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The Background

- In a recent study, Bill Day presented a definition of a healthy church which revealed that 89% of Southern Baptist Churches are plateaued or declining.

- One may conclude that most Southern Baptist Churches are in need of revitalization.
Church planting seems to be an effective method for reaching the unchurched.

A sponsor church is crucial for a church plant.

Often, though, a potential sponsor church wonders whether they are capable of sponsoring a church plant.
The contention of the researcher is that sponsoring new church plants results in corresponding growth in the sponsoring church, and church planting sponsorship should be considered a viable means of church revitalization.
The research problem was to analyze the impact of planting new churches on the sponsoring churches. Research was conducted by means of a statistical analysis of sample churches which sponsored a new church plant in 1999.
The Importance of the Study

1. A controlled, scientific analysis of current data would provide a more concrete theory of church revitalization by means of church planting sponsorship.

2. The results could be used on the field to aid pastors and church planters to make informed decisions about sponsorship of a church plant.
The State of Research

- This study examined church revitalization from a scientific perspective.
- An abundance of resources exist which focus on church revitalization; however, while the authors sometimes use surveys, their work lacks rigorous scientific methodology.
- Due to the limited scientific resources in the field of church revitalization, an examination of a parallel field was deemed worthwhile.
- Since church revitalization has roots in the Church Growth Movement, the researcher conducted a summary of church growth.
In 1962, William Petersen noted that religious research in the United States engaged few social scientists.

The first scientific study published in the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* related to church growth was Jon Alston’s article noting the decline of several denominations in America.
Beginnings of the Church Growth Movement

- The Modern Church Growth Movement began in 1955 with the publication of Donald McGravran’s book *The Bridges of God*.

- A significant contribution of *The Bridges of God* is the methodological approach of social-scientific analysis to increase effectiveness in mission strategy.
Understanding Church Growth

- Presented a refined theory of church growth.
- A defense and explanation of the field of Church Growth.
- His purpose was to communicate that establishing churches is pleasing to God, and demographic and sociographic data are helpful in this endeavor.
- An underlying purpose of the book was to foster greater mission activity to the masses.
In 1981, C. Peter Wagner published the book *Church Growth and the Whole Gospel*, which thrust him into the spotlight as a potential successor to McGavran.

His subsequent fascination with the world of spiritual power and its implications for church growth marginalized his influence on the Church Growth Movement.
Current Research

1. Methods and Models
2. Leadership
3. Measuring Growth and Decline in Local Churches and Denominations
4. Revitalization
5. Church Planting
Methods and Models

- Since the early 1990s, most of the church growth literature had to do with methods of church growth and models of church growth.

- Two major books were written by Rick Warren and Lee Strobel.
Rick Warren, *Purpose Driven Church*

- Described the methods Saddleback Community Church utilized to grow to mega-church status.
Lee Strobel, *Inside the Mind of Unchurched Harry & Mary*

- Described the methods Willow Creek Community Church utilized to grow to mega-church status.
Leadership

- Leighton Ford, *Transforming Leadership*
- Aubrey Malphurs, *Values Driven Leadership*
- Calvin Miller, *The Empowered Leader*
- Thom Rainer, *Breakout Churches*
Measuring Growth and Decline in Local Churches and Denominations

Dean M. Kelley, *Why Conservative Churches Are Growing*

- Perhaps the first scientifically based church growth study of denominations within the United States.
- Documented the decline of the major mainstream denominations while conservative churches simultaneously were experiencing growth.
Revitalization

- Stephen Macchia, *Becoming a Healthy Church: 10 Characteristics*
- Mark Dever, *Nine Marks of a Healthy Church*
- Robert Cueni, *Dinosaur Heart Transplants: Renewing Mainline Congregations*
- Ronald Richardson, *Creating a Healthier Church: Family Systems Theory, Leadership, and Congregational Life*
Revitalization

