Durham E-Theses

An Entrepreneurial Approach to Priestly Ministry in the Parish: Insights From a Research Study in the Diocese of Durham

VOLLAND, MICHAEL,JOHN

Michael John Volland

An Entrepreneurial Approach to Priestly Ministry in the Parish: Insights From a Research Study in the Diocese of Durham

<u>Abstract</u>

The objective of this doctoral research study is to explore the experience of a sample of entrepreneurial priests in the Diocese of Durham with a view to producing appropriate and informed suggestions for future practice in relation to the exercise of entrepreneurship by parish priests in the Church of England. Building on my own experience of being a priest and an entrepreneur, an understanding of the entrepreneur set out by John Thompson and Bill Bolton (2004), and beginning with the social, cultural, theological and ecclesiological case constructed by the *Mission-Shaped Church* report (2004), and upon which its recommendation of identifying 'mission entrepreneurs' rests, this thesis argues that the concept of entrepreneurship offers the Church of England a helpful lens through which to view priestly ministry and an understanding of an approach to priestly ministry in the parish that is well-fitted for the current mission task in England. The thesis argues that an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry is consistent with Anglican self-understanding as set out in the Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal. It also argues that an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry is consistent both with the nature of the Trinitarian God and with human collaboration with God's activity in the world. Research findings are based on thematic analysis of data generated through online testing and qualitative interviews with a sample of entrepreneurial priests in the Diocese of Durham. This thesis finds that entrepreneurial priests appear to adopt an entrepreneurial approach to parish-based ministry in spite of the institution of the Church of England rather than because of it. In addition, this thesis finds that when faced with challenges related to church buildings, entrepreneurial priests adopt an innovative approach that has the potential to generate social and spiritual capital. Further, this thesis finds that entrepreneurial priests instinctively work with others and that creating appropriate partnerships with outside agencies has the potential to generate significant social, cultural, spiritual and financial capital for the church and the wider community. The findings result in ten suggestions for future practice in relation to the exercise of entrepreneurship by parish priests in the Church of England.

An Entrepreneurial Approach to Priestly Ministry in the Parish: Insights From a Research Study in the Diocese of Durham

Michael John Volland

A thesis in one volume
for the degree of Doctor of Theology and Ministry

Department of Theology and Religion

Durham University

2013

Table of contents

<u>Statement of Copyright</u>

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

In bringing these brief acknowledgements to an end, I express my gratitude to the Maker and Creator of all things, the Father of light and the source of all truth. A sound mind and the opportunity to study are priceless gifts of grace for which I am only beginning to be grateful.

This thesis is dedicated to Bill Bolton

Chapter One

Introduction

> 'We believe the Church of England is facing a great moment of missionary opportunity.'[1]

> 'I propose that the language of entrepreneurship offers the Church a useful lens through which to imagine the shape of mission for our emerging culture. The concept offers a way of thinking about the missional task to which we are called and the kind of approach that some Christians might take towards it.'[2]

I am an Anglican priest. I am also an entrepreneur. The exercise of entrepreneurship has rarely made me any money and in the context of this doctoral thesis, that is precisely the point. In this thesis I use the term 'entrepreneur' to make reference to a way of being in the world that is characterised by a relentless and energetic pursuit of opportunities to do things in new ways in order to achieve improved outcomes for those involved.[3] Of course, some entrepreneurs act in this way in order to generate financial capital, but the exercise of entrepreneurship is not limited to the world of commerce. Entrepreneurs use their gifts in a diverse range of contexts including schools, hospitals and churches, and their efforts generate social, artistic and spiritual capital. My own entrepreneurial nature has found various expressions as an undergraduate art student, parish youth worker, budding author, mission-team member, Ordained Pioneer Minister and, most recently, as a theological educator. Entrepreneurship is a fundamental aspect of my personality. I have never been taught to be an entrepreneur but through establishing and running secret clubs and playground swap-shops at primary school, persuading a leading computer manufacturer to deliver a lorry-load of free equipment to my secondary school and establishing and running a successful club night as a young adult, I recognised my entrepreneurial flair, experimented with it, learnt from my mistakes and grew in entrepreneurial confidence. Once I was ordained it was natural to apply this 'way of

---

[1] Archbishop's Council, *Mission Shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expressions of Church in a Changing Context* (London: Church House Publishing, 2004), xiii.
[2] Michael Volland, *Should I be an Entrepreneur for Christ?*
http://www.freshexpressions.org.uk/news/entrepreneurship (08/01/13).
[3] An understanding and definition of the entrepreneur is addressed at length in chapter two.

being' to my work as a priest. I did not mention entrepreneurship overtly during my selection process, theological training or deployment into first curacy, but my way of approaching the task of ministry and mission was (and continues to be) innately entrepreneurial and I have attempted to find creative and innovative ways to engage in loving service as a priest in the communities in which I have served. The experience of being an entrepreneurial priest has been one of the key drivers for the current research study. A second, intimately related key driver has been my understanding of the nature and shape of the mission context in England in which Anglican priests seek to engage in appropriate and faithful ministry. Fifteen years of professional experience in the Church of England, as an entrepreneurial lay minister, priest and theological educator has led me to believe that a faithful and effective response to the mission situation[4] requires the contribution of entrepreneurs. In the current study, this belief finds specific shape in a focus on entrepreneurial priests.[5]

In February, 2004, the General Synod of the Church of England welcomed and commended the report, *Mission Shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expressions of Church in a Changing Context* (hereafter referred to as *MSC*). In the report's recommendations the word 'entrepreneur' appeared in direct relation to Anglican ministry.[6] *MSC* was published in the same year that I entered full-time training for Anglican ordination. Since I was training for priestly ministry and felt myself to be an entrepreneur, *MSC*'s direct link between Anglican ministry, mission and entrepreneurship caught my attention and provoked ongoing reflection that has consequently found full expression in the current study. *MSC* assumed a link between 'mission entrepreneurs'[7] and the planting of fresh expressions of church; specifically

---

[4] In speaking of the, 'mission situation', I am making reference to my understanding of the context in which Anglican priests attempt to engage in a ministry of loving service. My understanding of the mission situation in the UK is informed by a wide reading of the literature, including *MSC*'s understanding of the rapidly changing cultural context, and by my own experience as a priest. I explore this in greater detail later in the introduction and in the section of chapter three dealing with the Diocese of Durham. My understanding of priestly ministry is set out in detail in chapter three and is shaped by my reading of Scripture and my understanding of the Creeds, the *Book of Common Prayer*, the Articles of Religion, the Ordinal and my experience as a priest.

[5] I have focused my research on priests rather than deacons. It is usual practice in the Church of England for those ordained deacon to be ordained priest the following year and it is priests, rather than deacons who exercise authority as incumbents of parish churches, and who are therefore more likely to have the freedom and (local) authority to adopt an entrepreneurial approach to parish ministry.

[6] *MSC*'s Recommendation 11 stated that 'those involved in selection need to be adequately equipped to identify and affirm pioneers and mission entrepreneurs'. *MSC,* 147.

[7] *MSC,* 147.

that the latter would be undertaken by the former. Church planting is important and in my opinion *MSC* is right to highlight the need to identify individuals who have the gifts to undertake this ministry appropriately in the emerging culture. However, it is the contention of this thesis that the planting of contextual[8] churches by mission entrepreneurs is but one necessary part of a much bigger picture in the current context. My research has been designed and undertaken in the belief that the entrepreneurs have a wider contribution to make to the task of mission in the emerging culture and that it is important for the church to recognise the entrepreneurs who are engaged in ministry and mission in parishes across the UK and to encourage, support and learn from them. In the current study therefore, I suggest that the understanding of the sphere of activity of the 'mission entrepreneur' should be broader than the planting of new contextual churches[9] and can in fact take in a whole range of activities undertaken by entrepreneurial parish priests. In the early stages of the development of my doctoral research proposal my intention had been to focus on researching aspects of entrepreneurship as exercised by Ordained Pioneer Ministers (hereafter abbreviated to OPMs). Since OPMs were the category of ordained minister that eventually emerged from the church's consideration of *MSC*'s recommendation of identifying 'mission entrepreneurs', a focus on OPMs in my research would have allowed the maintenance of a clear link between my work and the way in which the term, entrepreneur, was used in *MSC*. After further consideration however, I moved my focus from OPMs to embrace the possibility of 'regular' Anglican priests, i.e. those without the designation 'pioneer', serving primarily in a parish context, being entrepreneurs and exercising entrepreneurial ministries. Although I recognise the potentially important contribution that OPMs are making to the ministry and mission of the church, the fact is that the majority of Anglican priests are not and will never be labeled 'pioneers', and do not generally have a direct brief or necessary freedom from other responsibilities to plant 'new' or 'fresh' forms of church, but rather, they

---

[8] Michael Moynagh uses the umbrella term 'new contextual church', 'to describe the birth and growth of Christian communities that serve people mainly outside the church, belong to their culture, make discipleship a priority and form a new church among the people they serve'. Moynagh identifies four overlapping tributaries, representing four responses to the new situation and from which new contextual churches are emerging. These are: 'Church planting'; 'The emerging church conversation'; 'Fresh Expressions of church'; and 'Communities in mission'. Michael Moynagh, *Church for Every Context: An Introduction to Theology and Practice* (London: SCM Press, 2012), x-xiii.
[9] Moynagh, *Church*, x.

exercise their priestly ministry in parishes.[10] My experience as a priest and my involvement with this research study have led me to believe that there are likely to be (varying numbers of) entrepreneurial priests ministering in each of the forty-four dioceses in the Church of England. It is the contention of this thesis that, given the mission situation faced by the Church of England it would seem expedient to recognise and invest in such a resource, rather than settling for the notion that it will primarily be OPMs (a minority of those ordained) who will exercise ministries characterised by entrepreneurship.[11] When I was first ordained I worked as an OPM in Gloucester but a significant part of my role involved collaborating with local parish priests and I quickly learnt to value the breadth of their activity and the potential for positive change that they could affect when adopting what might be described as an entrepreneurial approach to their ministries. This continued in the Diocese of Durham where, as a result of arranging student placements, I have been required to collaborate with a wide range of parish priests. I have observed and reflected on the positive impact on congregations and local communities that those who adopt an entrepreneurial approach to their ministry in the parish have been able to affect.[12] Further, in my professional practice as a theological educator, my main area of responsibility has been with those training to be 'regular' parish priests. As a result of my own experience and my understanding of the current mission situation, a significant aspect of my work with Anglican ordinands has involved a focus on understanding and encouraging entrepreneurship and stimulating reflection on what an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry in the parish might look like.

---

[10] At the end of 2009, there were 19,504 ministers licensed by Church of England dioceses, including clergy, readers and Church Army officers. The total does not include more than 1,600 chaplains to prisons, hospitals, the armed forces and in education, nor around 7,190 retired ministers with permission to officiate. Source: http://www.Churchofengland.org/about-us/facts-stats.aspx
(26/06/12). By contrast, only 146 OPM candidates were recommended for training during the years 2005 – 2012. Sources: Graham Cray, *Ordained Pioneer Ministry: A Report for the Ministry Council* (2011), and Stephen Ferns *Report on Attendance at Bishop's Advisory Panels for Ministry Council* (2013).

[11] In 2010 the report of a review of the selection procedures for OPMs report stated that 'the discernment of pioneer ministry is designed to assess a candidate's potential and capacity for entrepreneurial and innovative ministry in fresh expressions of Church'. Ministry Council: *Review of the Selection Procedures for Ordained Pioneer Ministry:* Paper 2: *Criteria for Pioneer Ministry.* (2010).

[12] I recognise the importance of lay entrepreneurship and the possibility of congregations becoming entrepreneurial. However, limitations on time and space in the current study meant that my focus had to be relatively narrow, hence the emphasis on entrepreneurial priests. Further research into entrepreneurial lay people and congregations may prove fruitful.

It is important to point out that I do not suggest that all priests should be entrepreneurs. Nor do I suggest that entrepreneurial priests are the only solution to the numerical and financial decline being faced in some dioceses in the Church of England. I do contend, however, along with Bill Bolton and John Thompson, that entrepreneurs make a positive difference and are therefore a potential resource to the Church of England in the current mission context. According to Bolton and Thompson,

> entrepreneurs create and build the future and they are to be found in every walk of life and in every group of people. Every community group, every public organisation has within it an entrepreneurial potential.[13]

Building on the social, cultural, theological and ecclesiological case constructed by *MSC* and upon which its recommendation of identifying mission entrepreneurs rested, it is the contention of this thesis that the concept of entrepreneurship offers the Church of England a helpful lens through which to view the exercise of priestly ministry and an approach to the tasks generally associated with priestly ministry in the parish that is well-fitted for engaging in ministry and mission in a rapidly changing host culture. This thesis proposes that entrepreneurial priests are present in the Church of England and that they are a potential resource at a time when the church seeks to address significant missional challenges. Building on my own identity as a priest and an entrepreneur, my understanding of the mission situation currently faced by the Church of England, my understanding of the role of the priest, my reflections on positive experiences of working alongside entrepreneurial parish priests in the dioceses of Gloucester and Durham and my ongoing involvement with Anglican ordinands training to be future priests, my research objective in the current study was as follows:

To explore the articulated experience of a sample of entrepreneurial priests in the Diocese of Durham with a view to producing appropriate and informed suggestions for future practice in relation to the exercise of entrepreneurship by parish priests in the Church of England.

---

[13] Bill Bolton and John Thompson, *Entrepreneurs: Talent, Temperament, Technique* (Oxford: Elsevier, 2004) (2nd ed.), 1.

My approach to achieving this research objective, including my engagement with appropriate literature, my rationale for arguing for an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry, my methods of data generation and analysis and my findings, conclusions and suggestions are set out in the five chapters following this introductory first chapter. In chapter two I address the contested nature of the term 'entrepreneur' in relation to Christian mission and ministry. I note the absence of a widely agreed definition of the entrepreneur in the literature. I outline the origin of the term and discuss some of the ways in which the work of key thinkers has shaped understandings of the entrepreneur. The work of Bill Bolton and John Thompson is introduced and their definition of the entrepreneur is presented and its constituent parts discussed in relation to wider literature and the notion of entrepreneurial priests. In chapter three I examine reasons for considering an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry in the parish. I propose that an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry is consistent with some of the characteristics exhibited by God and that as such, it is not only a valid approach to ministry, but an approach that we should expect to see evidence of in those places where Anglican priests are active in mission and ministry. This line of argument is given further weight by the identification of a number of figures in the Bible and in Christian history who have adopted an entrepreneurial approach to collaborating with God. I draw on the *Common Worship Preface to the Ordination of Priests,* the Declaration of Assent and the Five Marks of Mission to suggest that the exercise of priestly ministry in a time of rapid cultural change will be well served by an entrepreneurial approach. In chapter three I also reflect on the County of Durham and the Diocese of Durham in order to argue that, in the light of significant levels of social and economic deprivation, and faced with diminishing human and financial resources, the faithful and effective fulfillment of Christian mission by dioceses in the Church of England will be well served by the exercise of an entrepreneurial approach to ministry and mission. In chapter four I outline my methodology, including the use of an online test developed by Bolton and Thompson, my pilot study and data generation and analysis. In chapter five I discuss the themes that emerged from interviews with entrepreneurial priests and outline some initial findings and suggestions for the church. In the sixth, and concluding chapter, I set out a summary of the research findings and the suggestions for future practice in relation to the exercise of entrepreneurship by parish priests. I also suggest

areas where further research might prove fruitful and note some of the ways in which the findings of this research are to be disseminated.

Mission-Shaped Church

As noted above, the initial impetus for making a link between entrepreneurship and Anglican ministry in this thesis was the use of the term, entrepreneur, in *MSC*. Since *MSC* constructs the case on which the recommendation of mission entrepreneurs rests on a particular view of the shape of our rapidly changing society, and since the view set out in *MSC* has shaped subsequent literature and discussion (and aspects, therefore, of my own view of the mission context), it is important to provide an introduction to *MSC* and a brief outline of its content and understanding of the shape of the society in which Anglican priests are attempting to engage in ministry and mission.

MSC was the report of a working group set up by the Church of England's Mission and Public Affairs Council to assess progress and new developments in Church planting and fresh expressions of Church since the 1994 report *Breaking New Ground: Church Planting in the Church of England*. *Breaking New Ground* recognised Church planting in England as 'a supplementary strategy that enhances the essential thrust of the parish principle'.[14] Writing in the introduction to *MSC*, Bishop Graham Cray suggested that this was 'no longer adequate'.[15] He contended that 'The nature of community has so changed (and was changing long before 1994) that no one strategy will be adequate to fulfill the Anglican incarnational principle in Britain today.'[16] This statement, with its emphasis on the need for Anglican mission strategies (plural) in response to perceived changes in the nature of community in England captures the essence and thrust of *MSC*. A summary of the key points of *MSC*'s understanding of both the rapidly changing cultural context of our society and a theology for a missionary church is set out below. It is in the interaction of these

---

[14] *Breaking New Ground: Church Planting in the Church of England* (London: Church House Publishing, 1994), v.

[15] *MSC*, xi.

[16] *MSC*, xi. The footnote to this quotation in *MSC* explains that 'the Incarnation took place through entry into a particular culture. This became a principle of Christian mission within the New Testament, and eventually went on to underlie the Church of England's parochial ministry, with its commitment to a parish Church within each locality.' John Hull offers a critique of this in *Mission Shaped Church: A Theological Response* (London: SCM Press, 2006), 35, writing that 'the Church of England does not have local Churches because of a theology of locality but for historical reasons going back to the pre-Reformation period'.

two areas that *MSC* identifies and seeks to endorse and encourage the efforts of mission entrepreneurs.

MSC draws on social science data[17] to outline the changing contexts[18] in which the Church of England is attempting to minister in the twenty first century. The report highlights changes in housing, employment, mobility, family life and use of free time. From these snapshots, the report concludes that 'we are living increasingly fragmented lives'.[19] *MSC* states that ours is best described as a 'network society'[20] located in a globalized world and in which the importance of place is secondary to the importance of 'flows of information, images and capital'.[21] *MSC* contends that the nature of community is being changed by an increase in mobility and the unprecedented development and prevalence of communications technology. *MSC* endorses the fact that in our changing context the parish system is and will continue to be at the heart of the Church of England's delivery of incarnational mission. However, the report writers go on to argue that since, 'community is increasingly being formed around networks',[22] 'only a mixed economy of neighbourhood and network, collaborating together over a wider area [can] adequately fulfil the incarnational principle'.[23]

MSC argues that 'the core value of society has moved from 'progress' to 'choice',[24] stating that in our society we are all consumers and 'everything becomes a consumer choice'.[25] This, the report writers assert, is creating a self-indulgent society in which the poor are excluded since they cannot afford to buy things. John Hull particularly criticises *MSC*'s approach to poverty and the poor, pointing out the brevity of the treatment accorded to this issue in *MSC* and arguing that *MSC*'s '"theology of Good News for the Oppressed"' becomes an argument for keeping congregations of rich and poor people separate'.[26] Hull writes,

---

[17] *MSC* draws on the 2003 edition of the UK government publication, *Social Trends,* available from National Statistics Online (www.statistics.gov.uk).
[18] 'Changing Contexts' is the title of the report's first chapter.
[19] *MSC,* 4.
[20] *MSC,* 4.
[21] *MSC,* 5.
[22] *MSC,* 7.
[23] *MSC,* 8.
[24] *MSC,* 9.
[25] *MSC,* 9.
[26] John Hull, *Mission Shaped Church: A Theological Response* (London: SCM Press, 2006), 33.

This is a grave error. The poor are empowered not by having their own poor Churches but by escaping from poverty. The complacency and insensitivity of *MSC* at this point is truly incredible.[27]

MSC notes that we in England are 'in a consumer culture',[28] and that, although recognising this, the church must ask itself in what ways it can avoid being 'bound by its [consumer culture's] underlying values.'[29] *MSC* also notes that the church is seeking to minister in a post-Christendom context and states that 'the Christian story is no longer at the heart of the nation'.[30] *MSC* moves from here to suggest that as community becomes more complex, a 'come to us'[31] strategy based on a 'physical presence in every community'[32] can no longer be relied upon. As a result, *MSC* suggests that 'this new approach is to go to them. We need to find expressions of Church that communicate with post-Christian people'.[33]

MSC recognises that the church is the fruit of God's mission and that the church exists to serve God's ongoing mission. It draws on this missiological understanding to justify its focus on the planting of a variety of churches in a range of contexts in our changing culture. A key feature of *MSC* therefore is 'the recognition that the changing nature of our missionary context requires a new inculturation of the gospel within our society'.[34] The report writers state that 'It is the incarnation of the gospel, within a dominantly consumer society, that provides the Church of England with its major missionary challenge.'[35] Building on this reading of contemporary culture in England *MSC* outlines a 'theology for a missionary Church'.[36] *MSC*'s theology includes an outline of salvation history and an exploration of Christ and culture, including a focus on the incarnation, cross and resurrection and an introduction to the concepts of inculturation and contextualization. *MSC* notes the challenge of syncretism, and also states boldly that 'the Church is designed to

---

[27] Hull, *MSC: A Theological Response*, 33.
[28] *MSC,* xii.
[29] *MSC,* xii.
[30] *MSC,* 11.
[31] *MSC,* 11.
[32] *MSC,* 11.
[33] *MSC,* 12.
[34] *MSC,* xii.
[35] *MSC,* xii.
[36] This is the title of *MSC*'s fifth chapter.

reproduce'.[37] The marks of the church (one, holy, catholic and apostolic) are noted and a brief outline of Anglican ecclesiology is provided touching on the Declaration of Assent, the Lambeth Quadrilateral, the dominical sacraments, episcopacy and the national church.

Where I have been sitting has affected what I have seen

Doug Gay writes that 'today more of us [academics] aspire to an honest and reflexive 'standpoint epistemology' recognising that, "where we sit affects what we see".'[38] In light of Gay's comment, and in conclusion of this introductory chapter, it is important for me to note where I have been 'sitting' in relation to current thinking around mission, entrepreneurship and priestly ministry in the Church of England, and how this has affected what I have seen, my perception and interpretation of events and my views on what might constitute appropriate ways forward. This is not just important in terms of reflexivity, which Janet Heaton tells us 'generally involves the self-examination of how research findings were produced and, particularly, the role of the researcher(s) in their construction'.[39] It has also been foundational in the construction of the current study and is therefore fundamental to the findings, conclusions and proposed recommendations. Careful recognition and explicit statement of where I 'sit' therefore, is not a nod in the direction of a shallow reflexivity, which risks becoming 'rather narrow and potentially self-absorbed ruminations on research practice'.[40] but rather, a thorough alertness to what Nancy Jane-Lee defines as '[being] aware of these questions of affect rather than trying to remove such 'contaminations' through notions of objectivity'.[41] and secondly, a clear acknowledgment that my experience as a practitioner in the Church of England is the central driver for this doctoral research study. As I have already made explicit, my own experience shaped the epistemological and theoretical basis of the study and informed the rationale, research objective, methodology, methods, data analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations. My experience as an entrepreneur, an

---

[37] *MSC,* 93.
[38] Doug Gay, *Remixing the Church: Towards an Emerging Ecclesiology* (London: SCM Press, 2011), xvi.
[39] Janet Heaton, *Reworking Qualitative Data* (London: Sage, 2004), 104.
[40] Nancy-Jane Lee, *Achieving Your Professional Doctorate: A Handbook* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2009). 64.
[41] Lee, *Achieving*, 67.

Anglican priest, a theological educator and a contributer to the national Anglican conversation around mission through writing, speaking and teaching has generated, informed and shaped this research project. In the following brief section I set out selected autobiographical details in order to demonstrate that, in essence, I am a participant observer who has been and continues to be shaped by the ongoing conversation at local and national level around mission, entrepreneurship and the Church of England.

Between 1998 and 2004 I worked as a youth worker in a number of Anglican parishes in and around London. During this time I studied for a Masters degree with a focus on the interface between God, the church and approaches to ministry and mission in a rapidly changing host culture.[42] *MSC* was published in 2004, the year I entered full-time training for Anglican ordination at Ridley Hall, Cambridge. Bishop Graham Cray, chair of the *MSC* working group, had been the previous principal and Ridley Hall's reputation for engagement with mission in the emerging culture had grown under his leadership and influenced my decision to study there. In July 2006 I was ordained as a deacon and Pioneer Minister at Gloucester cathedral (I was ordained priest in 2007) and commissioned to plant a fresh expression of church in the city. My role allowed networking opportunities with many of the influential practitioners and writers within Anglican fresh expressions whose thinking continued to shape and influence my own. During this time, as a member of Roundtable 5[43] I contributed a chapter to the book, *Ancient Faith, Future Mission: Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition* (London: Canterbury Press, 2009) and published an edited version of my working journal as *Through the Pilgrim Door: Pioneering a Fresh Expression of Church* (Eastbourne: Survivor, 2009). I contributed to the Diocese of Gloucester's thinking on mission and fresh expressions while also being challenged and shaped by the Anglo-catholic theology and practice of Gloucester Cathedral's Dean and Chapter with whom I worked closely. In 2009 I was appointed to teach mission and pioneer ministry at Cranmer Hall, Durham. In this post, during which time I was engaged in the current research study, I taught 'regular' ordinands

---

[42] While studying for my MA at Kings College London, Pete Ward (who was the MA course leader) published his hugely influential book, *Liquid Church* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002). This book and related literature had a significant impact on my thinking in the area of mission and ecclesiology.

[43] Roundtable 5 is also known as the 'Sacramental and Contemplative' roundtable and is 'a space for practitioners and those interested in developing fresh expressions of Church drawing on the contemplative and catholic traditions'. http://www.freshexpressions.org.uk/roundtables (20/03/13).

(along with a small number of OPMs) who were expecting to enter parish ministry after their time at college. This prompted deep thinking about the nature of the ministries that I was helping to prepare these future priests for. During my time at Cranmer Hall I also co-authored a textbook on fresh expressions in which I wrote a section dealing with an entrepreneurial approach to ministry and mission.[44] I contributed to Deanery and Diocesan mission thinking, particularly by serving on the Diocesan Growth Group, and addressed the Council for World Mission on missional entrepreneurship. I also discussed entrepreneurship in Anglican ministry on a number of occasions with Bishop Justin Welby whose views shaped my own. As a member of the Common Awards module group, I also had a hands-on role in shaping the Mission and Evangelism aspect of the curriculum for Church of England training and authored a module titled, *Missional Entrepreneurship*. The experiences set out above have shaped my understanding of the current mission situation and my recognition that the practice of entrepreneurship has an important contribution to make to the Church of England as it seeks to engage in faithful and effective ministry and mission.

---

[44] David Goodhew, Andrew Roberts, and Michael Volland, *Fresh! An Introduction to Fresh Expressions of Church and Pioneer Ministry* (London: SCM Press, 2012).

Chapter Two

Towards an Understanding of the Entrepreneur

A contested term

> The word, entrepreneur, draws a mixed response when it is used in conjunction with Christian ministry. Although some are happy with it, more often than not it prompts responses ranging from discomfort to fervent objection. No doubt this is due to the association of the word with a worldly approach to wealth creation for personal gain.[45]

I wrote these words in one of the chapters I contributed to a co-authored textbook on fresh expressions of church and pioneer ministry, published in 2012. The comment comes in the middle of a passage of reflection on the kind of approach to Christian ministry that might be necessary in the current cultural context in the UK. I deliberately use the term entrepreneur to prompt the reader to consider the sorts of qualities that might be desirable in those engaging in this task. As part of my research for the chapter which, incidentally, took place alongside my doctoral research, I invited thirty men and women from diverse backgrounds and who were each engaged in various forms of Christian ministry to complete a survey. They were asked to provide responses to a number of questions. Among these was the following: 'Comment on the use of the term entrepreneur in relation to Christian pioneering'.[46] The responses were interesting and varied and I have reproduced nine of them below.[47]

John Went

Sometimes entrepreneurs have a tendency to be sole-operators, not good at listening to others, so I would wish to qualify entrepreneur with the ability to listen and to collaboratively involve others in the mission task.

