}) = 1/3[(\text{PRE} , aV_{sm}) + (\text{PRE} , aV_{im}) + (a_{do})])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? ((\text{PORT Q1}))</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.464</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? ((\text{PORT Q2}))</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? ((\text{PORT Q3}))</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community?</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.165</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{n=5} (aV_{sid})
\]

LKG\textsubscript{initial} = \[ \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{n=5} (aV_{sid})}{n} \]

n = number of supporting research questions = 5

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.330</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.1.1B Jesus Mission ***Post-Intervention All Data Processing***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Research Questions (Indicators)</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention Survey Matrix Average (Pre $a_{sv}$)</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention Interview Matrix Average (Pre $a_{vim}$)</th>
<th>Direct Observation Adjustment ($a_{do}$)</th>
<th>All Data Pre-Intervention Average ($a_{sid}$) = $\frac{1}{3} [(\text{Pre } a_{sv}) + (\text{Pre } a_{vim}) + (a_{do})]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community? (PORT Q4)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the church partner with other churches,</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?

(PORT Q5)

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{5} (a_{v\text{sid}}) \\
= 22.80
\]

\[
\text{LKG}_{\text{final}} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{5} (a_{v\text{sid}})}{n},
\]

\begin{align*}
n &= \text{number of supporting research questions} = 5 \\
&= 4.56
\end{align*}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE ((\text{PRE} \ aV_{sm}))</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION INTERVIEW MATRIX AVERAGE ((\text{PRE} \ aV_{im}))</th>
<th>DIRECT OBSERVATION ADJUSTMENT ((a_{do}))</th>
<th>ALL DATA PRE-INTERVENTION AVERAGE ((aV_{sid}) = \frac{1}{3}(\text{PRE} \ aV_{sm} + (\text{PRE} \ aV_{im}) + (a_{do})))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.780</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community? (PORT Q4)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the church partner with other churches,</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?

(PORT Q5)

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{n=1}^{n=5} (av_{sid}) \\
\text{LKG}_{\text{initial}} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{n=5} (av_{sid})}{n}
\end{align*}
\]

\[n = \text{number of supporting research questions} = 5\]
### TABLE 5.1.2B AWAKE CHAPEL ***POST-INTERVENTION ALL DATA PROCESSING*** *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE ((PRE \text{ AV}_{sm}))</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION INTERVIEW MATRIX AVERAGE ((PRE \text{ AV}_{im}))</th>
<th>DIRECT OBSERVATION ADJUSTMENT ((a_{do}))</th>
<th>ALL DATA PRE-INTERVENTION AVERAGE ((a_{sid}) = \frac{1}{3} ((PRE \text{ AV}<em>{sm}) + (PRE \text{ AV}</em>{im}) + (a_{do})))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.300</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community? (PORT Q4)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the church partner with other churches,</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?

(PORT Q5)

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{5} (a_{v,sid})
\]

\[
\text{LKG}_{\text{final}} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{5} (a_{v,sid})}{n}
\]

\[
\text{n} = \text{number of supporting research questions} = 5
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n=5)</th>
<th>(\sum (a_{v,sid}))</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(\text{LKG}_{\text{final}})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE (PRE $a_{sm}$)</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION INTERVIEW MATRIX AVERAGE (PRE $a_{im}$)</th>
<th>DIRECT OBSERVATION ADJUSTMENT ($a_{do}$)</th>
<th>ALL DATA PRE-INTERVENTION AVERAGE ($a_{sid}$) = $1/3[(\text{PRE }a_{sm})+(\text{PRE }a_{im})+(a_{do})]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community? (PORT Q4)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the church partner with other churches,</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?