- Macchia suggested healthy churches exhibited ten characteristics. The characteristics were based on his analysis of one hundred churches which underwent a revitalization process.
- Mark Dever posed nine marks of a healthy church. These marks were derived through biblical exposition rather than scientific study.
- Robert Cueni focused on revitalizing mainline congregations.
- Ronald Richardson described church revitalization by means of counseling-based family systems theory.
Three Scientific Studies of Church Revitalization

- Edwin Dunwoody Allabough, “The Development of a Model for Contemporary Worship in Established Churches with a History for the Purpose of Congregational Revitalization”
- Don Cecil McDonald, “Church Revitalization and Systemic Therapy: The Pastor as Interventionist, Story Breaker, and Story Maker”
John Michael Dodson, “An Analysis of Factors Leading to the Revitalization of Comeback Churches

- Methodology was that he first chose variables he thought led to revitalization, devised a survey measuring those variables, and then interviewed pastors of revitalized churches.

- A limitation to his methodology was that he seemed to lead the pastors to the conclusion that his variables were the cause of revitalization while limiting the pastors’ ability to draw their own conclusions.
Many researchers study the contextual and institutional variables of church growth and revitalization.

Scant research exists which examines the sponsorship of church plants as an institutional variable.
Church Planting

- Kevin Mannoia, *Church Planting: The Next Generation*
- Aubrey Malphurs, *Planting Growing Churches for the 21st Century*
The Definitions of Terms: Annual Church Profile

- Annual Church Profile (ACP) is a yearly survey sent to all churches and missions in the Southern Baptist Convention. Previously called the Uniform Church Letter, the ACP was utilized by churches to report on annual statistics, including membership, finance, program, and participation.
The Definitions of Terms: Revitalization

Revitalization refers to the process of breathing new life into a stagnant or dying church. While revitalization pertains to both tangible and intangible aspects of the church, the researcher focused solely on those tangible aspects which are measurable.
The Definitions of Terms: Sponsor Church

A sponsor church is a local church which is actively involved in the creation of a new church. Also called a mother church, sponsor churches tend to be involved in the planting process at different levels. Some sponsor churches provide a great deal of resources, such as providing leadership, finances, a worship location, and a group of members. The common thread amongst all sponsor churches is a deliberate decision to help a new church get started.
The Statement of the Subproblems

The First Subproblem

The first subproblem was to determine whether significant differences existed within selected church growth variables between the five-year time period before sponsorship of a church plant and the five years after sponsorship of a church plant among churches which sponsored a church plant in 1999.
The Statement of the Subproblems

- The Second Subproblem

The second subproblem was determining whether certain church growth variables were impacted to a greater degree than others due to the sponsoring of a church plant.
The Statement of the Subproblems

The Third Subproblem

The third subproblem was to determine whether proximity of the church plant to the sponsor church made an impact on the church growth variables identified in the first and second subproblems.
The Hypotheses

H1: Significant differences existed between church growth variables for the five years before the year of plant and the five years after the church plant sponsorship.

H2: Some church growth variables were impacted to a greater degree than others due to the sponsoring of a church plant.

H3: Proximity of the church plant had no effect on the sponsor church.
The Delimitations

1. Research was limited to a sample of Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) churches which sponsored a new church work in 1999. In the 1999 Annual Church Profile (ACP), these churches reported at least one new “church type mission started.”

2. This study examined general growth trends without isolating the role of pastoral tenure, preaching, or other contributing factors in the growth of the church. While these factors are worthy of examination, they were beyond the scope of this study.

3. The growth variables used in the study were limited to those variables provided by the ACP from 1994 to 2004, as well as data received from a North American Mission Board study for one variable dealing with proximity of the church plant to the sponsor church.
The Assumptions

1. The data submitted by the individual churches on the 1994-2004 ACP was complete and accurate.

2. The survey data submitted to the North American Mission Board Sponsorship Survey was complete and accurate.

3. The survey utilized by the North American Mission Board was a valid and reliable instrument for measuring the variables studied.
Chapter Two
Data and Methodology
The Data

- Databases stored on the network hard drives of the Center for Missional Research, NAMB and containing the Annual Church Profile data for the years 1994-2004 served as a primary source for this investigation.