---

[45] Michael Volland, *God's Call to Pioneer,* in David Goodhew, Andrew Roberts, and Michael Volland, *Fresh: An Introduction to Fresh Expressions of Church and Pioneer Ministry* (London: SCM Press, 2012), 143.

[46] Volland, *God's Call to Pioneer,* in Goodhew, Roberts, and Volland, *Fresh,* 146.

[47] Volland, *God's Call to Pioneer,* in Goodhew, Roberts, and Volland, *Fresh,* 146-149.

Chris Howson

I loathe the use of the term entrepreneur. We do not need to borrow more terms from the market – our faith has been privatized enough as it is! The word entrepreneur has too many connotations with taking risks for personal gain. The risks that a Christian takes are at personal cost, not gain. If one looks at contemporary understanding of the entrepreneur it is associated with programmes such as *The Apprentice* and *The Dragon's Den.* These programmes reflect the ruthlessness of modern Capitalist society, and are inherently confrontational and combative. Collaboration and solidarity are terms that might be more helpful.

David Wilkinson

I like the term entrepreneur. In a business context it speaks of someone who builds for the future, who sees new possibilities, who is prepared to take risks. I can see how some within the Church would react against it but there is creativity with entrepreneurship.

Ian Meredith

I run a business as well as being active in ministry (although I don't agree with the distinction). I am entrepreneurial in both.

Janet Sutton

Entrepreneur is not a term I would use in relation to my own pioneering ministry. I would prefer to use a word like prophetic. I suppose my own role is entrepreneurial as I began more or less with a blank piece of paper and a time span in which to achieve something. But it is not a definition that sits comfortably with me.

John Drane

I have no problem with the use of the word entrepreneur in relation to ministry just so long as we don't imagine it excludes some people.

Jonny Baker

An entrepreneur is someone who builds something. And I like people that spot opportunities or gaps and are able to create something there. It's an exciting word. For those of us who remember Margaret Thatcher it is also tainted with capitalist overtones but it's pretty clear that it's not being used in that way in the context of mission.

Robert Warren

Entrepreneurs are not often team players and can be driven rather than called. Servants and vocation are more important aspects of ministry that need exploring.

Ian Bell

> I understand the reason why the term is used, but I struggle to feel entirely comfortable with it. It is difficult to detach the word 'entrepreneur' from the world of business and commerce – which has sufficient connotations of consumerism and materialism to make it somewhat unhelpful. Maybe "spiritual entrepreneur" is slightly better?

The nine responses set out above are a selection of those received but they highlight the fact that the understanding and use of the term entrepreneur in relation to Christian ministry is not straightforward. Although some of the respondents are content with the association, with David Wilkinson, for example, stating 'I like the term',[48] others express varying levels of concern and one respondent, Chris Howson, goes as far as stating 'I loath the use of the term'.[49] The responses from my survey were not subject to rigorous analysis and cannot claim the authority that accompanies the conclusions of a robustly designed research project. In that sense, therefore, there is no claim that they are broadly representative of wider Christian attitudes. However, I strongly suggest that the responses point to the fact that in relation to Christian ministry, and therefore in the context of practical theology, the use of the term, entrepreneur, is contested.

In *The Enterprise Culture,* Peter Sedgwick acknowledges that 'There has been a suspicion of the market, wealth-creation and enterprise in the churches for a long time.'[50] This suspicion, as noted above, embraces the concept of the entrepreneur and is likely to be shaped by a number of factors including gender, personality type, social class, family history, political affiliations, profession, personal experience of financial matters, church denomination and tradition, understanding of scripture and image of God. I suggest, however, that there is a further, external factor, which has made a significant contribution to the negative perception of the entrepreneur articulated by some Christians. It comes from an observation made by Mark Casson et al., who make reference to the period in the West, since the early 1980s, during which a particular image of the entrepreneur emerged in the public consciousness. I contend that this image continues to shape perceptions of entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial

---

[48] Volland, *God's Call to Pioneer,* in Goodhew, Roberts, and Volland, *Fresh,* 147.
[49] Volland, *God's Call to Pioneer,* in Goodhew, Roberts, and Volland, *Fresh,* 146.
[50] Peter Sedgwick, *The Enterprise Culture: A Challenging New Theology of Wealth Creation for the 1990's* (London: SPCK, 1992), 6.

activity in the minds of many Christians who are uncomfortable with, or hostile to, the term. Casson et al. write,

> The enterprise culture of the 1980s and 1990s was a natural reaction to some of the anti-entrepreneurial attitudes that had taken root in the West in the early post-war period. It should not be inferred, however, that this enterprise culture was based on a correct understanding of the role of the entrepreneur. The highly competitive and materialistic form of individualism promoted by 'enterprise culture' did not accurately represent the dominant values of successful entrepreneurs of previous generations.[51]

I suggest that in relation to the current study, Casson et al's. observation is useful because it identifies a significant contribution to the negative associations that some make with the term, entrepreneur. An image of the entrepreneur as being responsible for, as well as a product of, a 'highly competitive and materialistic form of individualism'[52] is arguably still a dominant one for some Christians. One might say that, for some, the entrepreneur has become the personification of the morally suspect side of enterprise culture. This negative image was caricatured and widely popularised in 1988 by the comedian Harry Enfield in his creation of the obnoxious character, Loadsamoney[53], and has arguably been maintained by television programmes like *Dragons Den*[54] and *The Apprentice*.[55] I propose that the image of the entrepreneur as obnoxious, self-seeking and money-motivated continues to be a key association for some Christians. In his interview response, set out above, Jonny Baker recognises that for some, the term, entrepreneur continues to have negative associations with the culture of greed in the UK during the 1980s and early 1990s. With regard to the use of the term, entrepreneur, in relation to Christian ministry Baker states that 'For those of us who remember Margaret Thatcher it is also tainted with capitalist overtones'.[56] However, he goes on to point out that 'it's pretty clear that it's not being used in that way in the context of mission'.[57] Interestingly, having made their point about the enterprise culture of the 1980s and 1990s generating a wrong understanding of the role of the entrepreneur, Casson et al. go on to argue that the

---

[51] Mark Casson, et al., (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 10.
[52] Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 10.
[53] 'YouTube', http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ON-7v4qnHP8&feature=related (04/05/12).
[54] 'BBC Programmes'. http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b006vq92 (05/06/12).
[55] 'BBC Programmes'. http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b0071b63 (05/06/12).
[56] Volland, *God's Call to Pioneer,* in Goodhew, Roberts, and Volland, *Fresh,* 149.
[57] Volland, *God's Call to Pioneer,* in Goodhew, Roberts, and Volland, *Fresh,* 149.

evidence 'suggests that successful entrepreneurship is as much a co-operative endeavour, mediated by social networks, as a purely individualistic and competitive one'.[58] I suggest that those Christians who respond hesitantly or negatively to language around entrepreneurship are likely to have less of an issue with entrepreneurship when conceived of as a co-operative, mutually supportive and non-competitive approach to life and work (and all that this implies for Christian ministry and mission) rather than as competitive, individualistic wealth creation. In early 2012 I interviewed an Anglican priest in the Diocese of Durham as part of my research for an article on entrepreneurship that was subsequently published in the *Church of England Newspaper*. In the article I wrote,

> One parish priest, initially uncomfortable with the prospect of associating her ministry with that of being an entrepreneur, commented after a long discussion, "When I look at it like that, I'd like to be more entrepreneurial!"[59]

I am not suggesting that conclusions can be drawn from this single example, however, I do propose that it is possible that when given an explanation for the way in which the current study is using the language around entrepreneurship, those Christians for whom the term has negative associations might be helped to understand ways in which it could also be considered useful in reflecting on the potential shape of Anglican priestly ministry and mission in contemporary culture.

I have proposed that negative associations of the entrepreneur articulated by some Christians are, at least partially, a result of the image that has emerged from the enterprise culture discussed by Casson et al. At the root of discomfort with this image for some Christians is a dual recognition that *greed* is a primary motivating factor for a good deal of wealth-generating activity and that greed (whether expressed individually or corporately) is entirely inconsistent with Jesus' proclamation of the coming Kingdom of God.[60] It is possible to argue that Jesus' proclamation of the

---

[58] Casson, et al. (eds.), *Oxford Handbook,* 10.
[59] Church of Enlgland Newspaper. http://religiousintelligence.org/Churchnewspaper/?p=23985 (Published in print and online on 15/03/12).
[60] There is extensive literature dealing with Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom of God. Much of this is surveyed by George E. Ladd in *A Theology of the New Testament,* (revised ed.), (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 1994), and by N. T. Wright in *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 2004). These two scholarly works discuss the significant contributions made by Schweitzer, Bultmann, Dodd, Jeremias, Cranfield, Allison, Beasley-Murray, Meyer and Dalman among others.

coming Kingdom of God includes a 'preferential option for the poor'[61] and implies, therefore, a degree of hostility towards the creation, retention and use of wealth. Exponents of a theology of liberation,[62] for example, 'respond to the 'reality' which confronts millions: poverty, appalling living conditions, malnutrition, inadequate health care, contrasting with the affluence [of the wealthy elites]'.[63] Those who cite Jesus' preferential option for the poor, including, but not exclusively those who embrace theologies of liberation, point to the identity of those with whom Jesus chose to spend the majority of his time (the poor), the warnings he aimed at the rich and the explicit message of aspects of his teaching and a number of his parables. In support of this view, particular examples from the gospels[64] might include Matthew who, at Jesus' call, abandons his toll-booth,[65] exchanging lucrative employment for a life on the road with a homeless rabbi.[66] One might also highlight the account of the rich young ruler[67] to whom Jesus said, 'Go, sell everything you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me.'[68] There is the account of Zacchaeus,[69] who, upon encountering Jesus, repents of his corrupt and self-seeking existence, returns four times what he has taken from those he has cheated and gives half of his possessions to the poor. In the same chapter Luke records Jesus telling his

---

[61] The Medellin Documents of the Conference of Latin American Bishops (1968) quoted in Joseph Milburn Thompson, *Introducing Catholic Social Thought* (New York: Orbis Books, 2010), 31.

[62] For an introduction to Liberation Theology see Gustavo Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation* (new ed.) (London: SCM Press, 2001), and Leonardo Boff, and Clodovis Boff, *Introducing Liberation Theology* (New York: Orbis Books, 1996).

[63] Christopher Rowland, (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Liberation Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 5.

[64] In reflecting on Jesus' attitude to wealth in the Gospels I worked with the following commentaries: John Barton, and John Muddiman, (eds.), *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (Oxford: OUP, 2001); Fred B. Craddock, *Luke: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1990); James D. G. Dunn, (ed.), *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible* (Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003); Donald English, *The Message of Mark* (Leicester: IVP, 1992); Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1997); Michael Green, *The Message of Matthew* (Leicester: IVP, 1998); Douglas A. Hare, *Matthew: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1993); Leander E. Keck, et al., (eds.), *The New Interpreter's Bible* (Vol. 9) *Luke, John* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1995); William L. Lane, *The Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974); Bruce Milne, *The Message of John* (Leicester: IVP, 1993); Gerard Sloyan, *John: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1988).

[65] Mark 2: 14, Matthew 9: 9, Luke 5: 27-28.

[66] See Tom Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 2004), 297-301.

[67] Matthew 19:16–30, Mark 10:17–31, Luke 18: 18-25.

[68] Mark 10: 21.

[69] Luke 19:1–10.

hearers to, 'Sell your possessions and give to the poor'.[70] In Matthew's account of the Sermon on the Mount Jesus tells his hearers, 'Do not store up for yourself treasures on earth but store up for yourselves treasures in heaven. You cannot serve both God and money'.[71] We might also note Jesus' parable of the rich fool[72] who resolves to build bigger barns in which to store his surplus, but from whom God demands his life and about whom Jesus says, 'This is how it will be with whoever stores up things for themselves but is not rich toward God'.[73] It is possible to see from these examples how one might begin to construct a case for arguing that Jesus' agenda was firmly anti-wealth and its creation and that following him meant becoming *like* the poor; turning one's back on worldly wealth and time spent in its acquisition and embracing instead a life of austerity, if not outright poverty.

On the other hand there are plenty of examples of Jesus spending time with those who retained and used their wealth and who articulated solidarity with his message. Among examples that might be proffered are Zacchaeus, described by Luke as wealthy,[74] who gave away half of his possessions, and about whom Jesus announced, 'Today salvation has come to this household'[75] but who appeared to continue living in his home with the remaining half of his possessions and to pursue his occupation as a chief tax collector. Luke also reports that as Jesus travelled with his disciples from village to village proclaiming the kingdom, a large number of women, including the wife of the manager of Herod's household 'were helping to support them out of their own means'.[76] Joseph of Arimathea is described as a rich man[77] who is also a disciple of Jesus[78] who buries Jesus in his own tomb.[79] In relation to the examples provided about Jesus' attitude to wealth and its creation and use by those around him, Tom Wright argues that it is possible to detect in Jesus' call to various of his followers, different levels of challenge in relation to what must be abandoned and what might be retained. Wright states,

---

[70] Luke 12: 33.
[71] Matthew 6:19–21, 24.

[72] Luke 12:16–21.
[73] Luke 12: 21.
[74] Luke 19: 2.
[75] Luke 19: 9.
[76] Luke 8: 1-3.
[77] Matthew 27: 57.
[78] John 19: 38.
[79] Matthew 27: 57-60, Mark 15: 43-46, Luke 23: 50-53, John 19: 38-41.

It is clear that, while Jesus was perfectly content for some (like Mary and Martha) to remain loyal to him at a distance, he challenged some others to sell up and join him on the road. Some appear to have been with him from time to time; others to have provided for him and his disciples from their private property, which assumes that they still had property from which to gain income.[80]

We note, therefore, the need to proceed cautiously when attempting to articulate a view of Jesus' attitude to the creation and use of wealth. From what the gospel writers report of Jesus, we receive the impression that the thrust of his teaching was not concerned with opposition to making money in business, or to the fact of personal wealth, but was concerned rather with the *greed* that all too often lay behind these things. As noted above, those contemporaries of Jesus who were his followers and supporters included those who had personal wealth and those whose lives involved them in trade and commerce. Jesus told parables in which merchants and land-owners[81] were not the focus of disapproval but players in a wider drama. The central point here is that it is *greed* and not wealth or its generation that is inconsistent with Jesus' proclamation of the coming Kingdom of God.[82] Jesus inaugurates the Kingdom and announces the inevitability of all things, including the creation and use of wealth, being brought under God's sovereign rule[83] and in line, therefore, with principles of justice and provision for all.[84] This is part of the *Good News* announced by Jesus:[85] an end to an unfair system in which abundance for the powerful few was at the cost of scarcity for the powerless majority.[86] So, although we may argue that Jesus did not have a particular issue with business and the creation and use of wealth, his understanding of the nature and shape of the coming Kingdom of God led him to say some very significant things about the *place* that wealth and its generation occupied in the heart and life of the individual in relation to God and to others.[87] For twenty-first century Christians, Jesus' proclamation of the coming Kingdom of God continues to imply consequences for every sphere of human life and work, including business. Jesus' teaching and example echo the Jewish Law and the Prophets and include

---

[80] Wright, *Jesus*, 298.
[81] Examples include: Matthew 13: 45-46, Mark 12: 1-12, Luke 15: 11-32 and 16: 1-13.
[82] Matthew 23: 25, Mark 7: 22, Luke 11: 39 and 12: 15.
[83] Matthew 4: 17, Mark 1: 15.
[84] See Leviticus 25.
[85] Matthew 11: 5, Luke 4: 18.
[86] See N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (London: SPCK, 1992).
[87] See Wright, *Jesus,* 302-303.

warnings about the creation of wealth for its own sake,[88] since at the heart of this lies greed, which is a form of idolatry[89] and which points to a disregard for the needs of others. Both greed and a disregard for fellow human beings are outward signs of an attitude of the heart that is contrary to that which is demanded by Jesus' summary of the Law[90] and are therefore inconsistent with the values of the coming Kingdom of God.

The purpose of this brief discussion has been to highlight the fact that where the creation of wealth is motivated by greed (whether individual or corporate), this is in direct conflict with Jesus' proclamation of the coming Kingdom of God. I contend that the suspicion of the term 'entrepreneur' articulated by some Christians may ultimately be rooted in a perception, generated and, to some degree, sustained by the enterprise culture of the 1980s and 1990s outlined by Casson et al., that what motivates wealth-generating entrepreneurial activity is greed. For such Christians, greed indicates a disregard for God and for others, both of which are inconsistent with Jesus' teaching about the coming Kingdom of God. In relation to this point, we must keep in view Casson et al's. contention that the understanding of the entrepreneur that emerged in enterprise culture was in fact based on a wrong understanding of the entrepreneur when that role is considered in relation to the activity of entrepreneurs at other points in Western history. It is also important to note that although the image of the entrepreneur that emerged in enterprise culture may continue to have a negative impact on the associations some Christians make with the term, social science research in the area of entrepreneurship suggests that generation of wealth is a natural bi-product of entrepreneurial activity rather than a primary motivating factor for many successful entrepreneurs. In commenting on the work of Joseph Schumpeter, Swedberg comments that 'It should be pointed out that money *per se* is not what ultimately motivates the entrepreneur, according to Schumpeter.'[91] Schumpeter argued that the entrepreneur is driven by 'the desire for power and independence', 'the will to succeed' and 'the satisfaction of getting things done'.[92] According to significant studies, becoming involved in entrepreneurial activity because it is

---

[88] Luke 12:13–21.
[89] Exodus 20:3 and 23.
[90] Matthew 22: 37-40, Mark 12: 29-31.
[91] Richard Swedberg, (ed.), *Entrepreneurship: The Social Science View* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), 16.
[92] Swedberg, *Entrepreneurship,* 16.

interesting and enjoyable is a key motivating factor for many entrepreneurs,[93] as is a high need for achievement,[94] and a desire for autonomy.[95] In relation to this last point, Kirby echoes Schumpeter's view in stating that 'desire to manage or take ownership of one's own life is a central feature of entrepreneurship'.[96]

As I move towards a deliberate use of the term 'entrepreneur' in relation to Anglican priestly ministry, it is important to note the suspicions and negative associations that some Christians might have and to remain alert to the contested nature of the term. However, the current study proceeds from the belief that the term has much to offer the Church of England when the focus is moved away from wealth-creation and placed instead on a range of visionary and creative qualities that entrepreneurs exhibit and which, when exercised by Anglican priests in a receptive context, have the potential to produce outcomes that have recognised value for a wider group or groups.

The trouble with a definition…

It is important to acknowledge that there is no agreed definition of the entrepreneur in the social science literature or in common use. Drucker goes as far as saying that there is 'total confusion over the terms entrepreneur and entrepreneurship'.[97] While Brockhaus and Horwitz point out that 'the literature appears to support the argument that there is no generic definition of the entrepreneur'.[98] Kuratko and Hodgetts highlight the fact that 'no single definition of 'entrepreneur' exists and no one profile can represent today's entrepreneur'.[99] Ricketts follows this, explaining that 'Entrepreneurship is not a concept that has a

---

[93] See Deci and Ryan (1985), Delmar and Witte (2000), Amabile (1997).
[94] See McClelland's theory of nAch (1961).
[95] See Caird (1991), Cromie and O'Donoghue (1992), McClelland (1961).
[96] David A. Kirby, *Entrepreneurship* (Maidenhead: McGraw Hill Education, 2003), 113.
[97] Peter F. Drucker, *Innovation and Entrepreneurship* (Oxford: Elsevier, 1985), 19.

[98] Robert H. Brockhaus, 'Foreward', in Brockhaus, Robert H. Brockhaus, et al. (eds.), *Entrepreneurship Education: A Global View* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2001), ix.

[99] Donald F. Kuratko, and Richard M. Hodgetts, *Entrepreneurship: A Contemporary Approach* (5th ed.), (Sydney: Harcourt College Publishers, 2001), 28.

tightly agreed definition.'[100] Licht and Siegel also acknowledge the lack of an agreed definition for entrepreneurship and, with an economic focus uppermost in their minds, they ask 'for example, whether innovation is a necessary element or does self-employment suffice, or whether self-employment and ownership of a small business firm are equally entrepreneurial'.[101] They go on to highlight the fact that the lack of '[a widely] agreed definition makes it difficult to compare and even relate studies to one another'.[102] In the introduction to their work on the entrepreneurial personality, and having highlighted the absence of a 'standard, universally accepted definition of entrepreneurship',[103] Chell et al. quote Livesay who suggests that 'successful entrepreneurship is an art form as much as, or perhaps more than, it is an economic activity, and as such is as difficult as any other artistic activity to explain in terms of origin, method or environmental influence'.[104]

Chell et al. ponder whether persistence in asking questions about *what* entrepreneurship is and *who* the entrepreneurs are is a futile pursuit and they draw on Kilby's (1971) likening of the search for the entrepreneur to hunting the Heffalump to emphasise the point. Kilby writes,

> [The Heffalump] is a rather large and very important animal. He has been hunted by many individuals using various ingenious trapping devices, but no one so far has succeeded in capturing him. All who claim to have caught sight of him report that he is enormous, but they disagree on his particularities.[105]

And it is here that we are able to see and articulate an issue that has pertinence for the current study. The term 'entrepreneur' means different things to different people. The term itself is relatively young and the nature of the activity to which it pertains has evolved, and continues to do so, over time and across cultures. It is widely used in large and small business contexts, in industry, in politics, in the media, the entertainment industries and increasingly in the not-for-profit sector. It continues to

---

[100] Martin Ricketts, *Theories of Entrepreneurship: Historical Development and Critical Assessment,* in Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 34.

[101] Licht and Siegal in Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 512.
[102] Licht and Siegal in Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 512.
[103] Elizabeth Chell, et al., *The Entrepreneurial Personality: Concepts, Cases and Categories* (London: Routledge, 1991), 1.

[104] Livesay (1982), in Chell, et al., *The Entrepreneurial Personality*, 13.
[105] Peter M. Kilby, (ed.), *Entrepreneurship and Economic Development* (New York: Macmillan, 1971), in Chell, et al., *The Entrepreneurial Personality*, 2.

be studied, and therefore variously understood, by academics working across the social sciences in a variety of disciplines including economics, psychology, sociology, anthropology[106] and practical theology. Given the widespread recognition in the literature that there is no agreed definition of entrepreneur or entrepreneurship, and given the diversity of contexts within which these words are in use, I note that no authoritative, widely agreed definition of the entrepreneur straddling the range of practical contexts or academic disciplines is in existence, or indeed, will ever be possible. However, as we shall see, this does not imply that the term is unusable or that we cannot propose and work with a definition that is in sympathy with a mainstream understanding of it.

Origin and evolution of the term 'entrepreneur'

A recognisably modern idea of the entrepreneur began to emerge in Europe, England and the United States in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[107] The origin of the word provides us with some helpful insights into the development of the concept. 'Entrepreneur' derives from the French words *entre* meaning 'between' and *prendre,* which is the verb 'to take'. The French verb *entreprendre* means 'to undertake' or 'to do something.'[108] Bolton and Thompson suggest that these origins might imply that entrepreneur 'was another name for a merchant who acts as a go-between for parties in the trading process'.[109] Swedberg draws on the work of Hoselitz to argue that the verb 'was originally used in the Middle Ages in the sense of 'a person who is active, who gets things done'.'[110] For Bolton and Thompson the origin of the term, entrepreneur, is an important indicator of what the entrepreneur does and achieves, or of the process and results.[111] They argue that, although the term, entrepreneur, may not have emerged until the eighteenth century, subsequently giving rise to a range of commercially-related understandings that shape our modern

---

[106] For a survey of the social science literature see, Swedberg, (ed.), *Entrepreneurship.*
[107] See Sydney G. Checkland, *The Rise of Industrial Society in England 1815-1885* (London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1964).

[108] Swedberg, *Entrepreneurship,* 11.
[109] Bill Bolton and John Thompson, *Entrepreneurs: Talent, Temperament, Technique,* (2nd ed.). (Oxford: Elsevier, 2004), 14.
[110] Bert Hoselitz, *The Early History of Entrepreneurial Theory: Explorations in Entrepreneurial History 3* (1951), 193-220, in Swedberg, *Entrepreneurship,* 11.
[111] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs*, 14.

understanding of it, it is possible to identify the entrepreneur throughout history. They draw on the French verb *entreprendre* and explain that this relates to undertaking a venture 'but it can also be used in relation to starting a new venture, and this is central to the use of the word 'entrepreneur' in English'.[112]

In the view of Bolton and Thompson it is possible to identify figures throughout history including figures in scripture as entrepreneurs because the process of entrepreneurship is not shackled to the emergence of the word in eighteenth century France or the subsequent evolution of the concept in economic theory.[113] Casson et al. assert that 'the term 'entrepreneur' appears to have been introduced into economic theory by Richard Cantillon (1759), an Irish economist of French descent'.[114] In his theory of the entrepreneur, presented in a work enitled *Essay on the Nature of Commerce in General* (*circa* 1730), Cantillon 'stresses function, rather than personality or social status'.[115] 'According to Cantillon, the entrepreneur is a specialist in taking risk.'[116] This notion is consistent with Bolton and Thompson's association of the word with a merchant acting as go-between for trading parties; an undertaking that would almost certainly involve personal financial risk. Drawing on Hebert and Link,[117] de Montoya writes 'Cantillon's entrepreneur is someone who engages in exchanges for profit, using business judgement in a situation of uncertainty, buying at one price to sell at another, uncertain price in the future.'[118] Cantillion's entrepreneur

> insures workers by buying their output for resale before consumers have indicated how much they are willing to pay for it. The workers receive an assured income, while the entrepreneur bears the risk caused by price fluctuations in consumer markets.[119]

De Montoya tells us that as well as highlighting the bearing of risk as a function of the entrepreneur, Cantillon also identified

---

[112] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs*, 15.
[113] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs*, 14-16.
[114] Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 3.
[115] Monica Lindh de Montoya, in Swedberg, *Entrepreneurship,* 338.
[116] Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 3.
[117] Robert F. Hebert, and Albert N. Link, *The Entrepreneur: Mainstream Views and Radical Critiques* (New York: Praeger, 1988).
[118] de Montoya, in Swedberg, *Entrepreneurship,* 338.
[119] Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 3.

business judgement, or decision-making as important to entrepreneurship; a theme echoed by Marshall (1925), Mises (1951) and Schultz (1980) among others such as Kirzner (1985) who writes of the entrepreneur as someone who discovers profit opportunities and is an allocator of resources among alternative possible uses.[120]

This identification of the entrepreneur with judgement and decision-making is picked up by Casson et al. who, argue that the insights of economists such as Cantillon (1759), Marshall (1919), Knight (1921), Schumpeter (1934), von Hayek (1937) and Kirzner (1973) 'can be synthesized by identifying an entrepreneurial function that is common to all approaches. This is the exercise of judgement in decision making'.[121]

John Stuart Mill, whose writing highlights an important distinction between the entrepreneur (or undertaker) and the manager, is credited with introducing the term, entrepreneur, into English economics in the mid-nineteenth century.[122] Mill stated that the profit from an undertaking engaged in by an entrepreneur had to be sufficient to provide

a sufficient equivalent for abstinence, indemnity for risk, and remuneration for the labour and skill required for superintendence. While the difference between the interest and the gross profit remunerates the exertions and risks of the undertaker.[123]

Mill's use of the phrase 'indemnity for risk' is highly significant and is likely to have influenced his choice of the word 'undertaker' rather than manager when outlining the function of the entrepreneur. Although Cantillon is credited as being the first to identify the bearing of risk as a key function or specialism of the entrepreneur, the reward for which is profit, in Mill's writing we have, *in English*, the beginning of the association of the entrepreneur, or one who undertakes, with the notion of risk bearing; an association which continues to the present day. The association has been contested by some, the most prominent of whom is Joseph A. Schumpeter,[124] for whom 'the supply of capital and the supply of entrepreneurial services were quite

---

[120] de Montoya, in Swedberg, *Entrepreneurship,* 338.