(PORT Q5)

\[ \sum_{n=1}^{5} \text{avsid} \]

\[
LKG_{\text{initial}} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{5} \text{avsid}}{n}
\]

\( n = \text{number of supporting research questions} = 5 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n = 5 )</th>
<th>( \sum_{n=1}^{5} (\text{avsid}) )</th>
<th>6.60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( LKG_{\text{initial}} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{5} \text{avsid}}{n} )</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 5.1.3B APOSTOLIC ***POST-INTERVENTION ALL DATA PROCESSING***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE (PRE $aV_{sm}$)</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION INTERVIEW MATRIX AVERAGE (PRE $aV_{im}$)</th>
<th>DIRECT OBSERVATION ADJUSTMENT ($a_{do}$)</th>
<th>ALL DATA PRE-INTERVENTION AVERAGE ($aV_{sid}$) = $\frac{1}{3}[(PRE aV_{sm}) + (PRE aV_{im}) + (a_{do})]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.833</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community? (PORT Q4)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the church partner with other churches,</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?

(PORT Q5)

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{n=5} (av_{sid})
\]

\[
LKG_{final} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{n=5} (av_{sid})}{n}
\]

\(n = \text{number of supporting research questions} = 5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n=5)</th>
<th>(\sum_{n=1} (av_{sid}))</th>
<th>22.30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</td>
<td>PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE (PRE $a_{sm}$)</td>
<td>PRE-INTERVENTION INTERVIEW MATRIX AVERAGE (PRE $a_{im}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community? (PORT Q4)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the church partner with other churches,</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?

(PORT Q5)

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{5} (av_{sid})
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{LKG}_{\text{initial}} = \\
\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{5} (av_{sid})}{n}
\end{array}
\]

\(n = \text{number of supporting research questions} = 5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n=5)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[\sum_{n=1}^{5} (av_{sid})]</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{5} (av_{sid})}{n}]</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5.1.4B CEM ***POST-INTERVENTION ALL DATA PROCESSING** *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY MATRIX AVERAGE (PRE $a_{sm}$)</th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION INTERVIEW MATRIX AVERAGE (PRE $a_{im}$)</th>
<th>DIRECT OBSERVATION ADJUSTMENT ($a_{do}$)</th>
<th>ALL DATA PRE-INTERVENTION AVERAGE ($a_{sid}$) = $1/3[(PRE a_{sm})+ (PRE a_{im})+ (a_{do})]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.833</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community? (PORT Q4)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the church partner with other churches,</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?

(PORT Q5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n=5 \sum_{n=1}^{5} (a_{vsid}) )</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>22.48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\[
\text{LKG}_{\text{final}} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{5} (a_{vsid})}{n},
\]