- A second primary source of data was accessed from a Center for Missional Research, NAMB study on church plant sponsorship.
The Subjects

- In 1999, a total of 41,099 churches were in the Southern Baptist Convention.
- Of these churches, only 753 churches reported at least one new mission-type church started in 1999.
- A total of 309 churches of the original 753 churches responded to the survey and thus comprise the NAMB Sponsorship Survey sample group.
The Subjects

The reporting churches were dispersed among forty-four states and two United States territories (see table 1). Page 26.

A total of 129 churches were removed from the sample group for one of two reasons. One hundred seventeen churches were removed because they responded to the NAMB Sponsor Survey stating that they did not sponsor a church plant. The remaining 12 churches were removed because they did not report for all of the years preceding the sponsorship year due to the fact that the sponsor church was not in existence in 1994.

The final number of churches to be analyzed in this research project was 624.
## Comparison of Means between Sponsor Church Sample Group and SBC Population

<p>| Variable                             | Sponsor Churches N=624 | SBC Population N=40507 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Baptisms</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Additions</td>
<td>23.72</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Members</td>
<td>684.08</td>
<td>384.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sunday School Enrollment</td>
<td>395.83</td>
<td>197.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Sunday School Attendance</td>
<td>187.55</td>
<td>96.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Receipts</td>
<td>417,500.61</td>
<td>166503.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated Gifts</td>
<td>295,805.28</td>
<td>136223.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Gifts</td>
<td>91,489.30</td>
<td>37430.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mission Expenditures</td>
<td>46,515.47</td>
<td>19332.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning Worship Attendance</td>
<td>251.68</td>
<td>131.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Resident Membership</td>
<td>507.79</td>
<td>272.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tithes and Offerings</td>
<td>387,294.58</td>
<td>176,475.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Factors

Fifteen institutional variables and one contextual variable were studied in this research project.

The institutional variables were reported on the Annual Church Profile by the sponsor churches.

The contextual variable (Proximity of Church Plant) was reported in the NAMB Sponsorship Study.
Fifteen Institutional Variables

- Total Baptisms
- Other Additions
- Total Membership
- Sunday School Enrollment
- Average Sunday School Attendance
- Total Receipts
- Undesignated Gifts
- Total Missions Expenditures
- Cooperative Program Giving
- Annie Armstrong Easter Offering
- Lottie Moon Christmas Offering
- AM Worship Attendance
- Adjusted Resident Membership
- Designated Gifts
- Tithes
Variable Conversions

- For each institutional factor, a before variable and an after variable were calculated in order to conduct the appropriate statistical procedures.

- Each monetary factor was adjusted for inflation to 1994 dollars.

- Variables for the five years before the church planting year were added to form an aggregated-before-plant-year variable (e.g., Total Membership for each church was added by the following formula: \( \text{TOTMEM94} + \text{TOTMEM95} + \text{TOTMEM96} + \text{TOTMEM97} + \text{TOTMEM98} = \text{TOTMEMBPAG} \)).

- Variables for the five years after the church planting year were added together to form an aggregated after-plant-year variable (e.g., Total Membership for each church was added by the following formula: \( \text{TOTMEM00} + \text{TOTMEM01} + \text{TOTMEM02} + \text{TOTMEM03} + \text{TOTMEM04} = \text{TOTMEMAPAG} \)).
The Methodology

Statistical Procedures:

– Paired Samples t Test – Hypothesis One
– Comparative Analysis – Hypothesis Two
– ANOVA – Hypothesis Three
Paired Samples t Test

Assumptions

– Independence
  ▪ The subject churches were reporting observed data for the corresponding years without any regard to this or any other study and without regard for the answers of any other church, this condition was satisfied.