[121] Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 3.

[122] Joseph A. Schumpeter, *History of Economic Analysis* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1954), 556.

[123] John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy: The People's Edition*, (London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1898), pp. 245-6.

[124] See Joseph A. Schumpeter, *The Theory of Economic Development* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1911).

distinct, and risk attached to the former not the latter'.[125] Schumpeter's work will be discussed in a little more depth shortly. In his book, *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit*,[126] the US economist Frank Knight worked with and developed Cantillon's ideas and 'distinguished between risk, which is insurable, and uncertainty, which is not'.[127] According to Knight 'Risk refers to recurrent events whose relative frequency is known from past experience, while uncertainty relates to unique events whose probability can only be subjectively estimated.'[128] In Knight's opinion, the majority of risks relating to production and marketing fell into the second of these two categories. The owners of businesses cannot insure against such risks, argued Knight, which meant that they themselves were left to bear them. Casson et al. report that for Knight 'Pure profit is the reward for bearing this uninsurable risk: it is the reward of the entrepreneur.'[129]

As mentioned, above, the writing of Joseph A. Schumpeter has arguably contributed most to popular notions of entrepreneurship. According to Casson et al. Schumpeter was 'concerned with the 'high level' kind of entrepreneurship that, historically, has led to the creation of railways, the development of the chemical industry, and the growth of integrated oil companies.'[130] He viewed the entrepreneur as a revolutionary innovator who, in creating new industries, participated in major structural changes in the economy. He emphasized the importance of the entrepreneur in national economic development and is responsible for the metaphor 'gale of creative destruction'[131] which describes the 'competitive processes of capitalist development.'[132] The 'unceasing gale derives from the energy of entrepreneurs'.[133] Ricketts tells us that for Schumpeter, entrepreneurship is 'the force that prevents the economic system running down and continually resists the approach of the classic

[125] Martin Ricketts, *The Entrepreneur in Classical Political Economy,* in Casson et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 41.
[126] Frank H. Knight, *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1921).

[127] Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 3.
[128] Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 3.
[129] Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 3.
[130] Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 3.
[131] Joseph A. Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942),132.
[132] Ricketts, in Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 46.
[133] Ricketts, in Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 46.

stationary state'.[134] This notion is particularly interesting when transferred to the context of the Church of England, where one might argue that the presence and activity of entrepreneurial priests are a force that prevent the institution as a whole from 'running down' and becoming stationary.

In as much as it is to be found in a particular place, Schumpeter's theory of the entrepreneur is articulated in the second chapter (*Entrepreneurship as Innovation*) of the translated version (1934) of the second edition (1926) of *The Theory of Economic Development.*[135] It is here that Schumpeter

> says that entrepreneurship can be defined as the making of a '*new combination*' of already existing materials and forces; that entrepreneurship consists of making innovations, as opposed to inventions; and that no one is an entrepreneur for ever, only when he or she is actually doing the innovative activity.[136]

The emphasis here is on function: what the entrepreneur *does,* so that we might say that for Schumpeter particular individuals engage in necessary entrepreneurial activity from time to time. Schumpeter's emphasis on discontinuous activity differs from that of Bolton and Thompson who tie identity and function together more tightly and associate the entrepreneur's ability to innovate with habit. For Bolton and Thompson, the entrepreneur *habitually* engages in creative innovation in order to 'build something of recognised value'.[137] Whereas Schumpeter focused on the entrepreneur as a person with 'the vision and willpower to "found a private kingdom"'[138] and who performed a vital economic function by engaging in 'revolutionary and discontinuous'[139] innovation, Bolton and Thompson's entrepreneur 'just cannot stop being an entrepreneur',[140] and is likely to be found in any number of contexts beyond the world of business and commerce.

---

[134] Ricketts, in Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 46.
[135] Swedberg reviews Schumpeter's contribution to economic thought with particular attention to his theory of entrepreneurship which, Swedberg points out 'is part of an attempt to construct a whole new type of economic theory'. Swedberg, *Entrepreneurship,* 12.

[136] Swedberg, *Entrepreneurship,* 15.
[137] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.
[138] Ricketts, in Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 46.
[139] Ricketts, in Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 46.
[140] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.

Entrepreneurs: Talent, Temperament, Technique

In *Entrepreneurs: Talent, Temperament, Technique*, (2004) Bolton and Thompson set out their understanding and definition of the entrepreneur.[141] The first part of the book deals with the talent and temperament of entrepreneurs. Here Bolton and Thompson ask *who* the entrepreneur is. They begin by presenting their definition of the entrepreneur and reviewing the relevant research literature. They go on to explain their use of Talent, Temperament and Technique and to examine ways in which it might be possible to identify entrepreneurs. The first part of the book concludes with an exploration of the strategic contribution of entrepreneurs. In the second part of the book Bolton and Thompson provide practical examples to show how the three factors of talent, temperament and technique combine to produce entrepreneurs. These are the *what?* questions: what does an entrepreneur do? What happens in the real world? What do they achieve? In the third part of the book technique and entrepreneurial environment are examined. These are the *how?* questions: how do entrepreneurs do what they do? In this final section of the book Bolton and Thompson explore the practical issues of finding, developing and supporting entrepreneurs.

In light of the discussion at the start of this chapter on the contested nature of the term entrepreneur, Bolton and Thompson's comments about their hoped-for outcomes from the book are interesting. They write

---

[141] Bolton and Thompson's work on entrepreneurship has been used with Anglican clergy in the dioceses of Chelmsford and Southwell (this information was provided by e-mail by Bill Bolton on 22/12/11), and by the Church of England more widely in relation to the selection of Ordained Pioneer Ministers. A review of the selection procedures for ordained pioneer ministry in 2010 included the following statement: 'The candidate would also have to complete on-line Bill Bolton's test to measure entrepreneurial capacity.' Paper 3, *Selection Process for Candidates for Pioneer Ministry: Pre-Conference Paperwork,* 7., MC(10)04, The Archbishop's Council, Ministry Council, *Review of the Selection Procedures for Ordained Pioneer Ministry* (March 2010). The test to which the report makes reference is Bolton and Thompson's First Screening Entrepreneur Indicator (hereafter referred to as FSEI). The FSEI is an online tool that assesses entrepreneurial potential. The current study utilises the FSEI to generate research data. This is discussed in chapter four. The Church of England's use of Bolton and Thompson's work prompted my own professional and research engagement with their writing and with the FSEI. It is also important to note that Bolton is an Anglican Lay Reader in the diocese of Chelmsford. This factor is highly significant since it has prompted and informed much of his thinking in the area of entrepreneurship and, in my view, made him an ideal conversation partner in the current study. My evolving research interest in Bolton and Thompson's work resulted in a five-hour face-to-face interview with Bolton in London on 17 February 2011. In November 2011, at my invitation, Bolton gave a public lecture on *Kingdom Entrepreneurs* at St. John's College, Durham.

> We hope that it [the book] will make you think differently about entrepreneurs and understand that not all of them are out there making money at other people's expense. We would like to redeem the word 'entrepreneur' and give it a more positive image linking it with concepts such as integrity and philanthropy. Our emphasis on entrepreneurial talent, as being something a person is given, promotes that end.'[142]

They go on to remark that

> 'We want entrepreneurs to become both socially acceptable and academically respectable. Only when this happens will the culture barriers in society come down'.[143]

Other outcomes that Bolton and Thompson hope will result from their provision of insight into what entrepreneurs do and achieve include: a desire that various financial and bureaucratic hurdles to entrepreneurship are removed; those with the potential to be entrepreneurs are given opportunities, and those who work in large organisations become more enterprising. Their hopes apply to those working entrepreneurially in a diverse range of contexts. The attention that Bolton and Thompson pay to entrepreneurial behaviour in a range of contexts is one of the factors that makes their understanding of the entrepreneur particularly helpful in the context of the current study. Among the most significant of their hopes is their desire that the role that 'clusters of entrepreneurs can play in economic and social development [is] recognised'.[144] They argue that

> A few entrepreneurs can make a difference but when there are many of them and their number reaches a critical mass, a region or community simply takes off. Economic growth and social development become self-sustaining and an entrepreneurial culture develops.[145]

They provide examples of this, including the Renaissance, the Industrial Revolution and examples of the current high-technology revolution such as the Silicon Valley phenomenon. They point out that some argue that those with real entrepreneurial flair will simply get on with it regardless of whether they are alone and in spite of the difficulties involved. However, they explain that they do not subscribe to the 'macho

---

[142] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 5.
[143] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 5.
[144] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 6.
[145] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 6.

view of entrepreneurship'[146] and point out that when the environment is not receptive to entrepreneurs 'there will be significantly fewer of them and it is the number of entrepreneurs that is the critical factor'.[147] In the context of the current study, the point about clusters of entrepreneurs is pertinent since the dominant model of Anglican priestly ministry is that of the priest essentially operating alone, or possibly with a small leadership team. Clergy are, of course, members of their deanery chapter and are encouraged to gather regularly with their local colleagues in this forum. However, reflecting on my personal experience of attendance at many deanery chapter meetings in a variety of contexts, and given the house-keeping nature of the business that tends to dominate such gatherings, I suggest that this is not a forum that can be realistically compared with what Bolton and Thompson have in mind when they talk about clusters of entrepreneurs. If we take Bolton and Thompson's point about the importance of entrepreneurial clusters seriously, it is worth noting that where the Anglican priests interviewed as part of the empirical element of the current study are engaged in entrepreneurial activity, they would appear to be doing so in spite of their environment rather than as a result of it.

In moving towards a definition of the entrepreneur, Bolton and Thompson point out that entrepreneurs are 'a minority group',[148] and do not fit a particular *type*. Both of these points have significance for the current study and are to some extent confirmed by the empirical research both in my pilot study and in subsequent data generation. The pilot study[149] involved fourteen members of the academic teaching staff at St. John's College, Durham. Of these, four (a minority) achieved relatively high scores in the FSEI. Follow-up interviews with these four confirmed Bolton and Thompson's assertion that entrepreneurs do not fit a 'type'. Two were male and two female, three were married, one single. Each differed from the others in terms of family, educational, employment and financial backgrounds. In short, they didn't easily fit a 'type' either in relation to each other or a particular notion of the entrepreneur. Bolton and Thompson's points about minority and 'type' were also supported by the experience of the wider data generation for the current study. The eighteen priests in the wider data generation were male and female, married and

---

[146] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 6.
[147] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 6.
[148] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 14.
[149] The pilot study is outlined and discussed in chapter four.

single, ranging in age and differing from one another in terms of family, education, employment and financial backgrounds. The one area in which all the respondents showed little variation was ethnicity, with all being white European or white American. Significantly, Bolton and Thompson also contend that 'our education system and our professions – to name but two factors – not only inhibit the flowering of entrepreneurial talent, they positively discourage it'.[150] Given that the current study has emerged from my own professional practice as a theological educator, a position which involves me in delivering training for those seeking to exercise priestly ministry, this last point is pertinent and, although there is not space in the current study to explore the impact on entrepreneurial priests of clergy training and the move towards professionalisation, I note that Bolton and Thompson's point provokes reflection on the pedagogy underpinning and informing not only my own professional practice but that of Initial Ministerial Education (IME)[151] and Continuing Ministerial Development (CMD).[152]

Having argued that the 'who' question in relation to entrepreneurs is difficult, Bolton and Thompson go on to state that the 'what' is easier because the answer is based on what the entrepreneur does (i.e. the process) or on what the entrepreneur achieves (i.e. the results). In constructing their definition of the entrepreneur, Bolton and Thompson state that they 'see the 'who' as a person and the 'what' as a process that is habitual and involves creativity and innovation and results in something of value that can be recognised by others'.[153] They go on to remark that 'The building process, of course, first needs an opportunity to build on and this is something the entrepreneur is always able to spot.'[154] Bolton and Thompson's definition of the entrepreneur is

> **'A person who habitually creates and innovates to build something of recognised value around perceived opportunities.'[155]**

I will now comment on the central elements of this definition in turn.

---

[150] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 14.
[151] 'Church of England'. http://www.Churchofengland.org/clergy-office-holders/ministry/ministerial-education-and-development/initial-ministerial-education.aspx (12/06/12).
[152] 'Church of England'. http://www.Churchofengland.org/clergy-office-holders/ministry/ministerial-education-and-development/continuing-ministerial-development.aspx (12/06/12).
[153] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.
[154] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.
[155] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.

'A person'

Bolton and Thompson explain that in opening their definition with 'a person' their aim is to emphasise the involvement of personality rather than a system and that 'a person' can be a group of people since 'it is possible to describe teams and even organisations as entrepreneurial'.[156] In this, Bolton and Thompson echo Schumpeter's later writing, in which he expressed the view that 'the entrepreneur does not have to be a single person but can equally well be an organisation, either a political or an economic one. What matters is behaviour, not the actor'.[157] In an ideal situation entrepreneurial priests would find themselves operating as members of entrepreneurial teams within an entrepreneurial organisation. In reality entrepreneurial priests are likely to be working alone and against the grain since local congregations, as well as the Church of England more generally, tend, like most large organisations, towards an inherent conservatism. Entrepreneurial priests will find ways to satisfy their habitual entrepreneurial flair. With grace and wisdom this has the potential to be well directed and to gain and retain the support of the congregation, resulting in the creation of real value at a range of levels. At worst there is the risk of the entrepreneurial priest being responsible for starting initiatives that the congregation are unwilling or unable to support, or which result in the priest being viewed by the institution as difficult, eccentric or otherwise problematic. Kirby picks up on what is at the heart of the last point, stating that

> Enterprising individuals are often not attracted to large organisations and tend not to be found in them. When they are, either they become worn down by bureaucracy or they leave. Often, large organisations see such people as loners rather than team players, or as eccentrics more interested in pet projects than corporate objectives. They are frequently viewed as cynics, rebels, free spirits.[158]

The Church of England is a large institution and it is possible to recognise Kirby's point in relation to it. It is possible to make a challenging contrast between the radical life and teaching of Jesus Christ (and the example of the early Christians) with the church as it developed into an institution through the ages and across the globe. In spite of the fact that the contrast is all-too-easily simplified, the tension between the

---

[156] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.
[157] Schumpeter, in Swedberg, *Entrepreneurship,* 17.
[158] Kirby, *Entrepreneurship,* 302.

radical and the institutional is an inherent part of the story of the church and is something with which it continues to wrestle. The perception and treatment of entrepreneurial priests by others in the institution is an aspect of that struggle.

The terms 'organisational entrepreneurship', 'corporate entrepreneurship' and 'intrapreneurship' have all become popular ways of describing the 'process in which innovative products or processes are developed by creating an entrepreneurial culture within an organisation'.[159] Whether the Church of England is moving in this direction is outside the scope of the current study. The point here is to note that entrepreneurial priests cannot accurately be described as 'intrapreneurs' simply because they work for a large organisation. According to Kirby, intrapreneurship is a deliberate and strategic approach by large organisations to 'integrate the strengths of the entrepreneurial small firm (creativity, flexibility, innovativeness, closeness to market, etc) with the market power and financial resources of the large organisation'.[160] The Church of England has not adopted an explicitly intrapreneurial approach at any level and I suggest that those priests who act entrepreneurially do so because it is in their nature to act in this way and not because the organisation of which they are a part has made any deliberate strategic effort to encourage this type of activity. It might be helpful to point out that while intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship share characteristics such as a focus on innovation, the creation of value-added products and an involvement in 'risky' activities, there are a number of significant differences. Kirby tells us that 'intrapreneurship is restorative while entrepreneurship is developmental'.[161] Intrapreneurship is 'intended to counter stagnation within the organisation'.[162] Kirby goes on to say that 'while the entrepreneur is concerned to overcome obstacles in the market, the intrapreneur has to overcome corporate obstacles'.[163] I contend that the priest acting entrepreneurially has to overcome both!

While Bolton and Thompson state that 'a person' can be either an individual or a group of people, in *Faith Entrepreneurs* (2006), Michael Simms contends that being 'an agent of change who adds value through creatively and passionately

---

[159] Kirby, *Entrepreneurship,* 300.
[160] Kirby, *Entrepreneurship,* 300.
[161] Kirby, *Entrepreneurship,* 300.
[162] Kirby, *Entrepreneurship,* 300.
[163] Kirby, *Entrepreneurship,* 300.

launching bold initiatives, all the while taking calculated risks *for God*'[164] is never a solitary venture. Simms argues that, for those acting entrepreneurially 'for God', the key is to join with likeminded others whom he describes as 'gifted and passionate visionaries and implementers who help define our mission, help assess needs, analyse opportunities, and work together in meeting human needs and operating in our community'.[165] Although the lack of presence and availability of likeminded others may well be an issue for entrepreneurial priests working in rural or socially-challenging contexts, the priest's role, summarised in the *Common Worship* Preface to the Ordination of Priests,[166] obliges the entrepreneurial priest to attempt to seek out and utilise whatever others have to offer[167] as they endeavor to 'habitually create and innovate to build something of recognised value'.[168]

'Habitually'

Bolton and Thompson tell us that 'habitually' is the characteristic that distinguishes entrepreneurs from owner-managers in business and they explain, as noted, above, that 'the true entrepreneur just cannot stop being an entrepreneur'.[169] To illustrate this point they quote entrepreneur Bo Peabody, who says 'People ask me how to become an entrepreneur and I can't tell them. It's something innate. I couldn't stop even if I wanted to.'[170] Ucbasaran, Westhead and Wright comment that the 'evidence generally suggests that habitual entrepreneurs are a widespread phenomenon'.[171]

For Simms faith entrepreneurs act as change agents in the social sector and one of the ways in which they achieve this is by 'recognising and relentlessly

[164] Michael Keith Simms, *Faith Entrepreneurs: Empowering People by Faith, Nonprofit Organisational Leadership, and Entrepreneurship* (Lincoln, NE: iUniverse, 2006), 22-23.

[165] Simms, *Faith Entrepreneurs,* 23.
[166] 'Church of England',
http://www.Churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/texts/ordinal/priests.aspx (16/06/12).
[167] Moynagh points out that 'entrepreneurship is a team process' and explains that it 'involves a variety of activities', and 'requires one or more teams rather than a single person'. He goes on to say that entrepreneurs 'contribute to the team in many different ways, depending on their capabilities and personal traits'. Moynagh, *Church for,* 230.
[168] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.
[169] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.
[170] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.
[171] Deniz Ucbasaran, Paul Westhead and Mike Wright, in Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 464.

pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission'.[172] We might argue that Simms's word 'relentless' catches something of what Bolton and Thompson have in mind when they use the word, 'habitual'. While 'relentless' arguably implies a less rhythmic or sustainable approach to activity than 'habitual', both words open up a hugely important theme in relation to those who engage in entrepreneurial activity, and that is consistency of involvement in entrepreneurial activities over time. For Bolton and Thompson and for Simms, the entrepreneur *consistently* builds things of recognised value. They start a project, or a number of projects, that are very likely linked together, and as each project reaches completion, they begin something new. One successful project leads to the next, or may even open up the opportunity for the next, and so it goes on. Entrepreneurial priests may experience less fertile seasons when, because of illness, family concerns or the sheer weight of other demands, entrepreneurial activity is ticking over or even temporarily placed on hold. But this will not be the normal state of affairs, and what marks the entrepreneurial priest out is that 'normal' operating mode will involve the experience of being driven towards 'habitually creating and innovating to build something of recognised value.'[173]

'Creates'

Bolton and Thompson explain that the word 'creates' features in their definition in order to highlight that 'entrepreneurs start from scratch and bring something into being that was not there before'.[174] This notion has particular significance in the context of the current study since the concept of creativity has enormous theological traction for Christians. Simms remarks that 'If we catch God's entrepreneurial vision… creativity and dreaming become the norm'.[175] Each Sunday Anglican priests lead worship in which a confession of faith includes a statement of belief in a creator God.[176] Christians believe that in some sense human beings are created in the image of God[177] and might therefore express something of God's

---

[172] Simms, *Faith Entrepreneurs,* 25.
[173] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.
[174] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.
[175] Simms, *Faith Entrepreneurs,* 21.
[176] The Nicene Creed and the Apostles' Creed include references to God as 'maker' (Nicene) and 'creator' (Apostles').
[177] Genesis 1: 27.

creativity in their own lives.[178] In Bolton and Thompson's view this creativity is clearly in evidence in the entrepreneur and is an essential element in the process of entrepreneurship. According to von Hayek, it is not just that the entrepreneur is creative and exercises creativity in the process of building something, but that 'new and unknown knowledge is being *created* through the process of entrepreneurship. To be an entrepreneur implies a 'discovery process'.[179] Monica Lindh de Montoya tells us that Kirzner also 'emphasised entrepreneurship as a creative act of discovery'.[180] These views dovetail well with the Christian understanding of discipleship as an ongoing and relational process of discovery of God, of others, of self and of the nature of living as created beings, made in the image of a creator-God, in a created world.[181] In *The White Spider*, a classic work in mountaineering rather than economic literature, Heinrich Harrer writes of the 'enterprising and daring men'[182] and their 'out-of-the-ordinary ideas'[183] and tells us that it is 'the eternal longing of every truly creative [person] to push on into unexplored country, to discover something entirely new'.[184] I suggest a link between the sentiment communicated by Harrer's words and the nature of entrepreneurship that Bolton and Thompson outline and which I am exploring in relation to Anglican entrepreneurial priests. The notion of 'enterprising and daring' *priests* with 'out-of-the-ordinary ideas' and a creativity of spirit that continually provokes exploration into unexplored places and opportunities as part of a process of building things that did not exist before is a stimulating one. The current study is motivated in part by a desire to engage with such priests, to learn from them and to share knowledge and insights with the wider church in order that it might be better equipped to participate in the building of God's kingdom. I note however, a view articulated by Duncan and colleagues, with which I do not concur but which is nonetheless a view that one might argue appears to be present to varying degrees in the various forums of the Church of England. Duncan writes,

---

[178] For an exploration of this theme see Dorothy L. Sayers, *The Mind of the Maker* (London: Continuum, 2004), and Oliver Davis, *The Creativity of God: World, Eucharist, Reason* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
[179] Swedberg, *Entrepreneurship,* 20.
[180] Monica Lindh de Montoya, *Entrepreneurship and Culture: The Case of Freddy, the Strawberry Man,* in Swedberg, *Entrepreneurship,* 339.
[181] The use of 'creator' and 'created' in relation to God, the world and human beings, is to be distinguished from 'creationism'.
[182] Heinrich Harrer, *The White Spider: The Story of the North Face of the Eiger* (London: Harper Perennial, 2005), 30.
[183] Harrer, *The White Spider,* 30.
[184] Harrer, *The White Spider,* 29.

> Creative people are, to be honest, a pain in the neck. They disrupt the established order by asking questions and experimenting with new ways of doing things when well-established procedures are available to provide direction.[185]

It is this negative view of the creativity demonstrated by entrepreneurs that leads to opposition to some of their initiatives and it is overcoming such opposition that is one of the challenges outlined in the following section.

'Innovates'

Bolton and Thompson include innovation in their definition, arguing that it differs from creativity in its importance to delivering the final application of the entrepreneurial venture. It is innovation, they argue, that ensures that ideas generated by creativity become reality. According to Bolton and Thompson, entrepreneurs 'use their innovative talents to overcome obstacles that would stop most people. For them every problem is a new opportunity'.[186] Simms echoes this, stating that

> Entrepreneurship is about seeing, sizing and seizing new opportunities. This means taking on challenges in new ways, acting boldly and taking risks whilst expecting results that change lives. Change stands at the heart of entrepreneurship.[187]

Simms anticipates obstacles and difficulties for the faith entrepreneur, arguing that 'to get new results it's necessary to challenge existing mindsets'.[188] Challenge of this kind is arguably the most difficult of territories to navigate, and is central to the experience of the Anglican entrepreneurial priest since, unless the entrepreneurial priest identifies projects or opportunities that are in line with the congregation's norms and expectations, it is the hearts and minds of the members of the congregation that are likely to need changing before the process of building something of recognised value can be embarked upon. Simms goes on to state that

> Entrepreneurs introduce new rules and new conditions for living. They don't accept what everyone else sees as reality. They look for a new reality behind what is seen by others. They go deeper to discover the truth that sheds light on

---

[185] W. Jack Duncan, Peter M. Ginter, Andrew C. Rucks, and T. Douglas Jacobs, (1988) Intrapreneurship and the Reinvention of the Corporation. *Business Horizons* **31** (3), 16-21.
[186] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.
[187] Simms, *Faith Entrepreneurs*, 22.
[188] Simms, *Faith Entrepreneurs*, 22.

what is masquerading as truth. They probe and investigate and consider alternatives. They develop new initiatives to bring the truth and power of God's kingdom to bear on our temporal world.[189]

In this Simms outlines a role for the entrepreneur that is, one might argue, prophetic in its nature.[190] As well as working with those whose minds may need changing and who may need to be helped to see differently, Simms' entrepreneurs also have to overcome difficulties in terms of lack of resources or bureaucratic obstacles. To do this, Simms, in line with Bolton and Thompson, argues that entrepreneurs engage in a 'process of continuous innovation, adaptation, learning',[191] and by 'acting boldly without being limited to resources currently in hand'.[192] Simms explains that the faith entrepreneur 'Sees needs and seeks new ways to meet those needs – with little regard for what has been tried or never attempted.'[193] Simms' point resonates with my own experience of pioneering work as an entrepreneurial priest. I frequently heard the mantras, "We tried that once and it didn't work!" or, "We don't do that sort of thing here!". In response to this I developed strategies for shaping a culture in which ideas that were perceived to be out of kilter with a previous culture could be generated, discussed and absorbed with enthusiasm and anticipation.[194]

Kirby points out that large organisations inherently have too many levels of approval and argues that 'Multiple levels of management tend to stultify innovation as each level has the potential to kill the project'.[195] The Church of England doesn't quite have multiple levels of management and, in the sense that they are not 'managed', the majority of parish priests operate with a fair degree of autonomy. However, for entrepreneurial priests in an episcopally-led church, seeking to build something of recognised value, there will clearly be a need for large initiatives to gain the support of deanery colleagues and senior staff within the diocese, including the Archdeacon and possibly the Bishop himself. Here, Kirby's point about the potential death of projects at the hands of various levels of management has some traction. It is

---

[189] Simms, *Faith Entrepreneurs*, 22.
[190] For treatment of the nature of 'prophetic ministry' see Walter Brueggemann *The Prophetic Imagination* (2nd ed.), (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001).
[191] Simms, *Faith Entrepreneurs*, 25.
[192] Simms, *Faith Entrepreneurs*, 25.
[193] Simms, *Faith Entrepreneurs,* 20.
[194] For an account of my pioneering work as an entrepreneurial priest see Michael Volland, *Through the Pilgrim Door: Pioneering a Fresh Expression of Church* (Survivor: Eastbourne, 2009).
[195] Kirby, *Entrepreneurship,* 301.

outside the scope of the current study, but one might question whether entrepreneurial priests are more likely to opt for undertaking local, low-key, low-cost and potentially low-impact initiatives over larger projects because this leaves them in control of the situation rather than risking the death of an idea further up the hierarchy.