\( n \) = number of supporting research questions = 5

| \( \text{LKG}_{\text{final}} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{5} (a_{vsid})}{n} \) | | 4.50 |
### TABLE 5.2A COMMUNITY PRE-INTERVENTION SURVEY AND INTERVIEW DATA AVERAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Assigned Magnitude to Each Survey Question ($M_s$)</th>
<th>Interview Question Average ($\text{av}_{i_q}$)</th>
<th>Total $= (M_s) + (\text{av}_{i_q})$</th>
<th>Community All-Data Average $(\text{av}<em>{si}) = \frac{1}{2}(M_s) + (\text{av}</em>{i_q})$</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How easy is it to find a place of convenience (i.e. public toilet) in the community?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00/2=1.00</td>
<td>Majority of respondents indicated that it was “very difficult” to find a place of convenience in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How easy would it be for people in the community to change their current place of convenience for a public place of convenience?</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00/2=5.00</td>
<td>Majority of respondents indicated that it would be “very easy” for the people to stop open defecation in bushes to use a public toilet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent will the construction of a new public toilet be needed in the community?</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00/2=15.00</td>
<td>Majority of respondents indicated that a public toilet was “extremely needed” in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS</td>
<td>ASSIGNED MAGNITUDE TO EACH SURVEY QUESTION (MS)</td>
<td>INTERVIEW QUESTION AVERAGE (AVIQ)</td>
<td>TOTAL = [(MS) + (AVIQ)]</td>
<td>COMMUNITY ALL-DATA AVERAGE (AVSI) = ½[(MS) + (AVIQ)]</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. IT IS EASY TO FIND A PLACE OF CONVENIENCE (I.E., PUBLIC TOILET) IN THE COMMUNITY.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00/2=5.0</td>
<td>MAJORITY OF RESPONDENTS INDICATED THAT IT WAS NOW “VERY EASY” TO FIND A PLACE OF CONVENIENCE IN THE COMMUNITY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. THE NEWLY CONSTRUCTED PUBLIC TOILET HAS COME TO SERVE A DIRE NEED IN THE COMMUNITY</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00/2=5.0</td>
<td>MAJORITY OF RESPONDENTS INDICATED THAT THEY “STRONGLY AGREE” TO THE STATEMENT THAT THE NEWLY CONSTRUCTED PUBLIC TOILET HAS COME TO SERVE A DIRE NEED IN THE COMMUNITY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BY BUILDING THE PUBLIC TOILET THE CHURCH HAS SHOWN THAT THEY LOVE THE COMMUNITY</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00/2=5.0</td>
<td>MAJORITY OF RESPONDENTS INDICATED THAT THEY “STRONGLY AGREE” TO THE STATEMENT THAT THE CHURCH HAS SHOWN THAT THEY LOVE THE COMMUNITY BY CONSTRUCTING A PUBLIC TOILET IN THE COMMUNITY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. THE CHURCH DOES NOT ONLY TALK ABOUT JESUS BUT ALSO, WE SEE THEM</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00/2=5.0</td>
<td>MAJORITY OF RESPONDENTS INDICATED THAT THEY “STRONGLY AGREE” TO THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2SD</td>
<td>Majority of Respondents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOING SOME OF WHAT JESUS WOULD HAVE DONE FOR THE COMMUNITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WE SOMETIMES SEE THE CHURCH GIVING GIFTS TO PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. WE SOMETIMES SEE THE CHURCH CLEANING AND TAKING CARE OF THE ENVIRONMENT TO SHOW TO THE COMMUNITY THAT THEY CARE ABOUT GOD’S CREATION.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. THE PEOPLE IN THIS COMMUNITY SEE THE CHURCH AS IMPORTANT.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. THE CHURCH IS CONTRIBUTING TO THE TRANSFORMATION OF THIS</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activities of the church in the community have influence on people.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00/2=5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of respondents indicated that they “strongly agree” to the statement that the activities of the church have influence on the people in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What the church is doing in the community can attract people to Jesus</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00/2=5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of respondents indicated that they “strongly agree” to the statement that what the church is doing in the community can attract people to Jesus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K:
Church All-Data Comparative Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</th>
<th>ALL DATA PRE-INTERVENTION AVERAGE (PRE $\text{av}_{\text{sia}}$)</th>
<th>ALL DATA POST-INTERVENTION AVERAGE (POST $\text{av}_{\text{sia}}$)</th>
<th>CHANGE IN ALL DATA AVERAGE ($\Delta \text{av}<em>{\text{sia}}$) = (POST $\text{av}</em>{\text{sia}}$) (PRE $\text{av}_{\text{sia}}$)</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>+3.47</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average $\text{av}_{\text{sia}}$ implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>+3.39</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average $\text{av}_{\text{sia}}$ implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>+3.09</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average $\text{av}_{\text{sia}}$ implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>+2.44</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average $\text{av}_{\text{sia}}$ implies transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the community?  
(PORT Q4)  

| Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?  
(PORT Q5) | 1.94 | 4.67 | +2.73 | Positive change in the All-Data Average  
(a\text{sid}) \text{ implies transformation} |
|---|---|---|---|---|

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{5} (a_{\text{sid}}) \quad 7.68 \quad 22.80
\]

LKG = \[ \sum_{n=1}^{5} \left( \frac{n}{n} \right) \]