– Normality
  ▪ Tests for normality included normality plots and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests
Comparative Analysis

- **Assumptions**
  - Independence
    - Same as Paired Samples t Test
  - Normality
    - Conducted on the \( z \) scores in order to determine that the \( z \) scores were normal. The tests included normality plots and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests.
  - Random Sampling
    - The sample size was comprised of every church which sponsored a church plant in 1999, and thus was the population.
ANOVA

Assumptions

- Independence
  - Same as Paired Samples t Test
- Normality
  - Normality plots and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests.
- Homogeneity of variance
  - Levene Test
Chapter Three
Analysis of Data
Descriptive Data

- **Total Membership**
  - Range: 15 to 26,792
  - Mean: 684.08
  - Standard Deviation: 1,538.846

- **Total Baptisms**
  - Range: 0 to 843
  - Mean: 25.17
  - Mode: 0
  - Standard Deviation: 61.090
Total Membership Means
1994-2004

Year Mean
1994 651.84
1995 667.61
1996 670.84
1997 647.14
1998 656.5
1999 684.08
2000 666.77
2001 699.95
2002 682.22
2003 694.16
2004 692.07
Total Baptisms Means 1994-2004

Year
Mean
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Descriptive Data

- **Other Additions**
  - Range: 0 to 795
  - Mean: 23.72
  - Standard Deviation: 52.980

- **AM Worship**
  - Range: 10 to 8,490
  - Mean: 251.68
  - Standard Deviation: 521.388
Other Additions Means 1994-2004
Descriptive Data

- **Church-Type Missions Started**
  - Range: 1 to 25
  - Mean: 1.52
  - Standard Deviation: 1.699

- **Average Sunday School Attendance**
  - Range: 7 to 7,449
  - Mean: 187.55
  - Standard Deviation: 425.914
Average Sunday School Attendance Means 1994-2004
Descriptive Data

- **Adjusted Resident Membership**
  - Range: 0 to 20,206
  - Mean: 507.79
  - Standard Deviation: 1,161.180

- **Undesignated Gifts**
  - Range: $0.00 to $17,722,096.00
  - Mean: $295,805.28
  - Standard Deviation: $884,853.805
Adjusted Resident Membership Means 1994-2004
Undesignated Gifts Means
1994-2004

Year
Mean

1994: 241296.69
1995: 218132.66
1996: 232861.88
1997: 283035.6
1998: 264679.89
1999: 290008.79
2000: 298944.12
2001: 352888.8
2002: 351980.32
2003: 376825.75
2004: 370152.65
Descriptive Data

- **Designated Gifts**
  - Range: $0.00 to $4,324,461.00
  - Mean: $91,489.30
  - Standard Deviation: $272,007.852

- **Tithes**
  - Range: $0.00 to $22,046,557.00
  - Mean: $387,294.58
  - Standard Deviation: $1,134,160.983
Designated Gifts Means 1994-2004
Tithes Means
1994-2004
Descriptive Data

- **Total Receipts**
  - Range: $0.00 to $26,662,318.00
  - Mean: $417,500.61
  - Standard Deviation: $1,299,030.423

- **Total Mission Expenditures**
  - Range: $0.00 to $3,083,414.00
  - Mean: $46,515.47
  - Standard Deviation: $151,650.555
Total Receipts Means
1994-2004

Year
Mean
1994 318422.78
1995 295449.26
1996 320619.15
1997 380433.61
1998 377678.13
1999 409229.46
2000 434894.63
2001 493208.75
2002 499477.01
2003 500191.82
2004 532202.96
Total Mission Expenditures Means 1994-2004

Year:
- 1994
- 1995
- 1996
- 1997
- 1998
- 1999
- 2000
- 2001
- 2002
- 2003
- 2004