'To build something'

Bolton and Thompson include the phrase 'to build something' in their definition in order to describe the *aim* of the process referred to in the phrase 'habitually creates and innovates'. According to Bolton and Thompson, entrepreneurs 'build an entity that can be identified and is not just an idea or a concept though it may start that way'.[196] Entrepreneurial priests are those who *do* things, or get things done, rather than those who have a hundred great ideas before breakfast and realise none of them. The following part of Bolton and Thompson's definition has a bearing here. The building of the 'something' must be taken through to completion. According to Bolton and Thompson's definition the 'something' that is built must be 'of recognised value' and for this to be the case, the work cannot be left half-finished.

'Of recognised value'

Bolton and Thompson point out that the generally held view of the entrepreneur is that they create financial capital. In their use of the phrase, 'of recognised value', they state that they want to broaden the definition beyond financial capital and 'expand upon the use of the word 'entrepreneur' so that it also includes those who create social capital and aesthetic capital'.[197] In a Grove booklet, Bolton adds 'spiritual capital' to the forms of capital already mentioned. Bolton defines spiritual capital as, 'All the Father's riches made available to the disciples of his Son, Jesus Christ, through the work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer'.[198] He explains that the same talents are used to create all kinds of capital but reminds us that

---

[196] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 17.
[197] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 17.
[198] Bill Bolton, *The Entrepreneur and the Church* (Grove Pastoral Series. P 107) (Cambridge: Grove Books, 2006), 21.

in his view, entrepreneurs do not focus on capital. He argues that 'Their target is to build something of recognised value. In the process they both use capital and create it but essentially it is a by-product of their building enterprise.'[199] Drawing on the work of Fukuyama, Bolton argues that spiritual capital can enhance social capital. Making reference to the Great Awakening of the nineteenth century, Fukuyama discusses the connection between Christian faith and transformed social conditions. He writes 'In the battles against alcoholism, gambling, slavery, delinquency and prostitution and in the building of a dense network of voluntary institutions ministers and lay believers were the footsoldiers'.[200] This view of the link between spiritual and social capital is echoed by Simms, who argues that those who catch God's entrepreneurial vision 'can become agents for change in families and communities [and] help connect people of faith to their divine mission of meeting needs of people in society'.[201] We might expect to identify entrepreneurial priests through evidence of the generation of spiritual and social capital at a congregational level and, if the congregation catches the vision for wider community transformation, one might expect to see evidence of the generation of social capital in the wider community.[202]

'Around perceived opportunities'

Direction and focus are provided, argue Bolton and Thompson, by the inclusion of 'perceived opportunities'. The entrepreneur may not have original ideas 'but spotting the opportunity to exploit the idea is a characteristic of the entrepreneur. Entrepreneurs see something others miss or only see in retrospect'.[203] Simms states that 'A faith entrepreneur sees what others are blind to and dreams of new realities.'[204] Kirzner's approach to entrepreneurship was marked out by an emphasis on 'alertness'. For Kirzner the profit gained by the successful entrepreneur was not a reward for bearing uncertainty but for being alert to, and taking action on, previously

---

[199] Bolton, *The Entrepreneur and the Church,* 19.

[200] Francis Fukuyama, *The Great Disruption – Human Nature and the Reconstitution of Social Order* (London: Profile Books, 1999), pp16-17 in Bolton, *The Entrepreneur and the Church,* 21.
[201] Simms, *Faith Entrepreneurs,* 20.
[202] Generation of spiritual and social capital by respondents in the current study is discussed in chapter five.
[203] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 17.
[204] Simms, *Faith Entrepreneurs,* 21.

unnoticed opportunities. In discussing Kirzner's focus on alertness, Ricketts reports that, 'The gains from trade have to be *noticed* before they can be achieved.'[205] I note that the *Common Worship Preface to the Ordination of Priests* states that 'They share with the Bishop the oversight of the Church'.[206] I contend that a crucial aspect of exercising oversight is alertness.[207] The priest's sharing in the oversight of the church is to the end that the people of God 'grow into the fullness of Christ.'[208] Facilitating this growth requires, among other things, consistent alertness to opportunities to undertake the task in new and appropriate ways. In recent years, the Church of England has made a more active commitment to seeking to select, train and deploy priests who are alert to opportunities in ministry and mission. Evidence for this is to be found in the 2005 report, *Formation for Ministry in a Learning Church,*[209] which states that the church seeks ministers who, among other things 'Are passionate about the transformation of the whole created order into one that reflects the redemptive love of God'.[210] In light of this report, I suggest that Anglican priests who are to be selected, trained and deployed to be catalysts and participants in *transformation* must necessarily (and therefore increasingly) be those who, to varying degrees, are alert to opportunities to bring about transformation.[211] Further evidence of the Church of England's recognition of the need to deploy priests who are alert to a range of opportunities for the sort of entrepreneurial activity that will effect transformation is found woven into the 'Learning outcome statements for ordained ministry within the

---

[205] Ricketts, in Casson, (et al.), *Oxford Handbook,* 48 (italics mine).
[206] 'Church of England',
http://www.Churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/texts/ordinal/priests.aspx (16/06/12).
[207] For a treatment of the oversight ministry of priests and bishops see Steven Croft, *Ministry in Three Dimensions: Ordination and Leadership in the Local Church* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1999), Part Four: *Episcope: Ministry in the Third Dimension,* pp 139-192.
[208] From the preface to the Common Worship Ordination of Priests, 'The Church of England'. http://www.Churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/texts/ordinal/priests.aspx (17/07/12).
[209] The Archbishop's Council, *Formation for Ministry Within a Learning Church: Shaping the Future: New Patterns of Training for Lay and Ordained* (London: Church House Publishing, 2005).
[210] Archbishop's Council, *Formation,* 64.
[211] Stuart Read, et al., set out the arguments around opportunities being found and made, or between a 'search and select (causation)' approach and a 'creation and transformation (effectuation)' approach. They explain that whereas causation involves a focus on 'achieving a desired goal through a specific set of given means', effectuation involves a 'focus on a set of evolving means to achieve new and different goals'. They point out the effectuation 'evokes creative and transformative tactics', and they tell us that 'effectual logic is the name given to heuristics used by expert entrepreneurs in new venture creation'. Stuart Read, et al., *Effectual Entrepreneurship* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2011), 6-7. I suggest that effective entrepreneurial priests will collaborate with their congregations in adopting both approaches to opportunities, i.e. both finding and making opportunities for transformation on various levels. For an in-depth consideration of effectuation see: Saras, D. Sarasvathy, *Effectuation: Elements of Entrepreneurial Expertise* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd, 2008).

Church of England',[212] contained in the report which state that, at *selection* candidates should 'Demonstrate a passion for mission that is reflected in action'. At the point of *ordination* candidates should be able to 'Participate in and reflect on the mission of God in a selected range of social, ethical, cultural, religious and intellectual contexts in which Christian witness is to be lived out in acts of mercy, service and justice.'[213] In addition they should be able to 'Engage in and reflect upon practices of mission and evangelism, changing forms of church, and their relation to contexts, cultures, religions and contemporary spiritualities.'[214] Candidates should also be able to 'Communicate the gospel in a variety of media demonstrating sensitivity to audience and context.'[215] In order to be licensed to a post of incumbent status or equivalent responsibility candidates should 'Demonstrate understanding of the imperatives of the gospel and the nature of contemporary society and skills in articulating and engaging in appropriate forms of mission in response to them.'[216] And 'Demonstrate a readiness and openness for a ministry of oversight and vision, expressed in continued study, reflection, openness to new insights'.[217] We see from these extracts from the Learning Outcomes that all Anglican priests are expected to be alert to opportunities to lead others in communicating the transforming love of God in acts of service in the church and wider community. We might expect entrepreneurial priests to demonstrate this alertness to opportunities in very particular ways, providing an example of both a) the sorts of opportunities that might be taken (noting that these will vary according to context) and, b) the type of approach that might be required in doing this.

Chapter summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to introduce the term, entrepreneur, to locate it in relation to relevant literature, to acknowledge the contested nature of the term and to discuss the way in which it is understood, defined and used in the current study. I opened the chapter with a discussion about the contested nature of the term, entrepreneur, in relation to Christian mission and ministry. Although some Christians

---

[212] Archbishop's Council, *Formation,* 64-72.
[213] Archbishop's Council, *Formation,* 71.
[214] Archbishop's Council, *Formation,* 71.
[215] Archbishop's Council, *Formation,* 71.
[216] Archbishop's Council, *Formation,* 71.
[217] Archbishop's Council, *Formation,* 71.

are content to use the term, others express discomfort with it. My discussion focused on the possibility, proposed by Casson et al., that the enterprise culture of the 1980s and 1990s generated a 'highly competitive and materialistic form of individualism'[218] that came to be associated with the entrepreneur and continues to shape perceptions of the term. I suggested that at the heart of this was Christian rejection of greed, in line with Jesus' proclamation of the coming kingdom of God. I moved on to note the absence of a widely agreed definition of the entrepreneur in the literature. With this established, I outlined the origin of the term and discussed some of the ways in which the work of key thinkers has shaped understandings of the entrepreneur. The work of Bolton and Thompson was then introduced and their definition of the entrepreneur presented and its constituent parts discussed in relation to wider literature and the notion of the entrepreneurial priest.

[218] Casson, et al., *Oxford Handbook,* 10.

Chapter Three

Why *entrepreneurial* priests? Why *now*?

Introduction

A consideration of entrepreneurship in relation to the exercise of priestly ministry must necessarily address the question of 'why' this is important and, perhaps more specifically, why is this important 'now', in the second decade of the twenty-first century. These interconnected questions are considered in this chapter in four numbered sections. In a broad sense all four sections address the questions of 'why *entrepreneurial* priests?' and 'why *now*?' More specifically however, the first and second sections offer something approximating an apologetic. They are pre-emptive responses to potential criticisms of the association of the word 'entrepreneur' with Christian ministry. The third and fourth sections deal directly with the question of why an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry is particularly appropriate in the current context. In the first of the four sections I address the question posed in the title of this chapter by arguing that entrepreneurship is consistent with characteristics exhibited by God. In the second section I propose that we can identify figures in the Bible and in Christian history whose faith in God has resulted in them adopting what might be described as an entrepreneurial approach to their collaboration with God. In the third section I suggest that the exercise of priestly ministry in a time of rapid cultural change will be well served by an entrepreneurial approach. In the fourth section I suggest that the mission of the Church of England in local communities will be well served by an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry in the parish.

1) Entrepreneurship is consistent with characteristics exhibited by God

The problem of talking about God

I open this chapter by acknowledging that the use of language in relation to God is problematic and that using the language of entrepreneurship in relation to the characteristics that one might argue are exhibited by God is clearly no exception, since, like all language and ideas, entrepreneurship is a human construct that is 'very

naturally conditioned by creatureliness'.[219] Ludwig Wittgenstein argues in *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (first published in 1921) that any statement about God is nonsensical, stating that 'what we cannot speak about we must pass over in silence'.[220] Alister McGrath asks 'How can God ever be described or discussed using human language?' and in response writes 'Wittgenstein made this point forcefully: if human words are incapable of describing the distinctive aroma of coffee, how can they cope with something as subtle as God?'[221] McGrath goes on to draw on Aquinas to argue that because God created the world there is an 'analogy of being' between God and the world, making it legitimate to use things in the created order as analogies for God. In considering Aquinas' doctrine of analogy, McGrath draws on Ian T. Ramsey's work, *Christian Discourse: Some Logical Explorations* (1965). Ramsey proposes that the range of analogies in Scripture, each providing particular, although limited, insights, interact with one another and together provide a coherent understanding of God. This leads McGrath to conclude that 'God, who is infinite, may be revealed in and through human words and finite images.'[222] Mark McIntosh also considers the problem of talking about God, helpfully discussing the need to 'think about God in ways that allow God to determine the meaning of our speech',[223] and saying that 'Human words about God may become vessels provided by God and carrying the theologian from the shoreline of human meanings out into the unreachable depths of divine meaning.'[224]

Theologians have wrestled with the problems inherent in the use of language and concepts in relation to God but concluded relatively early in Christian history that this does not prevent us from thinking or saying anything coherent in relation to God. Emerging from reflection on the problematic nature of language and concepts in relation to God is the question of whether, in the process of arguing that an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry is consistent with characteristics exhibited by God, it is possible to apply Bolton and Thompson's definition of the

---

[219] Mark A. McIntosh, *Divine Teaching: An Introduction to Christian Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 2008), 32.
[220] Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (London: Routledge Classics, 2001), 8.
[221] Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 253.
[222] McGrath, *Christian*, 255.
[223] McIntosh, *Divine Teaching,* 33.
[224] McIntosh, *Divine Teaching,* 33.

entrepreneur to God in any meaningful way. I contend that within the boundaries of the current chapter, which seeks to consider the question of 'why entrepreneurial priests?', the following three points are appropriate and fruitful:

i)   Because God has revealed himself to human beings we may find meaningful and coherent ways of thinking and talking about him and his characteristics

ii)   We may contend that an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry is consistent with a way of viewing some of the characteristics exhibited by God

iii) Utilising human concepts such as entrepreneurship as a lens through which to view God helps to deepen our understanding of him

Although ultimately beyond the grasp of all language and understanding, the Trinitarian God of the Christian faith reveals himself[225] to us in proclamation and in Scripture and in the person of Jesus Christ, the Word of God, whose teachings and actions invite understanding and response.[226] Karl Barth writes that 'the Word of God means irrevocably and originally that God speaks'.[227] Since Christians believe that God has 'spoken', revealing himself to us 'through scriptural images and analogies'[228] and in the person of Jesus, we may state that it is possible to speak meaningfully and coherently about him, his attributes and the characteristics he exhibits. As we use language to seek a deeper understanding of God, we might view entrepreneurship as 'an inadequate concept that we humbly employ as a pointer towards the divine reality, one which infinitely exceeds the grasp of our language, and is thus a form of analogy'.[229],[230]

Alongside attempting to construct a plausible case for God exhibiting entrepreneurial qualities, a complementary line of enquiry is helpful and that is to ask whether the concept of entrepreneurship helps to deepen our understanding of God. Entrepreneurship is a concept that we are able to understand. We can imagine people

---

[225] In relation to God's revelation to human beings Karl Barth writes that 'men can know the Word of God. Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics: The Doctrine of the Word of God.* Volume 1. (1.1) (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark Ltd, 1956), 214.

[226] Barth writes 'we regard the Word of God not merely as proclamation and Scripture but as God's revelation in proclamation and Scripture, we must regard it in its identity with God Himself. God's revelation is Jesus Christ, God's Son." Barth, *Dogmatics,* (Vol. 1), 155.

[227] Barth, *Dogmatics,* (Vol. 1), 151.

[228] McGrath, *Christian,* 255.

[229] McIntosh, *Divine Teaching,* 32.

[230] In relation to this point I note the position of Karl Barth who stated that 'I regard the *analogia entis* as the invention of the Antichrist'. Barth, *Dogmatics,* (Vol. 1), x.

acting entrepreneurially and discuss the nature of this activity in space and time. On this subject McGrath says helpfully 'God is not an object or a person in space and time; nevertheless, such persons and objects can help us deepen our appreciation of God's character and nature.'[231] Clearly entrepreneurship is not a 'person' or an 'object', but it is a recognisable set of behaviours based on particular character traits and which, when undertaken successfully, has tangible results. In this sense, entrepreneurship is a concept that may serve to deepen our appreciation of God's character and nature. We can venture to say, 'in His revelation of Himself to us, God seems to be a bit like this', and by way of illustration we might then outline some of those characteristics associated with entrepreneurship. If we are able to say that, among other things, God exhibits entrepreneurial characteristics, then it is plausible to suggest that some people, including priests, might act in a like manner. It also follows that some, who are perhaps not natural entrepreneurs, might strive to act more entrepreneurially and by doing so locate themselves within a rich Christian tradition of seeking to emulate the characteristics of God that are encountered through prayerful meditation on Scripture, observation of the example of other Christians, and the action of the Holy Spirit in the heart.

A definition

Since the current study draws on Bolton and Thompson's definition of the entrepreneur, I consider the possibility of God exhibiting entrepreneurial qualities in relation to this definition:

> A person who habitually creates and innovates to build something of recognised value around perceived opportunities.[232]

'A person'

Bolton and Thompson say that ''person' emphasises that a personality, rather than a system, is involved'.[233] Barth writes that 'God's Word means that God speaks

---

[231] McGrath, *Christian,* 255.
[232] Bill Bolton and John Thompson, *Entrepreneurs: Talent, Temperament, Technique* (Oxford: Elsevier, 2004) (2nd ed.)*,* 16.

[and this] implies secondly its personal quality'.[234] The Church of England receives and upholds the doctrine, rooted in Scripture and shared across all Christian denominations that God's being is Trinitarian; God is Father, Son and Holy Spirit.[235] The Nicene Creed, the Apostle's Creed and the Athanasian Creed are used by the Church of England[236] as doctrinal formulas each setting out God's being as Trinitarian. The Trinitarian being of God is also set out in Article 1 of the Articles of Religion: *Of Faith in the Holy Trinity*, 'in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost'.[237] The doctrine of the Trinity, of three Persons coexisting in unity, allows us to say that this first aspect of Bolton and Thompson's definition is consistent with God's being, or that, since the being of God is personal rather than 'a system', the way is open for us to give further consideration to other aspects of Bolton and Thompson's definition in relation to God.

'who habitually creates'

Bolton and Thompson tell us that the word ''creates' is used to emphasise the fact that entrepreneurs start from scratch and bring into being something that was not there before'.[238] It is not overly challenging to argue that this aspect of their definition is consistent with a characteristic exhibited by God. That God *creates* is the first thing we discover when we begin to read Genesis.[239] We might say that God 'started from scratch' and we can certainly say, in line with Bolton and Thompson's definition that he brought 'into being something that was not there before'. In verse 2 we see this

---

[233] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.
[234] Barth, *Dogmtaics,* (Vol. 1), 136.
[235] In the third century Origen taught that God is, 'Three Hypostases in one Ousia', that is three divine *hypostases*, or persons (Father, Son and Holy Spirit), who are distinct from one another yet being of one *ousia*, or substance.
[236] Texts of the Creeds can be accessed at, http://www.Churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/texts/newpatterns/contents/sectione.aspx (18/01/13).
[237]http://www.Churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/book-of-common-prayer/articles-of-religion.aspx (18/01/13).
[238] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 16.
[239] Genesis 1: 1.

demonstrated in the creation of light, when previously there had been only darkness.[240]

The Church of England receives, accepts and teaches the doctrine of God as creator. The belief that God created all that exists is stated explicitly in the Nicene, Apostle's and Athanasian Creeds and in Article 1. *Of Faith in the Holy Trinity*, which names God as 'the Maker, and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible'.[241] God's creativity is not just seen at the initial act of creation but continues to be evident throughout the story of Scripture in the nature of His interactions with individuals,[242] the nation of Israel, the Incarnation of Jesus, including the nature of his life, teaching and miracles. We may argue that God's creativity, marked by his consistency in acting in unprecedented and 'game-changing' ways is most profoundly and disturbingly evident in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead; a foretaste of the age to come in God's new creation.[243] Bolton and Thompson tell us that ''Habitually' is an important characteristic of entrepreneurs. The true entrepreneur just cannot stop being an entrepreneur'.[244] Of God's interaction with his creation and engagement with those with whom he has dealings, David Ford writes 'there is always more, and God can go on springing surprises in history'.[245] The consistent, even persistent, creativity on God's part as he engages with people and nations in the story of Scripture cannot meaningfully be described as 'habitual', since habits are learnt behaviors and as such are particular to creatures rather than the creator. And, even though Bolton and Thompson imply a positive emphasis for the word, when used in relation to human beings it is generally encumbered by unhelpful baggage; having connotations of behavioral practices that one cannot really help, whether for good or ill. In this sense, we cannot usefully think of 'habitually' as being consistent with the being of God. However, if we take something of the essence of the word as Bolton and Thompson deploy it in their definition; that is, to assist us in understanding that the entrepreneur is not someone who happens to act in this way once or twice, or brings a single good

---

[240] Genesis 1: 2-3.
[241]http://www.Churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/book-of-common-prayer/articles-of-religion.aspx (18/01/13).
[242] Four examples are Noah (Genesis 9), Abram (Genesis 12), Moses (Exodus 3), and the Apostle Paul (Acts 9).
[243] Revelation 21.
[244] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs*, 16.
[245] David F. Ford., *Theology: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 36.

idea to life and then settles down, but rather a person who goes on creating as they act entrepreneurially, then in this sense we might apply this aspect of Bolton and Thompson's definition to God. Since his being and his doing are inseparable, God *is* creativity; he created, he creates and he goes on creating. The creativity of God will go on surprising us since it will always be unprecedented.[246] I contend therefore that the inclusion of 'creates' in Bolton and Thompson's definition is consistent with the being of God. Before moving on to the next section I note that human beings are created in the image, or likeness, of God.[247] Since creativity is not just consistent with God's being but is a fundamental aspect of it, it follows that those whom he has created 'in his image', will, to some degree possess and manifest the creator's desire and ability to create, which is, in fact, part of the rationale underpinning this section of the current study. That is, if we are able to say that aspects of a definition of entrepreneurship are consistent with God's being, then we might reasonably expect to see such characteristics displayed in human beings and especially, perhaps, in those who seek to serve God. Among many other characteristics that we might mention, creativity is manifest in the life and ministry of Jesus, who said about himself, "I am in the Father and the Father is in me."[248] And, "Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father."[249] And who said about his ministry, "My teaching is not my own. It comes from Him who sent me."[250] And, "Whoever believes in me streams of living water will flow from within him."[251] Those who are baptised into Christ are 'in him'[252] and his Spirit dwells in them[253] and as such they may expect to manifest creativity firstly by virtue of having been created and further, because of their participation in God the Father through Jesus the Son as a result of the ongoing work of the Holy Spirit in their hearts and minds.[254] It is this activity of the Spirit in the lives of those who are in Christ that compels and enables them to strive to learn from him and copy his

---

[246] We see evidence for this in Moses' encounter with God at the burning bush. God reveals His name as, 'I AM WHO I AM' or, 'I WILL BE WHAT I WILL BE'. Exodus 3: 14.
[247] Genesis 1: 27.
[248] John 14: 11.
[249] John 14: 9b.
[250] John 7: 16.
[251] John 7: 38.
[252] Romans 8: 1.
[253] 'For all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ.' Galatians 3: 27, and, 'There is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. And if the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead is living in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies through his Spirit, who lives in you.' Romans 8: 1 and 11.
[254] 'But the mind controlled by the Spirit is life and peace.' Romans 8: 6b.

example in word and deed[255] and so, at a fundamental level, and in the broadest sense, we may expect to see some degree of creativity manifested in the lives of those who profess to follow Christ. Those who are in Christ will exhibit their creativity in a countless variety of ways and with varying degrees of competence. They will not be more or less creative than those who do not profess to follow Christ but Scripture leads us towards the understanding that the God-given creativity of those who are in Christ is being daily shaped by the activity of the Holy Spirit and increasingly brought under the Lordship of Christ and used in the service of the Kingdom. The God-given creativity of those who are in Christ, therefore, is being sanctified and this ongoing sanctification is a collaborative process in which those who are in Christ strive continually to cooperate with the work of the Spirit within them.

The exercise of entrepreneurship involves more than creativity. Entrepreneurs make use of their God-given creativity alongside a range of other gifts and competencies. I have suggested that, since God created human beings in his image, it follows that we might expect to see evidence of creativity, however small, in each human life and that this creativity is being sanctified in the lives of those who are in Christ. Creativity is one aspect of Bolton and Thompson's definition and we may certainly say that this is a characteristic of God and of human beings. However, if all human beings have the potential to exercise creativity, it does not follow that all have the potential to act entrepreneurially.

'to build something of recognised value'

Bolton and Thompson tell us that 'to build something' describes the output rather than the process. The aim of the process is to build something and that something 'means that they [entrepreneurs] build an entity that can be identified and is not just an idea or a concept'.[256] When they talk about 'recognised value' Bolton and Thompson aim to 'broaden the definition from the purely commercial'.[257] They provide the example of Dr Barnardo, who created social capital. They explain that

---

[255] Jesus tells his disciples, "A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another. By this all will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another." John 13: 34-35.
[256] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 17.
[257] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 17.

'While his [Dr Barnardo's] motive may have been philanthropy, he was only able to achieve what he did because he was an entrepreneur.'[258]

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth and gave human beings a mandate to multiply and spread out over the earth and to steward his creation: essentially to 'build something of recognised value'. This value would be recognised by God and by those whom he had created.[259] We might say that, among other things, the writer of Genesis 1 sets out to teach the reader that human beings, created in the image of God, are to use the resources with which he has blessed them, including their creativity, in the ongoing fulfillment of a task that will require them to act habitually, creatively, innovatively and around countless perceived opportunities over the course of human history. The narrative of Scripture points to an intention on God's part for there to be collaboration between himself and those whom he has created in which things of recognised and eternal value are built over time and across nations. In this sense, we may say that this aspect of Bolton and Thompson's definition is consistent with the being of God: God creates and recognises the value of what he has spoken in to being,[260] and human beings, also (generally) recognising the value of the created order and their own existence within it,[261] strive to build things of recognised value, sometimes collaborating with God[262] and at other times building in spite of him.[263] It is interesting to note that when considering the possibility of 'recognised value' in relation to God, the narrative of Scripture provides a picture of God's covenant people, Israel, persistently failing or refusing to recognise the existence, presence or authority of God and instead worshipping the gods of other nations.[264] Directly related to this is the fact that much of what Jesus did went widely unrecognised, particularly by those in religious authority in Israel. The details of his humble birth, far from centres of power and people of influence; his childhood in a

---

[258] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 17.

[259] Genesis 1: 28a.

[260] 'God saw all that he had made, and it was very good.' Genesis 1: 31.

[261] As David demonstrates in the words of Psalm 8.

[262] 'Always give yourselves fully to the work of the Lord, because you know that your labour in the Lord is not in vain.' 1 Corinthians 15: 58.

[263] As we see set out in the description of 'the wicked man' in Psalm 10: 2-11.

[264] Numerous Scripture references could be provided in support of this point. As an example I cite the following, taken from the second chapter of Judges, and setting out what followed the death of Joshua: 'After [Joshua's death] another generation grew up, who knew neither the Lord nor what he had done for Israel. Then the Israelites did evil in the eyes of the Lord and served the Baals. They forsook the Lord, the God of their fathers.' Judges 2: 10 – 12.

poverty-stricken village in an insignificant corner of the Roman Empire; his execution as a young man after a brief and localised public ministry alongside petty criminals, with the accompanying implication of having achieved nothing except his own annihilation are all, we might say, the opposite of recognition! The writer of John's gospel highlights this, stating that 'though the world was made through him, the world did not recognise him. He came to that which was his own, but his own did not receive him'.[265] Within Scripture this rejection by some is set in the context of the overarching purposes of God and ultimately, the establishment of his Kingdom and the bringing of all things under the Lordship of Jesus Christ.[266] It is simply interesting to note that in considering whether this particular aspect of Bolton and Thompson's definition is consistent with the being of God, the activity of God among those whom he has created has been frequently dismissed and has failed to have 'recognised value'. This is in spite of the fact that there are many who do recognise the value of the work of God, and ultimately all *will* recognise, if not the value, then at least God's claim of ultimate authority over all things.