\( n \) = number of supporting research questions = 5

LKG\_\text{initial} = 1.54  
LKG\_\text{final} = 4.56  
(\Delta \text{ LKG}) = +3.02  
Positive change in the Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG) implies transformation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</th>
<th>ALL DATA PRE-INTERVENTION AVERAGE (PRE $\text{av}_{\text{sid}}$)</th>
<th>ALL DATA POST-INTERVENTION AVERAGE (POST $\text{av}_{\text{sid}}$)</th>
<th>CHANGE IN ALL DATA AVERAGE ($\Delta \text{av}<em>{\text{sid}} = (\text{POST } \text{av}</em>{\text{sid}}) - (\text{PRE } \text{av}_{\text{sid}})$)</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>+2.99</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average ($\text{av}_{\text{sid}}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>+3.10</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average ($\text{av}_{\text{sid}}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>+2.89</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average ($\text{av}_{\text{sid}}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community?</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>+2.28</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average ($\text{av}_{\text{sid}}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PORT Q4)</td>
<td>Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.39 4.67 +3.28 Positive change in the All-Data Average $(\text{av}_{\text{sid}})$ implies transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n=5$</th>
<th>$\sum_{n=1}^{n} (\text{av}_{\text{sid}})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>21.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{LKG} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{n} (\text{av}_{\text{sid}})}{n}, \quad n = \text{number of supporting research questions} = 5
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LKG\text{initial} = 1.44</th>
<th>LKG\text{final} = 4.35</th>
<th>$(\Delta \text{LKG}) = +2.91$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive change in the Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG) implies transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</td>
<td>ALL DATA PRE-INTERVENTION AVERAGE (PRE $a_{vid}$)</td>
<td>ALL DATA POST-INTERVENTION AVERAGE (POST $a_{vid}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community? (PORT Q4)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective? (PORT Q5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n=5</th>
<th>∑ (aVs(id))</th>
<th>n=1</th>
<th>6.60</th>
<th>22.30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LKG = (∑n=5 aVs(id)) / n</td>
<td>LKG_initial = 1.32</td>
<td>LKG_final = 4.46</td>
<td>(Δ LKG) = +3.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = number of supporting research questions = 5</td>
<td>Positive change in the Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG) implies transformation</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average (aVsd) implies transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5.3.4 CEM ***PRE- & POST INTERVENTION ALL-DATA AVERAGE COMPARED***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTING RESEARCH QUESTIONS (INDICATORS)</th>
<th>ALL DATA PRE-INTERVENTION AVERAGE (PRE $a_{\text{sid}}$)</th>
<th>ALL DATA POST-INTERVENTION AVERAGE (POST $a_{\text{sid}}$)</th>
<th>CHANGE IN ALL DATA AVERAGE ($\Delta a_{\text{sid}} = (\text{POST } a_{\text{sid}}) - (\text{PRE } a_{\text{sid}})$)</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the church involve herself in social services in the community? (PORT Q1)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>+3.38</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average ($a_{\text{sid}}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does understanding the kingdom of God point the church to externally focused ministry? (PORT Q2)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>+3.22</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average ($a_{\text{sid}}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the life together of the community of faith portray a peculiar people? (PORT Q3)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>+2.87</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average ($a_{\text{sid}}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community see the church as indispensable to the development of the community? (PORT Q4)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>+2.98</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average ($a_{\text{sid}}$) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the church partner with other churches, even those in different denominations, for the purpose of achieving a kingdom objective? (PORT Q5)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>+3.00</td>
<td>Positive change in the All-Data Average ((\text{av}_{\text{sid}})) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n=5 \sum_{n=1} \left( \text{av}_{\text{sid}} \right) \]

\[ \text{LKG} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{5} \left( \text{av}_{\text{sid}} \right)}{n} \]

\( n \) = number of supporting research questions = 5

\( \text{LKG}_{\text{initial}} = 1.41 \)

\( \text{LKG}_{\text{final}} = 4.50 \)

\( (\Delta \text{LKG}) = +3.09 \)

Positive change in the Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG) implies transformation.
APPENDIX L:
Overview of Churches’ Understanding of the Kingdom of God

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF CHURCH</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG$_{initial}$)</th>
<th>Post-Intervention Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG$_{final}$)</th>
<th>Change in Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God ($\Delta$ LKG) = (LKG$<em>{final}$ - LKG$</em>{initial}$)</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JESUS MISSION CHURCH (JM)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>+3.02</td>
<td>Positive change in the Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWAKE CHAPEL INTERNATIONAL CHURCH (AC)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>+2.91</td>
<td>Positive change in the Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOSTOLIC CHURCH - GHANA (ACG)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>+3.14</td>
<td>Positive change in the Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARISMATIC EVANGELISTIC MINISTRY (CEM)</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>+3.09</td>
<td>Positive change in the Level of Understanding of the Kingdom of God (LKG) implies transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