Mean:
- 1994: 43633.39
- 1995: 37571.41
- 1996: 37521.49
- 1997: 47578.85
- 1998: 45240.94
- 1999: 45524.7
- 2000: 50625.21
- 2001: 55186.4
- 2002: 56385.85
- 2003: 59937.25
- 2004: 66470.85
Descriptive Data

- Sunday School Enrollment
  - Range: 0 to 14,354
  - Mean: 395.83
  - Standard Deviation: 951.608

- Year Church Was Organized
  - Oldest Church: 1769
  - Newest Church: 1994
  - Mode: 1952
Total Receipts Means
1994-2004
Descriptive Data

- **Ethnicity**
  - A majority were White, Non-Hispanic.
  - Ethnic congregations included:
    - African-American
    - Hispanic
    - Native American
    - Chinese
    - Japanese
    - Korean
    - Filipino
    - Vietnamese
    - Haitian
    - Middle Eastern
    - Multi-Ethnic
    - Deaf
Frequency Distribution of Sponsor Church Ethnicity

- White Non-Hispanic
- African American
- Hispanic
- Native American (American Indian or Eskimo)
- Chinese
- Japanese
- Korean
- Filipino
- Vietnamese
- Deaf
- Haitian
- Middle Eastern
- Multi-Ethnic
- None of the Above categories adequately fits
Paired Samples t Test

Tests of Assumptions
- Box plots for each variable were used to identify outliers.
  - Variables found to contain outliers were examined case by case.
  - The church was identified, and the researcher contacted the church in order to confirm the numbers.
  - The data were either corrected, confirmed, or adjusted by mean substitution, as with missing data.
- Normality plots and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests for normality were conducted for each variable.
- All variables were found to be normal.
Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

Total Baptisms

- H0: TBAPTBPG = TBAPTAPAG
- H1: TBAPTBPG ≠ TBAPTAPAG
- The total baptisms before and after the plant year were not significantly different, t(623) = -0.796, p = 0.426, two tails. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

- **Sunday School Enrollment**
  - H0: SSENRBPAG = SSENRAPAG
  - H1: SSENRBPAG ≠ SSENRAPAG
  - The Sunday School enrollments before and after the plant year were not significantly different, t(623) = 0.949, p = 0.343, two tails. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Other Additions

- \(H_0: \text{OTHADDBPAG} = \text{OTHADDAPAG}\)
- \(H_1: \text{OTHADDBPAG} \neq \text{OTHADDAPAG}\)
- The other additions before and after the plant year were not significantly different, \(t(622) = -1.842, p = 0.066,\) two tails. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

- **Total Membership**
  - H0: TOTMEMBPAG = TOTMEMAPAG
  - H1: TOTMEMBPAG ≠ TOTMEMAPAG
  - The total membership before and after the plant year were not significantly different, $t(623) = -1.887$, $p = 0.060$, two tails. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

- Average Sunday School Attendance
  - H0: AVGSSBPAG = AVGSSAPAG
  - H1: AVGSSBPAG ≠ AVGSSAPAG
  - The average Sunday School attendance before and after the plant year were not significantly different, t(623) = -0.694, p = 0.488, two tails. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

Total Receipts

- H0: TRCPTSIBPAG = TRCPTSIAPAG
- H1: TRCPTSIBPAG ≠ TRCPTSIAPAG
- The total receipts before and after the plant year were significantly different, t(623) = -5.889, p = 0.000, two tails. The null hypothesis was rejected.
Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

Undesignated Gifts

- H0: UNDGFTIBPAG = UNDGFTIAPAG
- H1: UNDGFTIBPAG ≠ UNDGFTIAPAG
- The undesignated gifts before and after the plant year were significantly different, t(622) = -5.343, p = 0.000, two tails. The null hypothesis was rejected.
Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

■ Designated Gifts

- $H_0$: DESGFTIBPAG = DESGFTIAPAG
- $H_1$: DESGFTIBPAG $\neq$ DESGFTIAPAG

- The designated gifts before and after the plant year were significantly different, $t(622) = -5.05, p = 0.000$, two tails. The null hypothesis was rejected.
Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