Omissions

I have omitted to consider two aspects of Bolton and Thompson's definition in relation to God: 'innovates' and 'around perceived opportunities'. Since God's *being* and his *doing* cannot be separated,[267] what is brought into existence by God is, because of the nature of its creator, perfect. The concept of innovation cannot meaningfully be applied to God. Having created, God cannot innovate. However, God is distinct from what he has created, so that human beings have the capacity to utilise imagination to think creatively, about a problem, for example, and innovate in order to find a solution. The ability to engage in innovation allows human beings to collaborate creatively with God in a created order that is subject to decay[268] and in which the Kingdom is coming but has not yet been fully realised. The need for

---

[265] John 1: 10.

[266] Revelation 21 provides a powerful image of God's ultimate intention for the created order.

[267] Again we may note God's revelation of his name to Moses: 'I AM WHO I AM' or, 'I WILL BE WHAT I WILL BE'. Exodus 3: 14.

[268] 'For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own will. The creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God.' Romans 8: 20-21.

innovation is a reminder that it is the nature of things in their current state to be in flux rather than equilibrium.[269] The desire and ability to innovate should serve to remind human beings that they are the creature rather than the creator.

The second aspect of Bolton and Thompson's definition that I omitted to discuss in relation to God is, 'around perceived opportunities'. Since, by definition God perceives all things, we cannot speak meaningfully of God 'perceiving opportunities' but rather of human beings using their created faculties to achieve various types of advantage.

2) We can identify figures in the Bible and Christian history whose faith in God has resulted in them adopting what might be described as an entrepreneurial approach to their collaboration with God

Entrepreneurs in the Bible

The second argument that I advance in response to the questions, 'why *entrepreneurs*?' and 'why *now*? is that we can identify figures in the Bible and in Christian history whose faith in God has resulted in them adopting what might be described as an entrepreneurial approach to their collaboration with God.

'See, I have set before you an open door that no-one can shut.'[270]

Bill Bolton draws on this verse from Revelation to suggest that the church in Philadelphia, to whom the words are addressed 'served a God of the open door as do we'.[271] Bolton tells us that

> It should not therefore surprise us to find a strong entrepreneurial theme running through the Bible. Entrepreneurship is nothing new to the Church; we have a substantial heritage.[272]

Bolton names figures in the Bible whom he argues were entrepreneurs including Noah, Abram, Jacob, Joshua, Caleb, David, Jesus and Paul. He argues that these

---

[269] 'For this world in its current form is passing away.' 1 Corinthians 7: 31b.
[270] Revelation 3: 8.
[271] Bolton, *The Entrepreneur,* 5.

[272] Bolton, *The Entrepreneur,* 5.

characters display entrepreneurial qualities such as taking risks, facing challenges, spotting opportunities, finding innovative solutions to problems, challenging the status-quo, making a difference and building something of recognised value. He goes on to say that entrepreneurship is in the DNA of the church and writes that, after the resurrection of Jesus 'the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost is a remarkable entrepreneurial story. The book of Acts is a description of entrepreneurs in action'.[273]

To Bolton's list I would add other examples including, Nimrod,[274] Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Rahab,[275] Ehud,[276] Gideon,[277] Ruth, Abigail,[278] Elijah, Elisha, Jehoshaphat,[279] Hezekiah,[280] Josiah,[281] Ezra, Nehemiah, and the example of the Wife of Noble Character.[282] There are many others however, who feature in the narrative of Scripture but who are not accompanied by evidence of what could realistically be described as an entrepreneurial approach to their efforts at collaborating with God. Examples might include Noah's sons, Isaac, the sons of Jacob (excluding Joseph), various judges, kings, priests, prophets and countless 'ordinary' people. For Anglican Christians the Bible has prominence as a source of authority.[283] The purpose, therefore, of providing examples of individuals in Scripture whom we might argue demonstrate entrepreneurial characteristics is to provide grounds for suggesting that this is a faithful approach to collaborating with God and one that has a long heritage. As discussed above, recognising the presence of entrepreneurial individuals in the Bible is helpful partly because this has the potential to deepen our understanding of the being of God. It also lends validity to the idea that an entrepreneurial approach to ministry is a prospect that warrants serious and prayerful reflection on the part of those who seek to serve God faithfully in every age, including our own. In essence I

---

[273] Bolton, *The Entrepreneur,* 6.
[274] Genesis 10: 8-12.
[275] Joshua 2.
[276] Judges 3: 12-30.
[277] Judges 6-8.
[278] 1 Samuel 25.
[279] 1 Kings 22: 41-48 and 2 Chronicles 17-20.
[280] 2 Kings 18 and 2 Chronicles 29-32.
[281] 2 Kings 22-23 and 2 Chronicles 34-35.
[282] Proverbs 31: 10–31.
[283] Article 6 states that, 'Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation'. http://www.Churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/book-of-common-prayer/articles-of-religion.aspx#VI (23/01/13). Alan Bartlett writes, 'Scripture is reaffirmed in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, as the first of Anglicanism's non-negotiables, and in the Declaration of Assent as the place of unique revelation. It is the ultimate point of reference'. Alan Bartlett, *A Passionate Balance: The Anglican Tradition* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd, 2007), 91.

contend that since the Bible contains examples of people acting entrepreneurially, we might expect to see examples of Anglican priests acting entrepreneurially too. With the exception of Jesus, we note that there are aspects of the lives of each of those listed as examples of entrepreneurs, above, that we may argue deserve added consideration before emulating. However, the focus of the current study is on the way in which these individuals adopted an entrepreneurial approach to their collaboration with God rather than on the less savoury, or culturally awkward, aspects of their behaviour.

Entrepreneurs in Christian history

Further to the examples found in Scripture, as a response to their faith in God thousands of individuals throughout the course of Christian history have adopted an entrepreneurial approach to collaborating with Him. From what we know of their lives and from reflecting on the effect and legacy of their actions, some helpful examples, taking in early Christian history and moving up to the present day are:[284] Methodius;[285] Patrick;[286] Francis;[287] Clare;[288] Teresa of Avila;[289] Count Zinzendorf;[290] John Wesley;[291] William Carey;[292] Elizabeth Fry;[293] William and Catherine Booth;[294]

---

[284] The entrepreneurial Christians listed have been chosen on the basis of being relatively well known. There is no claim to objectivity or exclusivity. An equally effective list of examples could have been comprised of entirely different names.

[285] Methodius of Olympus (died 311). Bishop and Church Father, author and martyr. See L. G. Patterson, *Methodius of Olympus: Divine Sovereignty, Human Freedom, and Life in Christ* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1997).
[286] Saint Patrick, Bishop and missionary in Ireland in the second half of the fifth century. See Thomas O'Loughlin, *Saint Patrick: The Man and his Works* (London: SPCK, 1999).
[287] Saint Francis of Assisi, (1181 - 1226) founded the Franciscan Order, The Second Order of St. Francis (the Order of St. Clare), and the Third Order of St Francis. See Michael J. P. Robson, *The Cambridge Companion to Francis of Assisi* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
[288] Saint Clare of Assisi, (1194 - 1253) founded the Order of Poor Ladies (renamed the Order of St. Clare after her death) and was the first woman to author a monastic rule. See Regis J. Armstrong, *Clare of Assisi: The Lady* (New York: New City Press, 2006).
[289] Saint Teresa of Avila, (1515 - 1582) Spanish Carmelite nun, reformer of the Carmelite Order, co-founder of the Discalced Carmelites with John of the Cross, mystic, theologian, and writer in the Counter Reformation. See Teresa of Avila (translated by J. M. Cohen), *The Life of Saint Teresa of Avila by Herself* (London: Penguin Classics, 1987).
[290] Count Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf, (1700 - 1760) religious and social reformer in Germany and Bishop in the Moravian Church. See Diarmid MacCulloch, *A History of Christianity: The First Three Thousand Years* (London: Penguin, 2010), pp. 744-7.
[291] John Wesley, (1703 - 1791) Anglican cleric, theologian and co-founder of the Methodist movement. See Stephen Tomkins, *John Wesley: A Biography* (London: Lion Books, 2003).
[292] William Carey, (1761 - 1834) Baptist minister and missionary to India, co-founder of the Baptist Missionary Society, Bible translator. See S. P. Carey, and Peter Masters, *William Carey* (London: Wakeman Trust, 1993).

Dr Barnardo;[295] Toyohiko Kagawa;[296] Rick Warren;[297] Les Isaac;[298] Anne Marie Wilson;[299] Neil Cole;[300] Mike Breen,[301] Jessie Jacobs[302] and Rich Jones.[303] As we reflect on what we know of the lives of those listed and consider their approach to collaborating with God and the fact that as a result of spotting opportunities, using their creativity, engaging in innovation and taking risks they all built things of recognised value during their lifetimes, the effects of which continue to positively impact the lives of others, I contend that we might refer to them as entrepreneurs. As with those who have been given as examples of entrepreneurs in the Bible, there are aspects of the lives of some of those mentioned that may appear awkward or culturally challenging in the light of contemporary values and approaches to working with others.[304] However, as with the examples taken from the Bible, the purpose of drawing attention to examples of those whose Christian faith has resulted in an entrepreneurial approach to ministry is to validate the claim that the exercise of entrepreneurial approach to ministry by priests in the present is consistent with Christian activity across the centuries. Acting entrepreneurially in the service of God

---

[293] Elizabeth Fry, (1780 - 1845) Quaker, philanthropist, prison and social reformer. See Anne Isba, *The Excellent Mrs Fry: The Unlikely Heroine* (London: Continuum Books, 2010).

[294] William Booth, (1829 - 1912) and Catherine Booth, (1829 - 1890) co-founders of the Salvation Army. See Roy Hattersley, *Blood and Fire: William and Catherine Booth and the Salvation Army* (London: Abacus, 1999).

[295] Dr John Barnardo, (1845 - 1905) philanthropist, founder and director of Barnardo's children's homes. See http://www.barnardos.org.uk/what_we_do/who_we_are/history.htm (21/01/13).

[296] Toyohiko Kagawa, (188 - 1960) Japanese pacifist, labour activist, reformer and founder of Churches, hospitals and schools. See Toyohiko Kagawa, *Living out Christ's Love* (London: Upper Room Books, 1998).

[297] Rick Warren, American pastor and author, founder of Saddleback megachurch, California. See http://www.rickwarren.com/ (21/01/13) and Rick Warren, *The Purpose Driven Life: What on Earth am I Here For?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007).

[298] Les Isaac, founder of Street Pastors, UK.
See: http://www.streetpastors.co.uk/LesIsaacOBE/tabid/937/Default.aspx (21/01/13).

[299] Anne Marie Wilson, founder of '28 Too Many', a UK-based charity striving to eradicate Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) in twenty-eight African countries. See http://28toomany.org/ (21/01/13).

[300] Neil Cole, American Church leader, author and founder and director of Church Multiplication Associates and CMA Resources. See Neil Cole, *Organic Church: Growing Faith Where Life Happens* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2005).

[301] Mike Breen, English Church leader, author, founder of 3DM Ministries; a cross-denominational learning network of Churches. See: http://weare3dm.com/mikebreen/ (21/01/13) and Mike Breen, *Building a Discipling Culture* (Pawleys Island, SC: 3 Dimension Ministries, 2011).

[302] Jessie Joe Jacobs, founder and Chief Executive of 'A Way Out', an outreach and prevention charity, based in Stockton upon Tees and specialising in engaging vulnerable and hard to reach women and young people. See http://www.awayout.co.uk/ (04/07/13).

[303] Rich Jones, Chief Executive of 'The Joshua Project, a youth initiative, based in Bradford working with underprivileged children and young people. See http://joshuaproject.org.uk/ (04/07/13).

[304] A number of those mentioned were criticized by contemporaries for their domineering presence, headstrong approach, ignoring of protocol or failure to observe correct procedures.

has a significant heritage and it is an approach that we might expect to see in every place where the people of God are active in the service of the Kingdom.

Not all are entrepreneurs

I am not suggesting that because it is possible to argue that entrepreneurship is consistent with some of the characteristics displayed by God we should expect all priests, all Christians or all human beings to be entrepreneurs or to act entrepreneurially. The evidence would contradict such a position.[305] I have provided examples of entrepreneurial individuals in the Bible and Christian history. However, even if it were possible to make reference to the hundreds of thousands of individuals who, throughout history have expressed their faith in God by acting entrepreneurially, there have been, and are, millions of others who did not and do not serve God by acting entrepreneurially. Entrepreneurs achieve wildly different things, but they share an approach to life and a way of behaving that is unique to the few rather than the many. Entrepreneurs in Scripture and Christian history are catalysts for change and growth. Bolton refers to them as 'the leaven that affects the whole'.[306] I contend that they are, in essence, a gift of God to the majority;[307] their actions sometimes being of lasting benefit to the people of God[308] and to the wider community, as the individuals I have listed demonstrate.

---

[305] Bolton cites studies that show 10 to 15 per cent of people in the UK are entrepreneurs. Bolton, *The Entrepreneur,* 4.

[306] Bolton, *The Entrepreneur*, 4.

[307] I note that Bolton argues that entrepreneurs are not always able to act as 'leaven'. He writes, 'The leaven is not able to do its job because our institutions and bureaucratic systems prevent it. They have declared the entrepreneur redundant.' Bolton, *The Entrepreneur,* 4.

[308] Paul points out in 1 Corinthians 12: 27-30 that his readers are the body of Christ, that each has a part and that a variety of gifts are distributed to the members of the body by God for the service and benefit of the whole.

3) The exercise of priestly ministry in a time of rapid cultural change will be well served by an entrepreneurial approach[309]

The third argument that I advance in response to the questions, 'why *entrepreneurs*?' and 'why *now*? is that exercise of priestly ministry in a time of rapid cultural change will be well served by an entrepreneurial approach. As previously noted, studies show us that in a given population, whether the 'population' is made up of priests or some other grouping of individuals, a relatively small percentage will be entrepreneurs. Just as those ordained priest have a particular calling and function within the wider body of Christ, so we may say that, among those who are ordained priest, those who act entrepreneurially have a particular function among their ordained colleagues and in the wider body of Christ in that geographical location. The entrepreneurial priest has an approach to living out their vocation that is well suited to ministry in a time of rapid cultural change. In relation to this, Bolton argues that '[entrepreneurs] thrive on uncertainty and chaos and are at home in today's changing and effervescent world'.[310] Exercising ministry in this way, the entrepreneurial priest sets an example to their congregation, their fellow clergy and those living in the surrounding community.

Presbyters

The vocation to priestly ministry is set in the context of the priestly ministry of the whole people of God.[311] The tradition, as it emerges in the New Testament, builds on the way in which individuals were called, anointed and set apart for particular tasks in the Old Testament.[312] From the beginning the church has set apart individuals

---

[309] This is not to say that the exercise of priestly ministry is not well served by priests who do not adopt an entrepreneurial approach but simply to assert that the exercise of priestly ministry in a time of rapid cultural change will be well served by those priests who do adopt an entrepreneurial approach.

[310] Bolton, *The Entrepreneur,* 3.

[311] The Church of England's understanding in this matter is shaped by engagement with Scripture and the traditions of the Church throughout the ages, is set out in the *Book of Common Prayer* and the Articles of Religion and is summarised in the Preface to the Ordination of Priests.

[312] Christopher Cocksworth and Rosalind Brown write that 'the definition of the people of God as a priestly community, within which certain members of that community are called to exercise different ministries, is not a New Testament invention… God's people have always been a 'royal priesthood' (Exodus 19:6) with certain people called from within the community to shape and to form its life.' Christopher Cocksworth and Rosalind Brown, *Being a Priest Today: Exploring Priestly Identity* (Norwich: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2002), 7.

for particular tasks, or ministries. This setting apart, or ordination, has usually occurred through public prayer and laying on of hands. Setting people apart in this way is found in a number of places in the New Testament. In the gospels we encounter examples of Jesus calling individuals to be with him and to be sent out in ministry with his authority.[313] In the book of Acts we note Matthias' addition to the number of the apostles in place of Judas,[314] the commissioning of seven to serve as deacons,[315] the setting apart of Saul and Barnabas,[316] and the appointment of presbyters in the Jerusalem and Gentile Churches.[317] We also find many examples of individuals being set aside for particular ministries in the Epistles.[318] In relation to the emergence of presbyteral ministry in Scripture Steven Croft writes that

> The ministry of presbyters emerges from Acts and the New Testament letters as the recognised and authoritative ministry of public and personal teaching, preaching and care of individuals and of congregations, including prayer for their healing. It is not hard to see this pattern and this dimension of ministry modelled in the ministry of Jesus.[319]

Drawing on Scripture and the tradition of the Church, the Church of England recognises three aspects of ordained ministry; *diakonos* (meaning 'one who serves'), *presbyteros* (meaning 'elder'), and *episcopos* (meaning 'one who watches over'). The focus of the current study is priestly, or *presbyteral* ministry.[320] Priestly ministry will therefore be the sole focus of the following discussion.

Entrepreneurial priests in a time of rapid cultural change

The way in which the church has understood the ministries of those it ordains as priests has changed throughout history and continues to do so today. How priestly ministry is exercised in every age depends in large part on how the church situates itself in relation to Scripture, its own tradition and its host culture. The Church of

---

[313] Examples are, Mark 1: 7; 3: 13; 6: 6-13.
[314] Acts 1: 26.
[315] Acts 6: 1-6.
[316] Acts 13: 1-3.
[317] Acts 13: 23; 15: 22; 20: 17-38.
[318] Examples are, Romans 16: 1; Philippians 1: 1; 1 Timothy 3: 1-13; 4: 17-20; 1 Peter 5: 1-5.
[319] Steven Croft, *Ministry in Three Dimensions: Ordination and Leadership in the Local Church* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2008) (revised ed.), 95.
[320] I noted in my introductory chapter that the thesis focuses on priests rather than deacons because it is priests who bear the burden of responsibility in parochial work in the Church of England.

England understands its relation to its host culture primarily in the light of its dual calling: to worship God and to participate in and serve his mission in the world.[321] Within the host culture the exercise of priestly ministry will necessarily require certain gifts and competencies at particular times. As I have attempted to point out in the section dealing with *MSC*'s view of our rapidly changing culture, and as I will highlight in the section dealing with the Diocese of Durham that follows, priests who adopt an entrepreneurial approach to their ministries will, in the view of the current study, make a particularly timely contribution to assisting the Church to be faithful to its missionary calling at the present time. The Church of England's understanding of the task of mission; the context in which priests are to 'offer vibrant and collaborative spiritual leadership, [and] empower a vocationally motivated laity',[322] is summarised in the Five Marks of Mission.[323] These were adopted by the General Synod in 1996 and continue to shape an Anglican understanding of the task of mission in the context of an understanding of the priestly and missionary character of the whole people of God. The five marks provide a framework and a helpful lens for understanding the task of the priest as they seek to lead the people of God in mission in their local areas.[324] Undertaking the ministries outlined by the five marks assumes a people in movement and requires the courage to take risks, the ability to spot opportunities, the

---

[321] The report of the 1988 Lambeth Conference states that Anglican Christians 'follow Jesus who said, 'As the Father has sent me, so I send you.' (John 20.21). We are called to serve God's mission by living and proclaiming the good news. 'It's not the Church of God that has a mission, but the God of mission who has a Church.' As we follow Jesus Christ, we believe that God's mission is revealed to us by the Holy Spirit in three ways: through the Bible, through the tradition and life of the Church, and through our own listening, praying, thinking and sharing as we respond to our own context.' Lambeth Conference 1998, Section II p121. http://www.cofe.anglican.org/faith/mission/missionevangelism.html (24/01/13).

[322] The Ministry Division of the Archbishop's Council, *Shaping the Future: New Patterns of Training for Lay and Ordained* (London: Church House Publishing, 2006), 59.

[323] The Five Marks of Mission are: 1) To proclaim the good news of the Kingdom; 2) To teach, baptise and nurture new believers; 3) To respond to human need by loving service; 4) To seek to transform unjust structures of society; 5) To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and to sustain the life of the earth. The Anglican Consultative Council notes, 'The first mark of mission is really a summary of what *all* mission is about, because it is based on Jesus' own summary of his mission (Matthew 4:17, Mark 1:14-15, Luke 4:18, Luke 7:22; cf. John 3:14-17). Instead of being just one of five distinct activities, this should be the key statement about *everything* we do in mission.' http://www.Churchofengland.org/our-faith/mission/missionevangelism.aspx (24/01/13).

[324] The learning outcomes for ordained ministry state that those being licensed to posts of incumbent status should, 'Demonstrate understanding of the imperatives of the gospel and the nature of contemporary society and skills in articulating and engaging in appropriate forms of mission in response to them; Demonstrate an ability to lead and enable others in faithful witness and to foster Mission Shaped Churches; Enable others to articulate gospel truths and participate in their proclamation'. Archbishop's Council, *Shaping,* 71. These requirements shape theological college curriculums and ongoing ministerial training for clergy.

energy to be creative, the intelligence to innovate and the faith and vision to work for transformation in lives and communities. The entrepreneurial priest will, to varying degrees, possess some or all of these qualities, will set an example in putting them into practice and will encourage them within their congregations and communities in order that the work involved in undertaking the marks of mission can be effectively and faithfully carried out. Michael Ramsey describes the way in which the priest draws in and enables the people of God as they strive to engage in loving service in their communities. In my view he is describing the approach that an entrepreneurial priest naturally adopts. He writes

> Besides displaying the Church's response the priest also *enables* it, for by his professional training and concentration of labour, he 'gets things done'. And besides displaying and enabling he also *involves* the whole Church in his own activity. In the Church and for the Church he *displays*, he *enables*, he *involves*.[325]

The Preface to the Ordination of Priests is a summary of the Church of England's understanding of priestly ministry and in it we see the emphasis on a ministry of enabling, rooted in love for Christ that lies at the heart of an understanding of priesthood. The Preface is rooted in an understanding of ministry found in Scripture and in the ministry of Jesus himself.[326] The Preface reads as follows:

> God calls his people to follow Christ, and forms us into a royal priesthood, a holy nation, to declare the wonderful deeds of him who has called us out of darkness into his marvellous light. The Church is the Body of Christ, the people of God and the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit. In baptism the whole Church is summoned to witness to God's love and to work for the coming of his kingdom. To serve this royal priesthood, God has given particular ministries. Priests are ordained to lead God's people in the offering of praise and the proclamation of the gospel. They share with the Bishop in the oversight of the Church, delighting in its beauty and rejoicing in its well-being. They are to set the example of the Good Shepherd always before them as the pattern of their calling. With the Bishop and their fellow presbyters, they are to sustain the community of the faithful by the ministry of word and sacrament, that we all may grow into the fullness of Christ and be a living sacrifice acceptable to God.[327]

---

[325] Michael Ramsey, *The Christian Priest Today* (London: SPCK, 1985) (revised ed.), 7.
[326] The Preface to the Ordination of Priests reflects Paul's discourse on the nature of ministry given to the Ephesian elders and recorded in Acts 20 as well as the exhortations to presbyters contained in 1 Peter 5: 1-6 and in other pastoral Epistles.
[327] http://www.Churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/texts/ordinal/priests.aspx (23/01/13).

We see from the Preface that the Church of England understands priestly ministry to be the ministry of those who are set apart to sustain and develop the church as it worships God and participates in his mission in the world. Since priests are first ordained deacons, loving service remains the basis of their ministry. They are to serve the church and the wider community. This will involve them in a range of roles in which they have to hold pastoral and missional elements in tension. The priest is to be sustained in their ministry by commitment to a life of prayer and dependence on the Holy Spirit. Loving service and prayer are to be an example to the whole people of God. The ministry of the priest finds its focus in ensuring that the spiritual health of the church is maintained and that the people of God remain focused on their calling as a missionary people; a people in movement rather than stasis. The priest is to be committed to building up the whole people of God with the aim that the body is strong and able to grow spiritually and to multiply numerically. This will find its focus in the priest's ministry of Word and Sacrament. The entrepreneurial priest will embody and undertake the ministry set out above with a recognisable and habitual bias towards spotting opportunities, taking risks, creating, innovating and collaborating with others, both inside and outside the church, creating spiritual, social and economic capital with which to build things[328] of recognised value. Such an approach to priestly ministry is particularly appropriate at a time of rapid cultural change, significant social and economic need, and rigorous questioning and self-examination by the Church of England about the nature of its role in relation to its host culture, its engagement with communities, its understanding of its own traditions and the shape of its ongoing worship and participation in the mission of God.

The Declaration of Assent[329] is also helpful to us here. The Declaration is read out by the presiding Bishop each time a priest is licensed to a new parish. It sets out the Church of England's self understanding in the broadest possible terms but of particular interest is the fact that it states plainly the need for the people of God to

---

[328] 'things' in the context of parish ministry might be as diverse as a fresh sense of vision within the congregation, a new worship service, a community-focused initiative or even a literal building project. Examples of the sorts of 'things' built by entrepreneurial clergy in the Diocese of Durham can be found in chapter five.

[329] The Declaration of Assent includes the following statement: 'The Church of England professes the faith uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds, which faith the Church is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation'. Canon C 15, http://www.Churchofengland.org/media/35588/complete.pdf (24/01/13).

proclaim the Christian faith *afresh* in each generation. The new priest is to publicly commit themselves to partnering with God and the people of God in their pastoral charge in the task of proclaiming the good news about Jesus Christ within the body and also, crucially, to those in 'each generation', in other words, those in the surrounding communities. In a post-Christendom context the task of proclaiming the gospel afresh is particularly challenging. Steven Croft acknowledges this challenge and, because he implies change within the church itself, in my view, his position highlights the necessity of priests who are able to understand what is happening and respond appropriately. Croft writes that

> The forces of change that have been affecting our culture and society have to affect the whole way we are Church; the way we engage as Churches in the mission of God in our generation; and therefore on the nature and task of those who are ordained ministers.[330]

As I have previously noted in drawing attention to the learning outcomes for ordained ministry, to be faithful and effective in the present 'generation' the priest must understand the essence of the gospel; be actively committed to radical love and service; grasp the rich heritage of the Church of England and read the host culture. They must also avoid simply acting as a translator standing in the gaps between these elements but rather, be a prayerful catalyst for the bringing together of these diverse elements in order that, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, something new might be brought to birth. This 'new' thing will be consistent in some sense with what has gone before while being also appropriate in a fresh sense for our time. This is where the entrepreneurial priest's God-given creativity will be seen to be at work in collaboration with the creative Spirit of God, who is always and everywhere doing a new thing.[331] The net result of this creative collaboration will have a different shape in every place but will be characterised by positive transformation.[332] Since entrepreneurs thrive in an environment characterised by change and fluidity, changing times in the church and in culture represent opportunities for the entrepreneurial

---

[330] Croft, *Ministry,* 5.

[331] I note the words of Isaiah in relation to God's perpetual creative activity, 'See, I am doing a new thing! Now it springs up; do you not perceive it? I am making a way in the wilderness and streams in the wasteland.' Isaiah 43: 19.

[332] 'For Anglican Christians God's mission is about transformation; transforming individual lives, transforming communities and transforming the world.' Lambeth Conference 1998, Section II p121, http://www.Churchofengland.org/our-faith/mission/missionevangelism.aspx (24/01/13).

priest; opportunities to re-imagine[333] the shape and nature of the interface between the people of God and the surrounding culture, opportunities to take risks re-imagining the nature of the Church of England's commitment to be a presence in every geographical place; opportunities to re-imagine the way the good news about Jesus might be communicated and apprehended by local people and become a source of positive transformation for local communities in which people are struggling with the effects of social and economic deprivation, as is set out in the following section.[334] Making a public commitment to work with the people of God in proclaiming afresh the Christian faith in our post-Christendom, individualised, consumer-oriented, networked culture is a challenge that the entrepreneurial priest is well fitted to meet. The entrepreneurial priest is a gift of God to the Church of England as it strives to participate in his mission. Entrepreneurial priests have a particular and highly relevant contribution to make to the whole church as it attempts to discern the shape of its ministry in the present and in the years to come.