- **Total Mission Expenditures**
  - $H_0$: $\text{TMEIBPAG} = \text{TMEIAPAG}$
  - $H_1$: $\text{TMEIBPAG} \neq \text{TMEIAPAG}$
  - The total mission expenditures before and after the plant year were significantly different, $t(623) = -3.435$, $p = 0.001$, two tails. The null hypothesis was rejected.
Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

- Cooperative Program
  - H0: COOPIBPAG = COOPIAPAG
  - H1: COOPIBPAG ≠ COOPIAPAG
  - The Cooperative Program gifts before and after the plant year were not significantly different, t(623) = -1.194, p = 0.233, two tails. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Annie Armstrong Easter Offering

- H0: AAEOIBPAG = AAEOIAPAG
- H1: AAEOIBPAG ≠ AAEOIAPAG

The Annie Armstrong Easter Offerings before and after the plant year were significantly different, $t(623) = -4.234$, $p = 0.000$, two tails. The null hypothesis was rejected.
Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

Lottie Moon Christmas Offering

- H0: LMCOIBPAG = LMCOIAPAG
- H1: LMCOIBPAG ≠ LMCOIAPAG
- The Lottie Moon Christmas Offerings before and after the plant year were significantly different, $t(623) = -4.073$, $p = 0.000$, two tails. The null hypothesis was rejected.
Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

- **AM Worship**
  - H0: AMWORBPG = AMWORAPAG
  - H1: AMWORBPG ≠ AMWORAPAG
  - The AM Worship attendances before and after the plant year were significantly different, $t(623) = -5.599$, $p = 0.000$, two tails. The null hypothesis was rejected.
Adjusted Resident Membership

- H0: RMADJBPAG = RMADJAPAG
- H1: RMADJBPAG ≠ RMADJAPAG
- The Adjusted Resident Membership before and after the plant year were not significantly different, $t(623) = -1.176$, $p = 0.240$, two tails. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

- **Tithes**
  - $H_0$: TITHESIBPAG = TITHESIAPAG
  - $H_1$: TITHESIBPAG ≠ TITHESIAPAG
  - The tithes before and after the plant year were significantly different, $t(623) = -5.873$, $p = 0.000$, two tails. The null hypothesis was rejected.
## Paired Samples t Test – The Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Before Plant Mean</th>
<th>After Plant Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBAPT</td>
<td>103.48</td>
<td>107.25</td>
<td>-0.796</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSENR</td>
<td>1,871.30</td>
<td>1,913.06</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHADD</td>
<td>115.97</td>
<td>107.19</td>
<td>-1.842</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTMEM</td>
<td>3,293.93</td>
<td>3,435.17</td>
<td>-1.887</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGSS</td>
<td>869.28</td>
<td>1,130.94</td>
<td>-0.694</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCPTS</td>
<td>1,692,603</td>
<td>2,459,975</td>
<td>-5.859</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDGFT</td>
<td>1,241,379</td>
<td>1,751,147</td>
<td>-5.343</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESGFT</td>
<td>315,105.4</td>
<td>558,868.8</td>
<td>-5.050</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TME</td>
<td>211,546.1</td>
<td>288,605.6</td>
<td>-3.435</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOP</td>
<td>80,817.49</td>
<td>90,295.07</td>
<td>-1.194</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAEO</td>
<td>6,459.32</td>
<td>8,141.66</td>
<td>-4.234</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMCO</td>
<td>15,805.41</td>
<td>19,004.87</td>
<td>-4.073</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMWOR</td>
<td>1,094.64</td>
<td>1,330.05</td>
<td>-5.599</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMADJ</td>
<td>2,455.59</td>
<td>2,542.98</td>
<td>-1.176</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITHES</td>
<td>1,554,869</td>
<td>2,307,391</td>
<td>-5.873</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant Institutional Variables