Parish priests can be mission entrepreneurs too

Bringing together its reading of a rapidly changing culture, characterised by the increasing importance of networks over geography, with its proposed theology for a missionary church, *MSC* makes eighteen recommendations, one of which, as I have noted, includes a reference to 'mission entrepreneurs'. *MSC* explains that its eighteen recommendations flow out of the insights that have emerged from its overview and assessment of church planting and fresh expressions of church in the decade between 1994 and 2004 as well as its view of our changing society and its articulation of 'what it means for the Church to be missionary within those cultures and networks'.[335] While noting that *MSC*'s reading of contemporary culture and its proposed theology of mission are contested, most notably in John Hull's brief (2006) response, *Mission Shaped Church: A Theological Response*, and Andrew Davison and Alison Milbank's

---

[333] With direct reference to the Church of England, *MSC* argues that in a time of rapid cultural change, 'perhaps our greatest need is a baptism of imagination about the forms of the Church'. *MSC*, 90.
[334] In a chapter titled, 'Imagination', Sam Wells argues that, 'Imagination essentially means being able to conceive of a world different from this one. What was required was something to do [imagination] [and this] included education, entrepreneurship, confidence and resilience'. Sam Wells and Sarah Coakley, (eds.), *Praying for England: Priestly Presence in Contemporary Culture* (London: Continuum, 2008), 83.
[335] *MSC,* 145.

(2010) book, *For the Parish: A Critique of Fresh Expressions*, I also note the enormous (and ongoing) impact that *MSC* has had since its publication both in England and across the globe.[336] John Hull argues that *MSC* has a defective theological framework. He contends that *MSC*'s fundamental weakness is 'its failure to distinguish clearly between the Church and the mission of God'.[337] He argues that *MSC*'s missiology confuses the church and the Kingdom of God and that *MSC* shows no interest in difference outside the church, offers 'an entirely Church-centred view of social change',[338] essentially suggests ways of re-establishing Christendom, unhelpfully blames church members for the church decline, misses two essential features of inculturation and endorses a separation of rich and poor churches rather than proposing ways for the poor to escape poverty. Hull concludes his response by stating that 'We looked for a Mission Shaped Church but what we found was a Church-shaped mission'.[339]

Davison and Milbank state that *For the Parish: A Critique of Fresh Expressions* is a response to *MSC* which, in their view is 'the definitive Church report of the decade'.[340] They argue that, although admirable in its aim, *MSC*'s engagement with the contemporary context is done 'on the basis of a defective methodology, an

---

[336] According to Bishop Graham Cray at a public address given at Holy Trinity, Brompton (London) on 22/11/12, *MSC* had sold almost 30,000 copies worldwide. In the years since its publication *MSC* has been the catalyst for a huge amount of subsequent activity including the following: **1)** The emergence of hundreds of fresh expressions of church, 'The first ever statistical analysis of fresh expressions of church has concluded that there are at least 1,000 Church of England fresh expressions or new congregations across the country. Around 30,000 people attend fresh expressions each month who don't attend traditional regular services, equating to an average of around 40 people per participating parish exploring new forms of church - the statistical equivalent of an additional diocese. Almost all dioceses have reported fresh expressions or new congregations with over half of these initiatives aimed at families with young children.' http://www.freshexpressions.org.uk/news/cofestats2010 (10/01/13). **2)** The selection, training and deployment of lay and ordained pioneer ministers. **3)** the development of specific training pathways for pioneer ministers. **4)** The development of Bishop's Mission Orders, 'a legal device in the Church of England created as part of the 'Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure'. It enables a Bishop to legally recognise a mission initiative that will lead to a new Christian community.' There are currently 19 in place with a further 4 being considered. http://www.freshexpressions.org.uk/bmo (10/01/13). **5)** Mission Shaped Ministry, '[a] one-year, part-time course takes participants on a learning journey as part of a supportive community, training them for ministry in fresh expressions of Church.' http://www.freshexpressions.org.uk/missionshapedministry (10/01/13). **6)** The production of a range of resources including books and DVDs. **7)** An expansion in research at masters and doctoral level into fresh expressions of church. **8)** A range of partner organisations and denominations both in England and overseas joining with the Church of England to partner in establishing and learning from fresh expressions of church. http://www.freshexpressions.org.uk/about/partners (10/01/13).
[337] Hull, *MSC: A Theological Response,* 1.
[338] Hull, *MSC: A Theological Response,* 19.
[339] Hull, *MSC: A Theological Response,* 36.
[340] Andrew Davison and Alison Milbank, *For the Parish: A Critique of Fresh Expressions* (London: SCM Press, 2010), 225.

inadequate theology, and by accepting the very choice-led individualism from which Christianity should seek to liberate us'.[341] They argue that *MSC* and Fresh Expressions reveal 'a crisis of confidence in the Church of England',[342] a lack of confidence in the parish, and in current Anglican theology, and represent a flight from the mixed community of the parish, 'the value of tradition, common worship and the embodied self'.[343] *For the Parish* claims to offer a defence of the parish system and 'a theology that will restore the flagging morale of parish clergy'.[344] In response to Davison and Milbank's book, Bishop Graham Cray published an article in the Church of England Newspaper titled, *We are all 'for the parish'.*[345] He describes *For the Parish* as '[a] frustrating read because its misinterpretations detract from the important issues it makes'. He points out that he is also 'for the parish' and proceeds to offer a robust challenge to the authors on five key points.

MSC, although contested, proposes a reading of our rapidly changing culture and a view of the missionary task of the church that many have found (and continue to find) convincing. It is in the context of its reading of culture and the missional task that *MSC* identifies the contribution of mission entrepreneurs in planting new forms of church and recommends that the Church of England identify, train and deploy more individuals who possess entrepreneurial competency. It is the view of the current study that in recognising and drawing attention to the fruit of the efforts of mission entrepreneurs, and calling for the church to identify more individuals with such gifts, *MSC* has identified a way of approaching and engaging in ministry and mission that is consistent with:

1) The nature of God.

2) An approach to mission identifiable in the Bible and in Christian history.

3) The challenges of engaging in the missionary task in our rapidly changing culture.

4) The task of priestly ministry in the local communities served by Anglican parishes.

---

[341] Davison and Milbank, *Parish*, vii.
[342] Davison and Milbank, *Parish*, 225.
[343] Davison and Milbank, *Parish*, ix.
[344] Davison and Milbank, *Parish*, x.
[345] http://www.freshexpressions.org.uk/news/cen/201011parish (10/01/13).

I contend that in using the term 'entrepreneur' *MSC* has done the Church of England a great service but that it is necessary for the church to expand its understanding of the entrepreneur and his or her sphere of operation beyond simply the planting of new churches. The empirical research carried out for the current study identifies a number of priests in the Diocese of Durham who adopt an entrepreneurial approach to ministry in the parish. This is not necessarily evidenced in planting churches (although some have been involved in this type of activity while simultaneously undertaking a range of other tasks), but is apparent in the approach adopted by these priests to leading parish churches in regular worship and in missional engagement with their local communities. The current study wishes to endorse both the need for a mixed economy of church in our rapidly changing culture and the role played by mission entrepreneurs in planting fresh expressions of church. Alongside these two endorsements, however, the current study wishes to highlight the value of an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry in the parish in a rapidly changing culture in England, to provide some sense of what an entrepreneurial approach to ministry in the parish may look like, and to set out suggestions that may assist the encouragement and support of an entrepreneurial approach to ministry in parishes across the Church of England.

4) The mission of the Church of England in local communities will be well served by an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry in the parish

The fourth argument that I advance in response to the questions, 'why *entrepreneurs*?' and 'why *now*? is that the mission of the Church of England in local communities will be well served by an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry in the parish. *MSC*'s reading of culture and understanding of the mission task of the church are relevant and applicable across each of the Church of England's forty-four dioceses. However, each diocese has particularities that are rooted in the evolution of local cultures and which have been shaped by the historic engagement of the church with these local cultures. In the Diocese of Durham the societal changes identified by *MSC* have their own unique nature, shape and effect on the task of mission. The region's particular economic, social and spiritual heritage coupled with current developments in these key areas shapes local communities and the way in which parishes and their priests might seek to engage in loving service within such

communities. In this chapter I set out the social context in County Durham in order to strengthen my argument for the importance of an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry. It is the contention of this thesis that entrepreneurial priests have a potentially significant contribution to make in each diocese of the Church of England. This is a general point and I make it via reflection on a specific context. The Diocese of Durham has been chosen because it is where I live and work. My understanding of the Diocese of Durham has been shaped by three key areas of involvement, each of which has provided insights into the nature of ministry in this diocese and into the range of issues that are particular to communities in the region. The first of these is my work at Cranmer Hall. Via my role as Director of Mission I have been responsible for deploying more than twenty student mission teams to parishes in the diocese during the years 2009 – 2013. First-hand experience of the missions and reflection with student team members, host clergy and congregations has provided multiple insights into the nature of parish ministry in the Diocese of Durham. Secondly, I am a member of the Diocese's 'Growth Group' which is tasked with advising the Bishops of Durham and Jarrow on strategy for Church growth. Lastly, key insights have come via research interviews for the current study with priests and academics in the diocese.

The Diocese of Durham and County Durham

The North East has been of huge importance to the historic development of Christianity in England. The County of Durham, and in particular the cathedral, has deep association with this rich, regional Christian heritage. The former Bishop of Durham, Justin Welby, wrote that 'In many ways it [Durham] has been the ancient cradle of British Christianity. It is a place of opportunity and has an even greater future than its past.'[346] The Diocese of Durham was created in AD 995[347] and covers the historic County of Durham, an area of 2230 square kilometers of which more than half (1420 square kilometers) is agricultural land.[348] The diocese has three archdeaconries containing between them 249 parishes with 292 churches and 302

---

[346] http://www.durham.anglican.org/news-and-events/news-article.aspx?id=346 (11/01/13).
[347] http://www.durham.anglican.org/people-and-places/our-diocese.aspx (02/06/13).
[348] http://www.durham.gov.uk/Pages/Service.aspx?ServiceId=5651 (02/01/13).

licensed clergy.[349] The clergy and congregations of the diocese seek to serve 513,200 people in 223,000 households and 290 schools.[350] The diocese has twelve major centres with populations of more than 6000 people, these being Barnard Castle, Bishop Auckland, Chester-le-Street, Consett, Crook, Durham City, Newton Aycliffe, Peterlee, Seaham, Spennymoor and Stanley.[351] The average age of people living in the diocese is between 35 and 39 years[352] and the major areas of employment are the service industry (70%), manufacturing (17%), tourism (8%), and construction (5%).[353]

Durham County Council's website highlights the successful industrial heritage of the region, reminding readers that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the area covered by the diocese was a significant player in the Industrial Revolution, being a major producer and global exporter of coal and iron and a centre of rail innovation, with the first steam-powered locomotive to carry passengers running between Stockton-on-Tees and Darlington in 1825. The County Council self-consciously roots its current vision and priorities in this robustly positive view of the region's past and states that it has developed a new vision to

> Reflect the views and aspirations of the community and opportunities for improvement. This vision is focused around an 'Altogether Better Durham', and is made up of two components: to have an Altogether Better Place, which is Altogether Better for people.[354]

In articulating their vision for a better Durham, the County Council recognises the existence of significant social and economic deprivation in the region, indeed their energetic vision is a deliberate attempt to address the significant issues affecting the lives of many who live in the county.[355]

---

[349] Statistic received from Durham Diocesan Board of Finance, 05/01/12.
[350] Both figures from the Office of National Statistics 2011 Census estimates, sourced at: http://www.durham.gov.uk/Pages/Service.aspx?ServiceId=5651 (02/01/13).
[351] http://www.durham.gov.uk/Pages/Service.aspx?ServiceId=5651 (02/01/13).
[352] I contacted the Durham Diocesan Board of Finance on 15/01/13 to ask them for figures relating to the average ages of those attending worship services at churches in the diocese. No such figures were available as they are not collected.
[353] http://www.durham.gov.uk/Pages/Service.aspx?ServiceId=5651 (02/01/13).
[354] http://www.durham.gov.uk/Pages/Service.aspx?ServiceId=5651 (02/01/13).
[355] Durham County Council's website articulates an upbeat vision of the possibility of economic regeneration in the region stating that, 'Continued investment and the arrival of a range of new hi-tech businesses including telecommunications, advanced electronics and pharmaceutical and bio-tech companies have helped industry to diversify and grow in the county. Businesses in County Durham are adding to the success of the economy not only within the county but also in the North East of England

Deprivation

An insight into the challenges faced by many of those who live in communities in the county (the area served by the diocese) is provided by Durham County Council's 2010 Index of Deprivation Report (hereafter referred to as ID 2010).[356] The report provides a picture of a number of communities, representing a significant proportion of the overall population, within the Diocese of Durham where people experience multiple deprivation and lack access to realistic opportunities for improving their situation. The ID 2010 states that

> In terms of deprivation County Durham is a diverse area. East Durham, Stanley, Bishop Auckland and Shildon have more than half of their population living in relatively deprived areas (and within the top 30% most deprived areas nationally)... A high proportion of residents in areas such as Sherburn Road in Durham City and parts of central Chester-le-Street experience intense and multiple forms of deprivation despite living in relatively less deprived areas.[357]

The ID 2010 draws on data from 2008. In that year the report tells us that in County Durham 'there were over 85,000 residents on a low income and almost 45,000 people of working age workless, 27,000 income deprived older people (aged 60+) and around 20,000 children in poverty'.[358] The report notes that the figures pre-date the current recession and may therefore underestimate the scale of the problem.[359]

---

and the rest of the country.' http://www.durham.gov.uk/Pages/Service.aspx?ServiceId=5651 (15/01/13).

[356] The introduction to Durham County Council's 2010 Index of Deprivation Report states that, 'Deprivation covers a broad range of issues and refers to unmet needs caused by a lack of resources of all kinds, not just financial. The English Indices of Deprivation 2010 attempt to measure a broader concept of multiple deprivation [using] 38 separate indicators, organised across seven distinct domains of deprivation: Income Deprivation, Employment Deprivation, Health and Disability Deprivation, Education Skills and Training Deprivation, Barriers to Housing and Services, Living Environment Deprivation and Crime'. http://content.durham.gov.uk/PDFRepository/ID_2010_Summary_Website.pdf (15/01/13).

[357] http://content.durham.gov.uk/PDFRepository/ID_2010_Summary_Website.pdf (15/01/13).

[358] http://content.durham.gov.uk/PDFRepository/ID_2010_Summary_Website.pdf (15/01/13).

[359] Church Urban Fund report on Area Based Poverty claims that, '33% of people in the North East live in one of the 20% most deprived neighbourhoods in the country compared with just 7% of people in the South East.' The report states that, 'People in deprived areas are more likely to suffer depression and low self-esteem; to misuse drugs and alcohol; to be disabled and to die prematurely. They are more likely to be unemployed and to live in sub-standard housing in areas with higher levels of crime and lower social capital. Their children do less well at school, are more likely to experience family breakdown, and to be taken into care.'

http://www.cuf.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/CUF_AreaBasedPoverty_V2.pdf (15/01/13).

Between August 2008 and August 2011 job seekers claiming increased by over 6000 (to 14,060) an increase of over 75%.'[360] 34,980 people in County Durham claimed Incapacity Benefits or Employment Support Allowance in February 2008. According to the ID 2010,

> Clusters of highly deprived communities remain in Seaham, Peterlee, Easington Colliery and Bishop Auckland. Elsewhere pockets of the most deprived communities exist in South Stanley, central Chester-le-Street, Crook, Willington, Newton Aycliffe, Ferryhill and Spennymoor.[361]

The following brief statement provides a concise summary of the ID 2010,

> Overall, deprivation, as measured by the ID 2010, means that large numbers of County Durham residents have significant issues with relatively low income, worklessness, poor health and low educational attainment. Many localities experience multiple and intense forms of deprivation.[362]

The above information and statistical data provides a sense of some of the challenges faced by large numbers of people in the communities served by the Diocese of Durham. If the diocese is to be effective as an agent of community transformation in this context, it will be well served by an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry since such an approach will involve priests, congregations, communities and other partners habitually and creatively collaborating on and around perceived opportunities for positive change and working to bring together human and financial resources in order to build something of lasting value.[363]

Flourishing

Alongside deprivation there are many examples of social, cultural and economic flourishing that are to be noted. Two obvious examples are Durham as a

---

[360] http://content.durham.gov.uk/PDFRepository/ID_2010_Summary_Website.pdf (15/01/13).
[361] http://content.durham.gov.uk/PDFRepository/ID_2010_Summary_Website.pdf (15/01/13).
I have engaged with the priests in a number of these communities through my role at Cranmer Hall and while undertaking empirical research for the current study.
[362] http://content.durham.gov.uk/PDFRepository/ID_2010_Summary_Website.pdf (15/01/13).

[363] The Diocese of Durham engages in social action in a range of contexts, including significant outreach to asylum seekers. The breadth and success of this aspect of the diocese's engagement is evidence of an entrepreneurial approach to ministry and is carried out via various channels, such as collaborating with the Local Authority through Local Strategic Partnerships. For further information see: http://www.durham.anglican.org/mission-and-ministry/social-responsibility.aspx (16/01/13).

UNESCO World Heritage Site, (the city and cathedral attract 600,000 visitors a year[364]), and Durham University, a 'world top 100 university'[365] with over 15,000 students and employing more than 3000 staff.[366] In relation to business and commerce, the website of the Durham Chamber of Commerce claims that

> Durham is in the midst of an entrepreneurial boom that is attracting national attention including the Obama Administration and investors in Silicon Valley. It is also sparking dozens of successful ventures that are transforming our economy.[367]

The Chamber estimates that there are over sixty business startups in Durham City and asks, "What if" Durham becomes *the* hub for entrepreneurship in the North East?'[368] Hitachi,[369] Nissan[370] and SSI UK[371] have all recently announced plans for significant manufacturing development in the county, which will mean the creation of thousands of new jobs. A further example of flourishing within the area served by the diocese is the recently established Darlington Foundation for Jobs which aims to

> Establish formal links between schools and employers; encourage employers to offer internships; promote an increase in the number of apprentices; encourage young entrepreneurs and showcase young job seekers.[372]

In taking on the patronage of this initiative Bishop Justin demonstrated his own commitment to engagement with a key area of need[373] and recognised that an entrepreneurial approach to Christian ministry that speaks of 'Good News' in the region certainly involves advocacy for entrepreneurial approaches to job creation for young people. Bishop Justin wrote enthusiastically about the project in the *Northern Echo*,

> The importance of this project to the flourishing of communities in the

---

[364] http://www.durhamworldheritagesite.com/ (15/01/13).
[365] http://www.dur.ac.uk/ (15/01/13).
[366] http://www.dur.ac.uk/about/facts/ (15/01/13).
[367] http://durhamchamber.org/thrive/entrepreneurs-startups (15/01/13).
[368] http://durhamchamber.org/thrive/entrepreneurs-startups (15/01/13).
[369]http://www.thenorthernecho.co.uk/business/news/9837756.Full_steam_ahead_for___4_5bn_Hitachi_train_building_deal_at_Newton_Aycliffe/ (16/01/13).
[370] http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2012/dec/19/nissan-create-jobs-sunderland-infiniti (16/01/13).
[371] http://www.ssi-steel.co.uk/ (16/01/13).
[372] http://www.darlington.gov.uk/Business/advicesupport/training.htm (07/01/13).
[373] In a 2011 Church Urban Fund survey of over 200 CUF-supported groups, project leaders cited unemployment/lack of job opportunities as by far the most important issue affecting their local communities. http://www.cuf.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/CUF_AreaBasedPoverty_V2.pdf (15/01/13).

Northeast cannot be underestimated. Getting young people into work and equipping them with the skills needed to grow the local economy is the way that communities and economies can move from strength to strength. I would really like to see this fantastic scheme replicated widely - to allow other communities across the country to benefit.[374]

The above examples of flourishing within the area that the Diocese of Durham seeks to serve could be supplemented with scores of examples of small business startups,[375] local community initiatives,[376] highly regarded public art,[377] hugely popular areas of outstanding natural beauty,[378] nature reserves, coastline, ancient monuments, parkland and leisure facilities. These examples of flourishing must sit alongside the picture of deprivation in the area. They are evidence of the existence of a spirit of entrepreneurship in the region since to create, establish and sustain the cultural, social and financial capital represented by the ventures that I have mentioned requires entrepreneurial gifts and competence. As the Diocese of Durham seeks to serve diverse communities in the region, in the midst of both deprivation and despair, potential and opportunity, an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry will be consistent with the approach being taken by the local authority, local businesses and many others, including volunteer groups,[379] within the communities of the region. Such an approach will open up numerous opportunities for collaboration and partnership.

---

[374] http://www.durham.anglican.org/news-and-events/news-article.aspx?id=375 (07/01/13).

[375] The Durham and Darlington branch of the Federation of Small Businesses promotes the interests of over 1000 members in the area that the diocese seeks to serve. http://www.fsb.org.uk/north-east-region/durham-and-darlington (15/01/13).

[376] The establishment of 14 Area Action Partnerships (AAPs) since 2009 allows community residents to work with Durham County Council on a range of community projects. http://www.nlgn.org.uk/public/2012/engaging-the-community-in-county-durham/ (15/01/13).

[377] Including Antony Gormley's (1998) The Angel of the North, which attracts an estimated 150,000 visitors a year. http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/Leisure%20and%20Culture/attractions/Angel/Home.aspx (15/01/13).

[378] A list of more than forty visitor attractions in County Durham can be viewed at http://www.thisisdurham.com/things-to-do/durham-attractions/family-attractions/?p=1 (15/01/13).

[379] The Volunteer Centre, Durham provides hundreds of opportunities to volunteer. http://www.thevolunteercenter.org/tp42/Default.asp?ID=139710 (16/01/13).

Growing the Kingdom

The Diocese of Durham's current vision and priorities are set out in a leaflet with the title, *Growing the Kingdom 2013*.[380] The leaflet includes the strap line 'A diocese of diversity and challenge where anything is possible.' Four areas of priority are set out in the leaflet. These are:

- Praying: *We all pray daily and are growing spiritually.*

- Serving: *Each congregation is serving its local community and in particular its most vulnerable members.*

- Growing: *We are arresting decline in Church attendance and Churches are growing.*

- Giving: *Income is increasing, we are demonstrating good stewardship of our resources and are financially sound.*

The Diocese of Durham is attempting to realise the above vision and priorities in a context of national recession that has been particularly keenly felt in the North East, as some of the data quoted above makes clear. In his 2012 New Year Message, the Bishop of Durham acknowledges this, saying, 'Here in the North East, people's worries about the national economy, and their own household budgets, are particularly intense.'[381]

The pressures resulting from the ongoing financial crisis are also being felt in the diocese itself. At his presidential address to the Diocesan Synod on 26 May 2012, the Bishop of Durham explained that

> One of the most significant challenges that the diocese faces is that of recruitment and retention of clergy. We have at the moment more than ten posts that we are unable to fill. Vacancies put huge stress on congregations and especially on Church Wardens, neighbouring clergy and Area Deans. The shortage of clergy is a real pressure and one of our biggest issues. Everyone is taking cuts.[382]

---

[380]http://www.durham.anglican.org/userfiles/file/Durham%20Website/Archdeacons%20Resources/Priorities%202013.pdf (03/01/13).

[381]

http://www.durham.anglican.org/userfiles/file/Durham%20Website/News%20and%20Events/Latest%20News/Bishop%20message%20new%20year%20message%20final.pdf (14/01/13).

[382]

http://www.durham.anglican.org/userfiles/file/Durham%20Website/News%20and%20Events/From%20the%20Bishops/Bishop%20Justin/Diocesan%20Synod%20Meeting%2026%20May%202012.pdf

The Bishop of Jarrow expressed similar sentiment when he addressed the Diocesan Synod on 7 November 2009, stating that

> We seem to have run out of everything. We seem to be running out of money. In many Churches people tell me that they are running out of people to do things and that those who are left are running out of energy. In some places I even wonder whether we are brave enough to admit that we are running out of hope.[383]

The current reality is that the diocese is attempting to be an agent of transformation in communities experiencing increasing levels of need and deprivation, while facing its own acute pressures on finances, clergy and congregations. A context marked by multiple challenges demands dynamic leadership and the diocese secured this for a brief period in the Bishop of Durham, Justin Welby. Bishop Justin began his enthronement sermon on 26 November 2011 with the words, 'This is a time of opportunity'.[384] His sermon provided evidence of his recognition and understanding of the issues in the region,

> Material regeneration is needed, desperately, above all in this region which made the steel, mined the coal and built the ships of the world, that created great companies and was the foundation of so much of the national greatness.[385]

In the same sermon he spoke of the task of priests and congregations in the Diocese of Durham in such a way as to provide an insight into his own, entrepreneurial vision for the region,

> It is a huge task, to follow in the giant footsteps of Cuthbert and Aidan and Chad and so many more, intending in the north east to rekindle Christian faith. That is our task, to be those who bring this region to Christ, to spiritual life afresh. It is God's task through us.[386]

His innately entrepreneurial approach was also evident in the bold optimism that marked his articulation of the nature of the distinctive contribution the church could make to the region, and indeed the nation and Europe: 'Under God, I believe we can

---

(14/01/13).

[383] http://www.durham.anglican.org/news-and-events/Bishop-of-jarrow.aspx (15/08/12).
[384] http://www.durham.anglican.org/news-and-events/enthronement-sermon-by-the-Bishop-of-durham.aspx (14/01/13).
[385] http://www.durham.anglican.org/news-and-events/enthronement-sermon-by-the-Bishop-of-durham.aspx (14/01/13).
[386] http://www.durham.anglican.org/news-and-events/enthronement-sermon-by-the-Bishop-of-durham.aspx (14/01/13).

turn round the decline in numbers, influence and effect of the church that has happened for the last 80 years across the whole of North West Europe.'[387]

Sermons and addresses given by the Bishops of Durham and Jarrow highlight their awareness and recognition of the huge challenges facing the people of the region and the diocese. They also hint at innately entrepreneurial approaches to engaging in the task of mission in the diocese. I interviewed the Bishop of Durham, Justin Welby, and the Bishop of Jarrow, Mark Bryant, during the course of my research for the current study. Both men presented as highly entrepreneurial,[388] understanding and favouring the term and the qualities it typically signifies and articulating an entrepreneurial approach to their current Episcopal roles as well as to former ministries as parish priests. Both bishops were acutely aware of and practically engaged with the wide range of significant challenges facing the communities in the region and the Diocese of Durham itself and they outlined informed, realistic and generally positive approaches to leading the Church of England in mission in this context. A not insignificant example of this is the 2012 sale of Auckland Castle (owned by the diocese for over 800 years and the official residence of the Bishops of Durham since 1832) to the Auckland Castle Trust. The castle will be the centre of a substantial programme of Christian based regeneration for the North East of England. In my view this is a highly creative, entrepreneurial act that points to bishops and a diocese prepared to think laterally and take risks and who are setting an example of practical ways to address both the needs of the region and its own financial requirements.

In summary of this section, I contend that, although we are able to note many areas of potential and opportunity in the region, given the presence of significant levels of social and economic deprivation, and faced with its own diminishing human and financial resources, faithful and effective engagement in mission will be well served by the exercise of an entrepreneurial approach to ministry and mission in dioceses in the Church of England, including in the Diocese of Durham. I contend that addressing the multiple needs of local communities by sharing the love of Jesus

---

[387]   http://www.durham.anglican.org/news-and-events/enthronement-sermon-by-the-Bishop-of-durham.aspx (14.01.13).

[388] The Church of England Newspaper reported Mark Tanner, Warden of Cranmer Hall saying the following about Bishop Justin, 'He is a leader, an entrepreneur and an often prophetic voice speaking wisdom into broken situations'. (18/11/12).

in practical ways while also seeing congregations thrive spiritually, grow numerically and become financially sustainable will be well served by an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry as understood in the previous chapter.

Chapter summary

In this chapter I have addressed the interconnected questions of 'why *entrepreneurs*?' and 'why *now*?' in four sections. In the first of these I argued that entrepreneurship is consistent with characteristics exhibited by God. In the second I proposed that it is possible to identify figures in the Bible and in Christian history whose faith in God has resulted in them adopting an entrepreneurial approach to their collaboration with God. In the third section I suggested that the exercise of priestly ministry in a time of rapid cultural change will be well served by an entrepreneurial approach. In the final section I suggested that the mission of the Church of England will be well served by an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry in the parish.

<u>Chapter Four</u>

<u>Methodology</u>

Introduction

       In the first section of this chapter the research objective is restated. I move on to discuss the decision to adopt a qualitative approach to the research and I discuss the measures taken to demonstrate the credibility of the research. In the second section of this chapter I discuss Bolton and Thompson's entrepreneurial 'character themes'.[389] I set out my reasons for using their online tool to generate data and I discuss the strengths and weaknesses of using the tool in the current study. In the third section of this chapter I set out a discussion of my pilot study, which includes consideration of the decision to use semi-structured interviews to generate data and reflection on related issues, such as transcription. In the fourth section I set out my approach to data generation, I account for my decisions and I outline the strengths and weaknesses of my chosen approach. The final section of the chapter is a reflexive account of the approach taken to data analysis.

A qualitative approach to achieving the research objective

       In discussing data generation Harding argues that 'The research design should reflect the research question(s) or objectives'.[390] In light of this I open with a restatement of the research objective, initially set out in the introductory chapter of the thesis. Building on my own identity as a priest and an entrepreneur, my understanding of the mission situation currently faced by the Church of England, my understanding of the role of the priest and my ongoing involvement with the Diocese of Durham and Anglican ordinands training to be future priests, the research objective in the current study is:

---

[389] Bill Bolton and John Thompson, *Entrepreneurs: Talent, Temperament, Technique,* (2nd ed.), (Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, 2004), 50.
[390] Harding, *Qualitative*, 27.

To explore the articulated experience of a sample of entrepreneurial priests in the Diocese of Durham with a view to producing appropriate and informed suggestions for future practice in relation to the exercise of entrepreneurship by parish priests in the Church of England.

David Silverman reminds us that 'research problems are not neutral. How we frame a research problem will inevitably reflect a commitment (explicit or implicit) to a particular model of how the world works'.[391] Although my research objective was generated and shaped by my own experience of being both a priest and an entrepreneur, my interest in *exploring* the *articulated experience* of a *sample* of *entrepreneurial priests* reflects my interest in and commitment to the importance of 'Seeing through the eyes of others [and] understanding the perspectives of respondents'.[392] Although care must be taken to avoid making an overly simple distinction between qualitative and quantitative approaches,[393] the intention of the current study to collect detailed information from a relatively small group of people suggested a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach. The decision to adopt a qualitative methodology in order to achieve the research objective was driven by theoretical commitment and practical[394] considerations. The research objective included the aim of *exploring the articulated experience*, an objective that necessarily requires the pursuit of detail. Silverman argues that 'Generally speaking, qualitative researchers are prepared to sacrifice scope for detail detail is found in the precise particulars of such matters as people's understandings and interactions'.[395] Martyn Denscombe adds to this, pointing out that '[in qualitative research there is a] preference for depth of study and the associated 'thick' description'.[396] As I undertook the current study, engaging with my own experience and the relevant literature, and experiencing the research objective take shape before and during the process of data

---

[391] Silverman, *Doing,* 11.
[392] Harding, *Qualitative*, 10.
[393] Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007), Barbour (2008), Creswell (2009), Silverman (2010), and Harding (2013) all highlight the tendency for understandings of the differences between qualitative and quantitative approaches to research to be caricatured or over-simplified.
[394] As I engaged in the design of my research study it was helpful to bear in mind Silverman's point, that 'there is no 'perfect' model of research design. Practical contingences (e.g. access or the lack of it; the time you have available) are always going to affect any piece of research'. Silverman, *Doing,* 40.
[395] Silverman, *Doing,* 104.
[396] Martyn Denscombe, *The Good Research Guide for Small-Scale Social Research Projects* (4th ed.), (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2010)*,* 238.

generation, it was apparent that working with a large sample of priests would be impractical because of limits on the amount of time available for data generation and analysis. I also judged that it would be unnecessary to work with a large sample since, in my view the research objective could be achieved through engagement with a relatively small sample of priests. Working with a relatively small sample of priests allowed me to explore the experience of participants in my analysis in more depth than would have been possible with a larger sample. Depth of analysis rather than breadth of engagement was key to *producing appropriate and informed suggestions for future practice.* The approach to selection of the sample of entrepreneurial priests and the strengths and weaknesses of my decision to adopt this approach are discussed under the heading *data generation*, below.

Credibility, dependability, transferability and confirmability

Denscombe points out the importance of demonstrating the credibility of research. He tells us that the criteria for verification in positivist research have been validity, reliability, generalisability and objectivity.[397] However, he argues that 'the credibility of qualitative research is not easily judged by these criteria'.[398] He explains that it is all but impossible to replicate a social setting and highlights the fact that since the researcher is intimately involved with qualitative data generation and analysis, it is unlikely that another researcher could undertake similar research and arrive at the same conclusions.[399] Importantly, Denscombe goes on to tell us that

> although the nature of qualitative research means that it will never be possible to be verified in the same way as quantitative research, there is still a need to address the need for verification (e.g. Kirk and Miller 1986; Bryman and Burgess 1994; Miles and Huberman 1994; Seale et al. 1999; Silverman 2006).[400]

He goes on to outline alternative methods of verification, mentioning credibility rather than validity, dependability in place of reliability, transferability rather than generalisability and confirmability in place of objectivity.[401] In relation to validity, Denscombe cites Lincoln and Guba (1985), who prefer the term *credibility* since they

---

[397] Denscombe, *The Good,* 298.
[398] Denscombe, *The Good,* 298.
[399] Denscombe, *The Good,* 298.
[400] Denscombe, *The Good,* 298.
[401] Denscombe, *The Good,* 299-302.

believe 'it is not possible for qualitative researchers to prove in any absolute way that they have 'got it right'.'[402] Denscombe explains that it is possible for the researcher to take steps to reassure the reader that 'the qualitative data have been produced and checked in accord with good practice'.[403] I took the following measures, suggested by Harding, to demonstrate the credibility of the current study. Firstly I 'read the findings and then read back through the transcripts'.[404] Harding suggests that this is a helpful way of ensuring that the story told in the findings is an accurate reflection of the interview responses. Secondly, I sent a copy of my findings to each participant and asked them if they felt that what I had produced was an accurate reflection of their experience. Harding acknowledges that there are difficulties with this, for example, 'respondents may disagree'.[405] But he goes on to say that it can 'provide an indication of whether you have unintentionally misrepresented the views that were expressed'.[406] Participants' responses to my findings were generally positive and all agreed that the findings were an accurate reflection of their experience. Harding also recommends asking a colleague who is familiar with the subject matter to read the transcripts and the findings and comment on whether they feel the findings are justified.[407] Clearly there are issues around confidentiality, however, significant steps were taken to disguise the identity of each respondent by changing details including names, ages and geographical locations in order to protect the anonymity of respondents.[408] A colleague at Cranmer Hall read a selection of the transcripts and the findings and agreed that findings were justified. Lastly, Harding mentions the importance of reflexivity. In relation to reflexivity Swinton and Mowatt write that

> Reflexivity is perhaps *the* most crucial dimension of the qualitative research process. Reflexivity is not simply a tool of qualitative research but an integral part of what it actually *is*. Put simply, reflexivity is the process of critical self-reflection carried out by the researcher throughout the research process that enables her to monitor and respond to her contribution to the proceedings.[409]

---

[402] Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. *Naturalistic Enquiry* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1985), in Denscombe, *The Good,* 299.
[403] Denscombe, *The Good,* 299.
[404] Harding, *Qualitative,* 171.
[405] Harding, *Qualitative,* 171.
[406] Harding, *Qualitative,* 171.
[407] Harding, *Qualitative,* 172.
[408] The ethical aspects of this research study conformed in every detail to the policy set out for postgraduate research students at Durham University's Department of Theology and Religion.
[409] Swinton and Mowatt, *Practical*, 59.

Fox tells us that the definition of reflexivity goes beyond simple reflection to encompass

> analysis which interrogates the process by which interpretation has been fabricated [i.e., made]: reflexivity requires any effort to describe or represent to consider how that process of description was achieved, what claims to "presence" were made, what authority was used to claim knowledge.[410]

Lee suggests that developing reflexivity can be helped by keeping an up to date research journal. Lee writes that, in it the researcher should 'keep a record of thoughts, feelings, decisions, actions and reflections'.[411] Lee explains that this record of changes and thoughts will be useful when the time comes for the researcher to account for the research journey. She tells the researcher that a reflexive account is likely to,

- Give attention to researcher's own role or self-perception in the production of knowledge.
- Make your theoretical position on knowledge and your topic explicit.
- Account for methodological and ethical decision making as a process.
- Examine your own role in production of data.
- Where possible, provide retrievable data [including] interview transcripts.
- Account for analytical decisions made.
- Reflect upon the limitations of the research and of your conclusions.
- Show that other interpretations – including those of your respondents or readers – may be very different to your own.[412]

I kept a research journal[413] throughout the process of designing and carrying out the pilot study, main data generation and analysis. I found that it was a helpful way to process my own evolving thinking, to map out possible ways forward at each stage of the research journey, to gain clarity about particular issues, and to be able to look back regularly, note my route and recall why I had made particular decisions. I used the journal as a source of information as I set out to write the current chapter. My

---

[410] Fox, (1999, 220), in Nancy-Jane Lee, *Achieving Your Professional Doctorate: A Handbook* (Maidenhead: OUP, 2009), 64.
[411] Nancy-Jane Lee, *Achieving Your Professional Doctorate: A Handbook* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2009), 64.
[412] Lee, *Achieving*, 65.
[413] My research journal took the form of a Word document stored securely on my laptop.

attention to the factors set out by Fox and captured in my research journal are in evidence in the sections of the current chapter dealing with the pilot study, data generation and analysis. Discussion of reflexivity returns my focus to the alternative criteria for assessing qualitative research set out by Denscombe. After discussing *credibility* he moves on to highlight Lincoln and Guber's suggestion that qualitative research should strive for *dependability* rather than reliability. He explains that as a proxy for being able to replicate research, researchers should demonstrate that their procedures and decisions are reputable and reasonable.[414] He goes on to draw on the work of Seale et al., who argue that

> As a check on reliability, this calls for an explicit account of the methods, analysis and decision-making and the provision of a fully reflexive account of procedures and methods, showing the readers in as much detail as possible the lines of enquiry that led to particular conclusions.[415]

The account of the procedures and methods set out in the current chapter is an attempt to ensure that readers are able to see and evaluate lines of enquiry.

Denscombe goes on to discuss *transferability* rather than generalisability. Since qualitative research tends to focus on a relatively small number of cases, the issue of the extent to which it might be possible to generalise from findings is raised. Denscombe points out that many qualitative researchers argue that the issue must be approached in a different way. This is what Lincoln and Guber refer to as transferability. Which is

> an imaginative process in which the reader of the research uses information about the particular instance that has been studied to arrive at a judgement about how far it would apply to other comparable instances. The question becomes 'To what extent *could* the findings be transferred to other instances?' rather than 'To what extent *are* the findings likely to exist in other instances?[416]

The current study uses a relatively small sample of entrepreneurial priests but the research objective states that the intention is to produce, *appropriate and informed suggestions for future practice in relation to the exercise of entrepreneurship by parish priests*. The extent to which the findings and resulting suggestions are

---

[414] Denscombe, *The Good,* 300.
[415] Seale, C. et al., *The Quality of Qualitative Research* (London: Sage, 1999), 157., in Denscombe, *The Good,* 300.
[416] Denscombe, *The Good,* 301.

transferable to dioceses other than Durham will be dependent on the reader's answer to the question posed by Denscombe, above, concerning the extent to which findings *could* be transferred to other contexts. I have striven to ensure that the information and evidence set out in this thesis allows the reader to arrive at an informed conclusion about the extent to which findings could be transferred to another context.

Denscombe discusses the notion of *confirmability* rather than objectivity. Objectivity has to do with demonstrating that findings are free from the researcher's influence but Denscombe argues that

> it needs to be recognised straight away that no research is ever free from the influence of those who conduct it. Qualitative data, whether text or images, are always the product of a process of interpretation. The data do not exist 'out there' waiting to be discovered but are produced by the way they are interpreted and used by researchers.[417]

In my view it is not possible to eliminate the researcher's influence on research and the current study takes account of this by acknowledging that 'the role of the self in qualitative research is important'.[418] In light of this I have endeavoured, in the thesis introduction and the current chapter, to set out a reflexive account of my approach to data generation and analysis. Indeed, I have explicitly stated that the research objective builds on my own experience as a priest and an entrepreneur. The current study, therefore, does not claim objectivity but rather clear *confirmation* of the role played by the 'researcher's identity, values and beliefs'[419] in the generation and analysis of data.

Bolton and Thompson's FACETS and First Screening Entrepreneur Indicator

This research study draws on a theory of entrepreneurship set out by Bolton and Thompson. Data generation for the current study utilised an on-line tool designed by Bolton and Thompson. The tool identifies entrepreneurial character themes. The following discussion includes reflection on my reasons for using the online tool and a consideration of its strengths and weaknesses.

---

[417] Denscombe, *The Good,* 301.
[418] Denscombe, *The Good,* 302-3.
[419] Denscombe, *The Good,* 303.

Bolton and Thompson discuss the task of identifying the entrepreneur and tell us that 'identification is about recognition'.[420] They point out that identifying entrepreneurs is subjective but that there is an added difficulty, which is that 'people change, develop and mature over time'.[421] They explain that this is why 'identifying potential entrepreneurs is a different task from identifying practicing entrepreneurs'.[422] Bolton and Thompson view the identification of the potential entrepreneur as the key challenge in the field of entrepreneurship, ranking it above education, training and finance.[423] I note that in the current study I sought a sample of practicing entrepreneurial priests rather than those with potential. In the first instance, however, it was the Bishop of Jarrow who provided the sample. I used Bolton and Thompson's online tool to gain further confirmation of entrepreneurial potential and as a basis for further exploration of each priest's experience in interview. Bolton and Thompson propose a two-pronged methodology, which they believe addresses the challenge of identifying potential entrepreneurs. The first part of the methodology is the suggestion that 'entrepreneurs combine talent, temperament and technique to achieve excellence'.[424] In discussing the trinity of talent, temperament and technique, Bolton and Thompson tell us that it is like 'the three-legged stool, if one leg is missing it will fall over and if they are not all in balance it will be uncomfortable and even dangerous to sit on!'[425] They point out that the case has already been made for the importance of technique in relation to entrepreneurs and argue that they are making a case for recognition of the importance of talent and temperament. In relation to talent they explain that, 'We see talent as inborn but with a potential to be developed.'[426] They tell us that, in their view 'we all have a collection of talents but that for a whole host of reasons we all too often fail to identify and therefore develop and exploit them'.[427] They go on to talk about temperament and explain that 'for our purposes, it is important to note that there is an inborn element in temperament that is later shaped by our environment, particularly in childhood.'[428] Bolton and Thompson

---

[420] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 43.
[421] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 43.
[422] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 43.
[423] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 43.
[424] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 43-44.
[425] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 44.
[426] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 46.
[427] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 45.
[428] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 46.

discuss talent and temperament in relation to roles, explaining that while talent and temperament are about the individual 'Roles are about what people do, about their job, their tasks and responsibilities.'[429] They explain that when talent and temperament are well matched with role, it is possible to achieve excellence.[430] However, they point out that 'the same job can be done well in a number of different ways'.[431] They also highlight the fact that role is not the same as job and that 'different roles can be appropriate to the same job'.[432] This attention to role is pertinent since the role of the priest is considered in the current study and my interview data supports Bolton and Thompson's contention that a wide variety of roles appear to be considered appropriate by those who find themselves doing the job of a priest.

With talent, temperament and technique comprising the first aspect of Bolton and Thompson's two-pronged methodology, the second is 'a set of six habitual attributes that are the talents and temperament of the entrepreneur'.[433] They refer to the attributes as 'character themes'[434] and describe a character theme as 'a personality attribute or characteristic that defines a person's normal expected behaviour'.[435] Bolton and Thompson's six character themes form the acronym FACETS. They claim that these themes can be measured and therefore form a basis for identifying potential entrepreneurs. The six character themes are as follows:[436]

1. *Focus*. The ability to lock on to a target and not be distracted, to act with urgency and not procrastinate, to get things done and not just talk about them.

2. *Advantage*. The ability to select the right opportunity, to pick winners.

3. *Creativity*. The ability to come up with new ideas habitually. This facet allows entrepreneurs to think differently, to see patterns others miss.

4. *Ego* (*inner*). Provides confidence, creates passion and delivers the motivation to achieve and win.

---

[429] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 48.
[430] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 48.
[431] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 48.
[432] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 48.
[433] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 44.
[434] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 50.
[435] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 50.
[436] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 51.

> *Ego* (*outer*). The ability to carry heavy responsibility lightly but not flippantly, to be openly accountable and instinctively courageous.
>
> 5. *Team*. The ability to pick the best people and get them working as a team, to know when you need help and to find it, to build an extensive network of supporters.
>
> 6. *Social*. The ability to espouse a cause and deliver on it.[437]

Bolton and Thompson point out that the first four facets, which form the acronym FACE, are essential for entrepreneurs and that 'without them it is not possible to be a successful entrepreneur'.[438] The last two, *team* and *social* are not found in all entrepreneurs. Bolton and Thompson argue that some entrepreneurs 'create followers but not teams'[439] but those who are strong on *team* are able to multiply the effect of their entrepreneurial efforts by building and facilitating a strong team. The *social* facet is unique to the social entrepreneur and is, along with *ego,* a temperamental issue. Bolton and Thompson suggest that temperamental facets are the most crucial and argue that 'There is just no point in starting along the entrepreneur road without a strong *ego* facet to keep you going and make the journey a fulfilling and successful experience.'[440] By contrast, *focus, advantage, creativity and team* are talents and Bolton and Thompson suggest that 'we have them whether we like it or not but they must be discovered, nurtured and developed if they are to achieve their full potential'.[441] The six character themes constitute the facets of the entrepreneur. According to Bolton and Thompson it is possible to measure a person against these facets and assess their entrepreneurial potential. Bolton and Thompson point out that the task of assessing the presence or otherwise of the six character themes is not a simple one when considering an individual's potential because 'some of the facet themes may be dormant'.[442] They also point out that 'people are very complex'[443] and they therefore prefer to think in terms of 'indicating' a person's potential rather than of identifying it. On this basis Bolton and Thompson have 'devised a three-stage

---

[437] Summary of FACETS from: Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 51-52.
[438] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 52.
[439] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 52.
[440] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 52.
[441] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 52.
[442] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 77.
[443] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 77.

'entrepreneur indicator' procedure'.[444] They explain that 'the first two stages screen or filter people through to the point where there is every indication that they are potential entrepreneurs. Stage three then works with them to further develop their talent, temperament and technique'.[445]

The *First Screening Entrepreneur Indicator* (hereafter referred to as the FSEI) is a set of balanced questions that participants answer online, receiving instant feedback. Bolton and Thompson describe the FSEI as 'necessarily short and approximate'.[446] The strengths of respondents' facet character themes are derived from their responses to the questions. I elected to use the FSEI in the course of my empirical research for the following reasons:

- It is easily accessible (via the internet at www.efacets.co.uk).
- The interface is user-friendly.
- It is completed in less than ten minutes.
- Feedback is immediately available to the participant, and (remotely) to the researcher.
- Feedback is focused and can be easily interpreted by the researcher.
- Access to the FSEI is relatively low-cost.

These points made the FSEI suitable for use in the early stages of data generation. The participant's scores informed the interviews, providing a basis for discussion and reflection and a platform for exploration of each priest's articulated experience as an entrepreneur.

Pilot study

Nancy-Jane Lee suggests that 'If you are doing field research of any sort, then you should always pilot and revise your research tool (whether that be a particular test interviews, and so on).'[447] With this in mind, in the latter part of the Michaelmas term 2011, I undertook a pilot study in preparation for carrying out data generation with priests in the Diocese of Durham. The participants in the pilot study were members of

---

[444] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 77.
[445] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 77.
[446] Bolton and Thompson, *Entrepreneurs,* 77.
[447] Lee, *Achieving,* 76.

teaching staff at St. John's College, Durham. [448] The pilot study had three central aims. These were as follows:

1) To test my confidence in the FSEI as a tool that would produce appropriate data.

2) To provide me with an opportunity to observe and reflect on the ways in which participants responded to:
   - My invitation to be involved in the pilot study.
   - My summary of the aims of the research, the specific aims of the pilot study and the invitation to take the FSEI and participate in an interview.
   - Receiving e-mailed instructions in order to access the FSEI.
   - Accessing and completing the FSEI.
   - Receiving a prompt to complete the FSEI if it had not been done in the time frame specified.
   - Being invited to participate in a follow-up interview.
   - Discussing scores and answering related questions in a recorded interview.

3) To develop my experience of interviewing as a data generation method. Specifically, learning more about:
   - Constructing an interview schedule that would generate relevant data.
   - Arranging and setting up interviews.
   - Conducting interviews.
   - Recording interviews.
   - Transcribing interview recordings.

I note that when engaging with ordained Anglican colleagues I was working with those who would most closely approximate those from whom I would be seeking to obtain data beyond the pilot study. My colleagues were also selected as participants in the pilot study because of limitations on time. I required those whose responses would

---

[448] Silverman argues that, when designing and carrying out research, it is prudent to, 'Begin in familiar territory… work with data that are close to hand and readily available'. Silverman, *Doing,* 39.

not only generate appropriate data, but who were also readily available Fourteen of my colleagues agreed to participate. I purchased FSEI access codes[449] and e-mailed each participant with instructions and their unique codes. As the participants engaged with the FSEI I was able to note the strengths and weaknesses, which were as follows,

Strengths of the FSEI

- Ease of administration by researcher.

- Ease of completion by participant.

- Ease of access to participant's scores and feedback.

- Relative ease of interpretation of participant's scores and feedback.

- The participant's scores generally matched my preconceptions, with one or two minor surprises. This increased my confidence in the ability of the tool to produce meaningful data.

- The scores and feedback provoked useful (and lively) follow-up conversation in interview with participants.

Weaknesses of the FSEI

- Participants required a relatively lengthy explanation from the researcher in order to adequately understand the meaning of their scores and feedback.

- Participants viewed the FSEI as a 'test'. I chose to interview those with the higher scores and in the interviews it became apparent that these participants had been keen to achieve high scores. I realised that it would be important to note that when interviewing those with high scores, I was also interviewing those who *wanted* to score highly in what they perceived to be a test. The FSEI is not a test and therefore the use of the word 'scores' by Bolton and Thompson might be misleading. It is possible that a desire to score highly in

---

[449] Each access code consisted of a unique user-name and password. Once the participant had completed the FSEI, the test could not be re-taken. The individual's scores and feedback could be accessed at any time by anyone using the unique user-name and password. This allowed me, as the researcher, to have ongoing access to each participant's scores.

what is perceived to be a test might also be integral to the respondent's potential as an entrepreneur.

In summary, I had confidence with minor qualifications in my use of the FSEI as a research tool. My aim in using the tool was to confirm the entrepreneurial potential of participants and to provide a useful starting point for research interviews in which the participants' experience of entrepreneurship in priestly ministry could be explored in greater depth. The pilot study allowed me to ascertain that the FSEI would achieve this and on the basis of this I used the FSEI during the main data generation phase.

The second aim of the pilot study was that it would provide me with an opportunity to observe and reflect on the ways in which participants responded to the various aspects of the process. I noted that participants responded warmly to being involved with the pilot study. None of the participants experienced negative issues with communication via e-mail and all were able to follow the instructions and access the FSEI without difficulty. Of the fourteen participants, three did not complete the FSEI within the timeframe I had specified. I sent a brief e-mail reminder and the three participants went on to rapidly complete the FSEI.

Further reflections on the use of the FSEI in the pilot study

Those who scored highly in the FSEI were those whom I expected to do so. These were colleagues whose personalities and general approach to life and work appear to be more obviously 'entrepreneurial'. That is, my perception of them was that they appeared to regularly make creative connections, spot opportunities, generate innovative ideas and adopt a creative approach to a range of issues. This was perception only and not admissible as data, but it was nevertheless a perception that increased my confidence in the ability of the FSEI to correctly identify those with entrepreneurial potential and to help to identify in which of the participants' character themes this potential found its real focus. I noted that three of the five whose FSEI scores were high were Anglican priests. I used a simple coding system to anonymise the participants' score sheets and interview notes.

Further reflections relating to the pilot study's second aim

At the end of the Michaelmas term 2011 I contacted the five participants with the highest FSEI scores and invited them to take part in an interview. In an e-mail I explained the following:

- The interview would last no longer than forty-five minutes.
- The interview would be digitally recorded.
- The recording would be transcribed.
- Interview data would be stored securely.
- Participants would remain anonymous.

Silverman argues that 'research methods should be chosen based on the specific task at hand'.[450] With this in mind, my decision to follow up the FSEI results with semi-structured interviews, both in the pilot study and subsequent data generation, was influenced by the research objective, which was to, *explore the articulated experience of a sample of entrepreneurial priests* in light of the relevant literature and my own experience. Harding tells us that 'The qualitative interview provides an opportunity for the researcher to listen to the views or experiences of one respondent for an extended period of time and to ask probing questions to explore ideas further.'[451] This made interviews suitable for my research objective. Hennink et al. suggest eight areas in which interviews are helpful. Of these, five directly relate to the research objective in the current study. The five are:

- In examining people's beliefs and perceptions.
- In identifying motivations for behaviour.
- In determining meanings that people attach to their experiences.
- In examining people's feelings and emotions.
- In extracting people's personal stories or biographies.[452]

As I designed my interview schedule I bore these points in mind and attempted to shape questions and prompts which would allow the respondents to talk freely about their beliefs, perceptions, motivations, meanings, feelings and to tell stories about

---

[450] Silverman, *Doing,* 9.
[451] Harding, *Qualitative*, 22.
[452] Monique Hennink, Inge Hutter, and Ajay Bailey, *Qualitative Research Methods* (London: Sage, 2011), 109-110.

their experiences of being entrepreneurial priests that I could reflect on in light of the literature and my own writing and experience. In conducting interviews and analysing the data, I concurred with what Harding points out when he draws on the work of Miller and Glassner who argue that 'interviews do not provide an objective view of the social world that the respondent inhabits but demonstrate the meanings that they attribute to this world and their experience of it'.[453] It was important that I understood that, 'interviews are performances',[454] and that my respondent's accounts, both in the pilot study and subsequent data generation were subjective views shaped by a wide range of factors to which I had no access. My questions and my own behaviour during the interviews shaped the responses, and the data I collected was a construction given meaning by the context of the interview, the relation of the data to other interview data and to the relevant literature within the framework of the research. Bryman's comparison of qualitative and quantitative interviews is helpful as it highlights some of my own reasons for opting for a qualitative interview approach. He states that

> [the qualitative interview] is more interested in drawing out the respondents' perspectives and addressing the issues that most concern them. Qualitative interviewers often encourage respondents to 'ramble' – to talk without interruption for an extended period – which can demonstrate what is important to them. In qualitative interviews, the interviewer can ask new, unplanned questions as a result of something the respondent has said; they can also vary the order or the words of questions.[455]

During the pilot study I found that it was important to change the questions on my interview schedule in response to reflection on the responses that were generated. Rosaline Barbour suggests that 'as we carry out successive interviews we sometime augment this list with new questions arising from issues or even distinctions or qualifications made by interviewees'.[456] As I note below, in conducting interviews subsequent to the pilot study, I retained a schedule but continued to adapt the order and form of the questions as seemed appropriate for each respondent. I held the potential benefit of adding new questions or omitting particular questions in tension with the possibility suggested by Barbour that 'it makes sense to attempt to include similar questions in our schedules in order to facilitate comparison between

---

[453] Harding, *Qualitative*, 22.
[454] Rosaline Barbour, *Introducing Qualitative Research: A Student Guide to the Craft of Doing Qualitative Research* (London: Sage, 2008), 120.
[455] Harding, *Qualitative*, 30.
[456] Barbour, *Introducing*, 126.

transcripts'.[457] Harding concurs with this saying that, in a semi-structured interview 'analysis is likely to be easier because there will be a number of topics on which every respondent will have made some comment.'[458] I developed my interview schedule during the pilot study by making appropriate adjustments both during and between interviews. In conducting interviews beyond the pilot study I retained the same interview schedule although I felt more comfortable omitting some questions with some respondents and allowing respondents to talk more freely and to take directions that I had not always anticipated.