- Total Receipts
- Undesignated Gifts
- Total Missions Expenditures
- Tithes

- Annie Armstrong Easter Offering
- Lottie Moon Christmas Offering
- AM Worship Attendance
- Designated Gifts
Comparative Analysis

Tests of Assumptions

- The assumptions for the $z$ scores were the same as for the $t$ tests.
- The assumptions of normality and independence were shown to have been satisfied.
- The additional $z$ score assumption of random sampling was satisfied by virtue of the fact that the sample group was comprised of the population of sponsor churches for 1999.
Comparative Analysis – The Analysis

- The second null hypothesis stated that the variables would be equally affected by the sponsorship of a church plant
  
  H0: TRCPTS = UNDGFT = DESGFT = TME = AAEO = LMCO = AMWOR = TITHES

- The alternate hypothesis was that the variables would not be equally affected by the sponsorship of a church plant
  
  H1: TRCPTS ≠ UNDGFT ≠ DESGFT ≠ TME ≠ AAEO ≠ LMCO ≠ AMWOR ≠ TITHES
Comparative Analysis – The Analysis

Variables examined:

## Comparative Analysis – Percent Change of Significant Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>$z$ score Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRCPTS</td>
<td>45.34</td>
<td>45.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDGFT</td>
<td>41.07</td>
<td>41.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESGFT</td>
<td>77.36</td>
<td>77.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TME</td>
<td>36.43</td>
<td>36.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAEO</td>
<td>26.05</td>
<td>26.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMCO</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>20.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMWOR</td>
<td>21.51</td>
<td>21.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITHES</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparative Analysis – Percent Change of Significant Variables in Descending Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>z score Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESGFT</td>
<td>77.36</td>
<td>77.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITHES</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCPTS</td>
<td>45.34</td>
<td>45.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDGFT</td>
<td>41.07</td>
<td>41.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TME</td>
<td>36.43</td>
<td>36.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAEO</td>
<td>26.05</td>
<td>26.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMWOR</td>
<td>21.51</td>
<td>21.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMCO</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>20.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most significant variable, DESGFT, was used for the third hypothesis test.
Analysis of Variance

Tests of Assumptions

– The assumptions for the ANOVA were the same as for the *t tests* and *z* scores.

– The assumptions of normality and independence were shown to have been satisfied.

– The test for Homogeneity of Variance was the Levene test.
The most significant variable, DESGFT, was used for the third hypothesis test.

- The null hypothesis was that proximity of the church plant to the sponsor church played no part in the effect on the sponsor church.
- The alternate hypothesis was that the location of the church plant would impact the effect on the significant variables.
The Analysis of Variance revealed a significant difference between groups, $F(5, 291) = 2.645$, $p = 0.023$. 
Analysis of Variance—The Analysis

- A Tukey B post hoc test revealed a difference between treatments.
- Specifically, two subsets existed for proximity.
  - The first subset consisted of Different City, Different Country, Same Community, Same Building, and Different Community/Same City.
  - The second subset consisted of Different State.
Bonferoni Post hoc tests revealed that the only significant difference was found among subset 2, Different State.

Further examination of this treatment revealed that there were only four churches in this group.

The difference between the sample size for Different State and the other treatments would not allow for a homogeneous variance.
Therefore, excluding the treatment Different State no significant differences were found between groups. The researcher, then, could not reject the null hypothesis.
Summary

- Hypothesis one stated that significant differences existed between church growth variables for the five years before the year of plant and the five years after the church plant sponsorship.

- Hypothesis one was accepted for eight of the fifteen growth variables examined.
Hypothesis two stated that some church growth variables were impacted to a greater degree than others due to the sponsoring of a church plant. Hypothesis two was accepted.

After converting the means of the eight variables discovered via the paired samples $t$ tests to standardized scores, the percent change was examined and designated gifts were found to have been impacted the greatest at 77.4%.
Hypothesis three stated that the proximity of the church plant had no effect on the sponsor church. This hypothesis was accepted.

The ANOVA test did not reveal a significant difference between the factors. Location of the church plant had no effect on the sponsor church.
Hypothesis three stated that the proximity of the church plant had no effect on the sponsor church. This hypothesis was accepted.

The ANOVA test did not reveal a significant difference between the factors. Location of the church plant had no effect on the sponsor church.
Conclusions

- This research project found that the sponsor church was positively impacted in eight growth variables.
- The variables were categorized into two types: monetary variables and worship attendance.
Conclusions – Monetary Variables

- Of the fifteen variables examined, eight were monetary variables, and seven of these variables were affected positively by the sponsorship of a church plant.
- The single variable which did not show a significant difference before and after the church plant was Cooperative Program gifts.
- Designated gifts experienced the greatest percentage increase (77.4%).
- Tithes were the second greatest percent increase (48.4%).
Conclusions – Worship Attendance

- Of the fifteen variables examined, seven variables dealt with people (i.e., membership and attendance).
- Only one of these variables was found to be significantly different after the church plant year -- worship attendance.
- Worship attendance increased by 21.5% for the five years after the church plant. This finding was a surprise.
- Conventional logic would suggest that worship attendance would decrease after the sponsorship of a church plant due to worship attenders moving to the new church plant.
Implications

- A significant implication was that the variables impacted by church plant sponsorship were primarily financial in nature.
- Designated gifts showed the greatest increase potentially due to the financial obligation of the sponsor church to the church plant.
- However, an attitude of mission giving seemed to be fostered through the sponsorship relationship.
- Both Annie Armstrong Easter Offerings and Lottie Moon Christmas Offerings increased for the five years after the church plant.
Implications

- An objection to sponsoring a church plant has been that the church did not have enough money to do so. The findings of this study suggests this objection has little merit.

- Not only did the church members give more to the sponsor churches, they gave significantly more. Designated Gifts increased 77.4%.

- Tithes and offerings increased 48.4%. Giving to missions via Annie Armstrong Easter Offerings and Lottie Moon Christmas Offerings increased by 26.05% and 20.24% respectively.

- Christians are more than willing to give sacrificially; however, they must be given the opportunity and the vision. Pastors must provide that opportunity and share the vision.
Implications

- A second objection to sponsoring a church plant is that the church cannot afford to give up any members.
- Worship attendance significantly increased for the five years after the sponsorship of the church plant even though membership and Sunday School attendance did not increase significantly.
- The only variable that reflected a decrease for the entire sample was Other Additions.
- It seems that sponsorship of a church plant does not hurt a church’s membership (even if it is not readily apparent that it helps the church’s membership).
Implications

A third objection to sponsoring a church plant dealt more with the location of the church plant. Pastors often are concerned that a church plant in the immediate area will draw away members and prospects for their church.

This study found that proximity did not appear to have a significant impact on the sponsor church.
Implications

- In light of the findings of this research project, churches ought to sponsor church plants.

- Apparently the sponsoring of church plants creates an interest in missions in the local church. This study showed that the members of the sponsor churches increased financial support of missions and more people attended the worship services.

- A mission-focused atmosphere in the church aids the members to be more receptive to the Holy Spirit, which allows the members to see their community from a kingdom perspective rather than a parochial perspective.
Future Study

1. A more thorough examination of the role that church size plays in the effect of church planting sponsorship on the sponsor church should be undertaken.
2. Additional research on the type of sponsorship would be beneficial.
3. Several variables which did not show a significant difference for the five years after the sponsorship of a church plant had experienced a decrease in the fourth and/or fifth year. Study of the effect of sponsorship for a shorter period of three years may reflect more significant variables.
4. An examination of the ethnicity of the sponsor church and the church plant would be interesting to note as the SBC continues to reach more and more ethnic groups.
5. In order to isolate the impact of sponsorship in the growth of a church, certain institutional and contextual factors should be examined.