At the start of each pilot interview the participants expressed eagerness to find out more about what the scores meant. Each of the five explained that they had been generally pleased with their scores, although each expressed disappointment with low Creativity scores, with participant 13SJC stating, "I was gutted with my score". Each participant explained that they felt that they were creative. Once I had provided an explanation of the way in which Bolton and Thompson use the terms in the FSEI, each of the participants expressed satisfaction. Participants in the 'real' data generation responded in similar ways. The pilot study helped me to prepare for this and to offer appropriate responses that allowed me to move beyond reassuring participants and into conversation that generated appropriate data.

The participants were my colleagues and as such, I was surprised to find a discernable level of nervousness at the beginning of the interview with three out of the five. Cohen, Manion and Morrison point out that 'the interviewer will need to establish an appropriate atmosphere such that the participant can feel secure to talk freely'.[459] With careful management, taking care to address the 'interpersonal, interactional, communicative and emotional aspects of the interview',[460] the participant's relaxed and signs of nervousness gradually faded. The participants had all agreed in advance for the interview to be recorded. In spite of this, three of the participants appeared to show slight discomfort when I produced the digital recorder. Cohen, Manion and Morrison point out that 'an audiotape recorder might be

---

[457] Barbour, *Introducing,* 126.
[458] Harding, *Qualitative*, 31.
[459] Louis Cohen, Lawrence Manion, and Keith Morrison, *Research Methods in Education* (6th ed.) (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), 361.
[460] Cohen, Manion and Morrison, *Research Methods,* 362.

unobstrusive but might constrain the respondent'.[461] Participant 02CH even suggested at this point that I might like to consider e-mailing the questions and explained that they would be happy to provide written answers. I pressed on gently and the participant agreed to continue. Participant 01CH appeared to be unsure of exactly what the questions were attempting to get at and, in fact, appeared a little uncomfortable about the whole process. Cohen, Manion and Morrison point out that the interviewer should ensure 'that the interviewee does not feel threatened by lack of knowledge'.[462] It was possible that this participant felt that they lacked knowledge as their responses appeared to be more about what they thought might sound correct in relation to the subject, rather than providing particularly personal insights. This participant was the one I knew least well and this lack of relationship might have been responsible for the apparent lack of clarity. This was something I held in mind as I conducted interviews with priests in the Diocese of Durham who were not known to me. Aware that 'qualitative interviews involve the researcher and the respondent participating in meaning making',[463] and that in a face-to-face interview 'a full range of communication is possible, with both interviewer and respondent able to respond to the non-verbal signs given by the other',[464] I made detailed notes during the first three interviews but this felt uncomfortable since, making notes interrupts the 'social encounter'[465] and I was aware that 'this could be highly off-putting for some respondents'.[466] Cohen, Manion and Morrison point out that 'the issue here is that there is a trade-off between the need to catch as much data as possible and yet to avoid having so threatening an environment that it impedes the potential of the interview situation'.[467] I did not take notes during subsequent interviews but waited until the interview was concluded and made notes of my observations at the earliest opportunity afterwards. I decided to transcribe the interview recordings myself in order to get a sense of key issues and challenges. David Silverman argues that 'there is no 'best' method for transcribing interviews: so transcribe in a way that is appropriate to your research problem and theoretical model'.[468] With reference to

---

[461] Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, *Research Methods,* 364.
[462] Cohen, Manion and Morrison, *Research Methods,* 362.
[463] Harding, *Qualitative*, 35.
[464] Harding, *Qualitative*, 33.
[465] Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, *Research Methods,* 364.
[466] Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, *Research Methods,* 364.
[467] Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, *Research Methods,* 364.
[468] Silverman, *Doing,* 201.

transcribing interview recordings, Cohen, Manion, and Morrison contend that 'transcriptions inevitably lose data from the original encounter for a transcription represents the translation from one set of rule systems (oral and interpersonal) to another very remote rule system (written language)'.[469] They go on to state that 'it is unrealistic to pretend that the data on transcripts are anything but *already interpreted* data'.[470] They add that 'there can be no single 'correct' transcription; rather the issue becomes whether, to what extent, and how a transcription is useful for the research'.[471] As I moved beyond the pilot study and into the 'real' data generation, and the accompanying need for transcription of longer interviews that would be subject to detailed analysis, these issues shaped my approach to analysis and affected my perception of the themes that emerged. I did not analyse the pilot interview data because the purpose of the pilot interviews had been to trial the process of data generation rather than to produce data for analysis. I note however, that the responses of my colleagues were of some relevance to the study since they are all involved in Christian ministry in some form and their responses, although not analysed, were helpful to me in continuing to reflect on the exercise of entrepreneurship by priests in the parish.

Data generation

> Many researchers talk about collecting or gathering data, but Mason says, 'it is more accurate to speak of *generating* rather than *collecting* data, precisely because [no] researcher can be a completely neutral collector of information about the social world' (Mason 2002: 36).[472]

In order to undertake my research in the Diocese of Durham I sought the permission and support of the bishop. There were three reasons for this. Firstly, I felt that the bishop's own perspective would be valuable. I was therefore eager that the bishop should take the FSEI and participate in a research interview. Secondly, I wanted the bishop to direct me to clergy whom he felt were entrepreneurial because, as the focus for Anglicans-in-mission in the diocese, the bishop's spiritual and working relationship with his clergy meant that his opinion about whether clergy were

---

[469] Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, *Research Methods*, 367.
[470] Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, *Research Methods*, 367.
[471] Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, *Research Methods,* 367.
[472] Lee, *Achieving,* 76.

acting entrepreneurially was informed and carried weight. It is important to note here that I was aware that the involvement of the bishop in the research study was likely to result in increased levels of participation by clergy. The third reason for gaining the permission and support of the bishop relates to the fact that I hold a Bishop's License in the Diocese of Durham. As a priest who has sworn an oath of canonical obedience to the bishop, it was important to gain his approval for the study and secure his participation.

In late November 2011 I wrote to the Bishop of Jarrow[473] and invited him to participate in and support the current study.[474] He agreed and quickly completed the FSEI and participated in a digitally recorded face-to-face interview at his office. At the end of the interview I asked the bishop if he would be willing to use his knowledge of the diocese to propose Anglican priests who, is his view, were entrepreneurs showing evidence of acting entrepreneurially in their parish ministries and whom he felt would be open to being involved in the current study. The Diocese of Durham has 302 licensed clergy.[475] The bishop named sixteen priests whom he felt met the criteria I had outlined. The list of names provided by the bishop included priests of both genders and covered a range of ages, a mix of spiritualities and varying lengths of service and seniority. I contacted each potential respondent, explaining the nature of the study and the fact that the bishop had suggested that they might be willing to participate and inviting them to take part. All sixteen responded quickly and in the affirmative. Along with the Bishop of Jarrow (and, subsequently, the former Bishop of Durham, Justin Welby), these sixteen clergy formed my *sample of entrepreneurial priests in the Diocese of Durham* (eighteen in total). My approach was close to what Harding has called 'purposive sampling'.[476] This involves the researcher being 'deliberately subjective, choosing those respondents who will best fit the purpose of the research'.[477] Harding highlights the fact that there is a danger that subjectivity might become bias. I note that it was, in fact, the bishop who chose the respondents. However, I chose the bishop and provided him with an understanding of

---

[473] At the point of beginning data collection Justin Welby had only just been appointed as Bishop of Durham and had no working knowledge of priests in the diocese. This being the case, the Bishop of Jarrow was better placed to assist with the current study.
[474] Work on the pilot study came to an end during the Christmas vacation in 2011.
[475] Statistic received from Durham Diocesan Board of Finance, 05/01/12.
[476] Harding, *Qualitative,* 17.
[477] Harding, *Qualitative,* 17.

the nature of the study, a definition of the entrepreneur and particular selection criteria for entrepreneurial clergy. In light of this it is important to be open about the possibility of my own bias and that of the bishop. It is also important to provide an account of the strengths and weaknesses of my decision to allow the sample used in the study to be selected by the bishop. Rather than asking the bishop to select participants, I could have simply sought his permission and support, and having secured these, used my own contacts in the diocese to find participants for my research. Had I opted to find participants without the guidance of the bishop, my selection would have been highly subjective and limited by the fact that my contact with clergy has been mainly limited to those who host Cranmer Hall students on placements. To move beyond my relatively limited contacts I could have adopted a 'snowball sample'[478] approach. In the first instance this would also have been shaped and limited by the extent of my network of contacts, although it may have provided some useful data. I note that the bishop's selection of participants for my research would have been shaped and, one might therefore argue, limited by his own understanding of entrepreneurship, which would depend on his previous experience and perception and my explanation of the term during my interview with him. I note also that the bishop's selection of participants was open to bias. The clergy who came to mind may simply have been those with whom he had had recent dealings. His choices may also have been influenced by his perception of whether particular clergy were on board with his, or the diocese's, current agenda. It was possible that the bishop suggested clergy whom he felt would provide data that would reflect well on the diocese once the research findings were published. Had I given him more time, or asked him to add to his list at a later date, other names may have emerged. I also note that the bishop may have avoided giving me the names of entrepreneurial clergy with whom he had had little contact or whom he experienced as difficult. These points are noted by way of demonstrating a reflexive approach to the selection of participants for my research. I suggest that, having noted the ways in which the bishop's selection of participants may have been shaped by various limiting factors, the selection of participants by the bishop was legitimate and justifiable in the context of the current research study because of the nature of the relationship that an Anglican bishop has with his clergy. The strength of the bishop selecting participants for my research is

---

[478] Silverman, *Doing,* 194.

that he is the focus for unity in the diocese and, at the point of his participation in the current study, having been in post for five years, he had a good working knowledge of the diocese and of those priests under his pastoral care and as such, his selection of *a sample of entrepreneurial priests* as participants in the current research was appropriate and legitimate.

As well as noting the strengths and limitations of using a sample of participants selected by the bishop, it is important to say something about the size of the sample. Silverman tells us that 'the question 'How many cases do I need?' depends upon your research problem'.[479] In this sense, there was no obvious answer to the question of how many entrepreneurial priests I needed to work with in order to address my research objective. The number of respondents with whom I could realistically work was partially influenced by the time available to me for data generation. However, since the research objective included a note of my intention to *produce appropriate and informed suggestions for future practice in relation to the exercise of entrepreneurship by parish priests*, I reflected on the potential effect on my recommendations of working with too small a sample. On this point, Silverman highlights the fact that 'qualitative interview studies tend to be conducted with quite small numbers'.[480] Since the current research study adopts a qualitative rather than quantitative methodology and since the research did not aim to generate findings from which I intended to generalise, but rather, as noted above, to produce recommendations based on findings from which readers might exercise their own judgement about the extent to which there might be *transferability,* I contend that an exploration of the experience of a *single* entrepreneurial priest would be legitimate and would generate worthwhile insights. In the event I did not focus on a single priest but felt that the eighteen priests (a total including the Bishops of Jarrow and Durham), comprised a sample that was small enough to work with in the time available and large enough to generate a volume and depth of data to adequately meet the requirements of the research objective.

I followed up the positive responses with an e-mail providing further information about the study, a consent form for completion and access information for

---

[479] Silverman, *Doing,* 193.
[480] Silverman, *Doing,* 194.

the FSEI. I encouraged respondents to complete the FSEI within two weeks of receipt. The majority of respondents had completed the FSEI by the end of January 2013. As they did so I was able to access their FSEI scores and begin to make initial observations. I contacted each respondent shortly after receiving confirmation of their FSEI completion and invited them to participate in an interview. I explained that the interview would last for approximately forty-five minutes, could take place either in person or over the telephone, would be digitally recorded and transcribed and the data anonymised. FSEI tests and interviews were carried out between January 2012 and May 2012. Anonymised dates, times and durations of the research interviews are set out in the table, below.

Table detailing anonymised dates, times and durations of the research interviews

Name	Interview date	Interview time	Interview duration	In person or telephone
Bishop Jarrow	22/12/11	14.00	20.26	In person
Bishop Durham	24/01/12	07.30	18.15	In person
Roger	31/01/12	14.00	64.35	In person
Matt	10/02/12	09.00	57.22	In person
Clive	10/02/12	13.30	43.39	Telephone
Peter	15/02/12	14.00	47.19	Telephone
Jane	16/02/12	10.00	48.10	Telephone
Jack	24/02/12	10.00	35.50	Telephone
Rupert	29/02/12	14.00	57.02	Telephone
Simon	02/03/12	9.00	53.00	Telephone
Gregory	07/03/12	12.00	41.00	In person
Susan	08/03/12	10.00	86.01	In person
Jim	13/03/12	13.00	47.18	Telephone
Joseph	16/03/12	08.50	36.50	Telephone
Carl	22/03/12	10.45	29.34	Telephone
Rosemary	23/03/12	09.30	29.31	Telephone
Dan	26/03/12	10.30	48.22	Telephone
Mark	05/05/12	13.15	29.47	Telephone

Second interviews were conducted with three respondents

Name	Interview date	Interview time	Interview duration	In person or telephone
Dan	16/05/12	10.00	87.23	In person
Matt	06/06/12	09.30	47.19	In person
Jane	24/10/12	10.30	44.05	In person

Before moving on to discuss my approach to data analysis, I note that as I received the results of the participant's FSEI tests and began to embark upon conducting interviews, I was making observations, comparisons and connections with my own experience, with the literature and with the data generated in the pilot study. Relatively early on in the data generation process I noted that I was not asking every respondent all of the questions on my guide sheet and neither was I asking the questions in exactly the same order each time. I was concerned about this at first but on reflection I realised that my research objective was to explore each respondent's experience and that allowing some limited flexibility in the order or number of the questions, and keeping my own interruptions to a minimum resulted in richer responses in which the respondent divulged information that was important to them and which I would have missed if I had stuck too rigorously to my guide.

Data analysis

This thesis adopts a thematic[481] approach to data analysis, which involves, 'identifying themes that emerge from the data'.[482] Harding tells us that thematic analysis has been criticised for obscuring detail and distancing accounts from respondent experience[483] but Gibson and Brown reject such criticism and suggest that thematic analysis

> provides a way of linking diverse experiences or ideas together, and of juxtaposing and interrelating examples and features of the data. The themes do re-present and re-contextualise the data to which they relate, but this can be of value in creating new readings and renderings of that data.[484]

Gibson and Brown explain that thematic analysis aims to examine commonality[485] by 'pooling together all the material across a dataset that has something in common'.[486] Harding explains that a commonality is 'any feature that two or more cases have in common',[487] and he gives the example of common characteristics, common

---

[481] Catherine Dawson, *Introduction to Research Methods* (Oxford: How to Books Limited, 2009), 119-125.
[482] Harding, *Qualitative,* 4.
[483] Harding, *Qualitative,* 4.
[484] William J. Gibson and Andrew Brown, *Working with Qualitative Data* (London: Sage, 2009), 129.
[485] Gibson and Brown, *Working*, 128.
[486] Gibson and Brown, *Working*, 128.
[487] Harding, *Qualitative,* 5.

experience and common opinion.[488] Gibson and Brown go on to say that thematic analysis also aims to examine differences across the data set as well as relationships. They suggest that 'the researcher should examine how different parts of their analysis fit together and contribute to an understanding of different issues and themes'.[489] As I engaged in thematic analysis of my data I was looking for commonalities, differences and relationships. I began my analysis while engaged in the process of data generation. Silverman urges researchers to '[begin] data analysis at an early stage rather than allowing the data to accumulate, it allows you to reconsider the direction in which your research is heading'.[490] Rosaline Barbour takes this further, arguing that 'the qualitative research process is iterative rather than linear, and it is argued that analysis – or, at least, analytic thinking – begins as soon as the first interview has been held'.[491] She goes on to point out that 'even as we generate our data, we are engaged in anticipating analysis'.[492] This was my experience during the data generation process and involved making detailed notes and observations in my research journal after each interview and engaging in analytical reflection long before coming to the point at which I was 'writing up' my research. Full transcripts were produced of nine initial interviews and of second interviews conducted with three participants. Partial transcripts were produced of the remaining nine interviews. I read and re-read transcripts and noted observations in my research journal. In this sense I was engaging in analysis throughout the process of data generation. Lee explains that

> The first step in data analysis is to organise your materials into some kind of order. The next step we might call 'getting to know' your data – this involves listening to, reading or looking at your data *over and over,* until you get a feel for what is there and for key themes or findings.[493]

Harding concurs with this, pointing out that 'it is important to read and re-read transcripts thoroughly'.[494] My decision to make full transcriptions of some interviews rather than others was affected by the significant amount of time that transcription takes. Added to this was the realisation that I would need to reduce the amount of data that had been generated if I was going to be able to engage in-depth analysis in the

---

[488] Harding, *Qualitative,* 5.
[489] Gibson and Brown, *Working*, 128.
[490] Silverman, *Doing,* 7.
[491] Barbour, *Introducing,* 189.
[492] Barbour, *Introducing,* 126.
[493] Lee, *Achieving*, 79.
[494] Harding, *Qualitative*, 56.

time available. In relation to volume of data, Lee says 'As you begin to analyse and write about your data, you will quickly realise that you probably have too much. Be prepared to let go of some of your data'.[495]

All of the respondents scored relatively well on the FSEI but some scores were significantly higher than others. I made a decision to focus analysis in the final instance on those whose FSEI scores were entirely within the top two brackets, that is, those whose potential for entrepreneurship, according to Bolton and Thompson's categories, ranked as either *Entrepreneurial* or *Outstanding* in each of the facets. Seven priests fell into this bracket and I focused the thrust of the latter stages of the data analysis on their interview responses. Since I had been engaged in analysis throughout the period of data generation, and had therefore engaged in some depth with all of the respondent's FSEI scores and interview responses, I felt that this decision was justifiable in terms of maintaining the credibility of the research.

Harding talks about the importance of making summaries of interview transcripts in order to facilitate further analysis. He explains that 'reducing an interview to the key points can enable the researcher to see through the mass of detail and repetition to the points that are most relevant to the research question(s) or objective'.[496] Harding goes on to reference the work of Miles and Huberman to suggest that 'the full transcript should be reduced to a summary that fits onto one sheet of paper and so is easy for the researcher to compare with other summaries'.[497] Harding explains that summarising is a process involving the following four steps:

1. Identify the research objective(s) that the section of the transcript is most relevant to.
2. Decide which pieces of information or opinion are most relevant to this objective.
3. Decide where there is repetition that needs to be eliminated.
4. On the basis of these decisions, write brief notes.[498]

---

[495] Lee, *Achieving*, 80-81.
[496] Harding, *Qualitative*, 56.
[497] Harding, *Qualitative*, 57.
[498] Harding, *Qualitative*, 57.

Harding tells us that 'making summaries is essentially a means to an end; a method of reducing the large amounts of data present in an interview to an at-a-glance view of the points that are likely to be most useful in analysis.'[499] As I sought to engage in thematic analysis I followed the approach suggested by Harding. I engaged with the data as it was generated. However, once I had completed my interviews and transcriptions, I listened to each of the interview recordings in succession, making notes and observations. Having done this, I re-read all of the transcripts. I then took the seven full transcripts of the respondents whose FSEI scores had been in the highest bracket and read through these again, making summary notes in the margin of each. The summaries corresponded approximately to the interview questions. I then placed the seven summaries alongside one another in a chart. I read through the summary chart a number of times and made notes of commonalities, differences and relationships. I then returned to the original transcripts to ensure that the emerging themes were consistent with what respondents had said in their interviews. Having done this I re-drafted the themes, making alterations where necessary to ensure that they accurately reflected the views of respondents. In chapter five I explore the themes in relation to the literature and the issues set out in chapters two and three. The analysis of themes in chapter five is organised under the following headings:

1. Responses to Bolton and Thompson's definition.

2. Responses to the use of the term, entrepreneur, in relation to priestly ministry.

3. Buildings.

4. Working with others.

5. Factors respondents' felt might aid the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish.

6. Factors respondents' felt might hinder the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish.

7. Responses to being asked about the extent to which the presence (or lack) of entrepreneurship in the senior leadership in a diocese affects the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish.

---

[499] Harding, *Qualitative*, 79.

Chapter Five

Analysis of themes emerging from interview responses

'We dream dreams, but we will also have the reality'[500]

Introduction

In this chapter I discuss and analyse the FSEI scores and the interview data generated through interviews with seven entrepreneurial priests.[501] The chapter is divided into seven sections and each deals with a different theme or collection of themes that have emerged from the interview responses. I begin each section with general comments that are intended to provide a first impression of the shape of the respondent's views. I move on to set out and discuss specific respondent's comments in relation to those of others and I discuss the responses in relation to the emerging theme or themes. Throughout the chapter I relate emerging themes to material discussed in chapters two and three. I consider where emerging themes concur with what the relevant literature and the discussion of the missional task facing the Church of England led me towards expecting to see. I note and comment on themes or omissions that are surprising in light of the discussions in chapters two and three. Each section includes summary comments and practical suggestions for reflection and action. In dealing with the analysis of the data, I use extensive quotes from the interviews. In relation to this, Nancy-Jane Lee draws on the work of Stanley and Wise who recommend 'putting 'accountable knowledge' into practice by using 'retrievable data' (Stanley 2004: 10), that is presentation of extended data extracts as well as the researcher's analysis of this'.[502] My intention in this chapter is to help the reader to gain as full a sense as possible of the views of respondents and to assist the reader in bringing their own judgement to bear on the process of analysis set out in this thesis.

---

[500] Quote from an interview with Jane.
[501] The selection of the seven priests from a larger initial group of respondents is discussed in chapter four.
[502] Stanley and Wise (2004), in Nancy-Jane Lee, *Achieving Your Professional Doctorate: A Handbook* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2009), 66.

Responses to Bolton and Thompson's definition

During each interview I asked the respondent to give me their instinctive reaction to Bolton and Thompson's definition of the entrepreneur.[503] Responses were positive and generally brief, with Rupert and Dan expanding a little more than others. Jim simply stated, 'It sounds good and succinct.' Rupert made a more obvious personal connection, saying, 'I relate to the definition.' Jane related the definition to her own ministry, saying, 'I agree with that. I suppose that's what I do.' Roger also related the definition to his ministry, stating,

> I can see where the word fits with priestly ministry and with who I am. Because it had never occurred to me to use the word entrepreneur as a way of measuring or considering my approach to ministry but I see it. I do see it.

Matt related the definition to his own ministry and his response touched directly on the negative perceptions of the entrepreneur that I addressed in chapter two and which Bolton and Thompson set out to rectify in their work. He said,

> I'm happy with that. That is a definition of entrepreneur with which I, one, identify and b, feel more comfortable than other definitions of entrepreneurship. I think the American get rich quick literature has done no service to the idea of entrepreneur. I think it creates this slightly morally ugly character which has put me off that word and what we talked about today, and this, doesn't. I'm happy with that as a definition.

The opportunity to discuss and reflect on a positive definition of the entrepreneur in relation to the exercise of priestly ministry appeared to have challenged Matt's negative perceptions of entrepreneurship and provided an alternative way of viewing the shape and task of priestly ministry for Roger.

Roger, Rupert and Susan identified the word *habitually* in Bolton and Thompson's definition. Roger liked what this inferred about this approach becoming instinctive. Rupert related to the idea that an entrepreneur couldn't help it. He also said that he could see how this might annoy others. Susan spoke of habitually as being helpful as it highlighted the fact that the entrepreneur did not stop acting entrepreneurially. Rupert and Susan both commented on the presence of the word *opportunities* in Bolton and Thompson's definition. Susan stated 'Opportunities. That's the key word in any ministry. If you're looking for the opportunity that's

---

[503] This is set out and explored in chapter two.

where those good ideas will come from and that's when things will flourish.' Rupert was clear that the opportunities had to be spotted by the entrepreneur themselves rather than 'somebody sitting at the top of an organisation having great ideas and dispatching others to do them'.

Rupert and Susan both picked up on the words 'creates' and 'innovates' and talked about the fact that entrepreneurship did not always involve starting something huge from scratch. Rupert stated that,

> I think sometimes it's about taking things that are already there and synthesizing something new out of those components, um, discovering synergy. Sometimes, creating value in the simplest of ways. Practically saying, 'John you ought to meet Stephen', or whatever, and somehow generating value in that way.

Jane's comments resonate with Rupert's. She said,

> To be an innovator doesn't mean reinventing the wheel it just means taking the wheel and looking at the things in the community that need to shape that wheel. It's about using the factors around you, developing things to full potential.

Dan suspected that there have always been entrepreneurs in the church. This is an opinion that resonates with the discussion about entrepreneurs in Christian history set out in chapter three. He said that entrepreneurs found ways of getting things done but also said that 'sadly, in the Church of England, we see too many people having to leave the Church of England in order to achieve things.' He spoke of living with frustrations as an entrepreneur and said he could not understand why entrepreneurs were blocked or, 'why we can't change things'. It was not clear whether by 'we' Dan meant the church or entrepreneurial priests, including himself. The notes I made in my research journal immediately after the interview with Dan included references to the fact that a sense of frustration with aspects of the institution appeared to permeate the interview.

All seven respondents were positive about Bolton and Thompson's definition. It appeared from Roger and Matt's responses that, having spent some time considering the definition they had experienced a change of perception. If the Church of England is to encourage entrepreneurial priests I suggest that creating opportunities to discuss and debate the concept of entrepreneurship in an informed way in order to address fears, misconceptions and stereotypes will be key in changing perceptions and

stimulating a culture in which an explicitly entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry is more desirable and more possible.[504]

Three respondents directly identified the word 'habitually' in the definition and spoke positively about this facet, mentioning an entrepreneurial approach becoming instinctive, being something the entrepreneur could not help, and being a way of acting that does not stop. This is helpful as it resonates with the charge in the Declaration of Assent to 'proclaim [the Christian faith] afresh in each generation'.[505] I suggest that the practice of habitual entrepreneurship in the parish would help to counter the notion of the one-off 'good idea' or the temptation to announce, 'we tried that once before and it didn't work'. A focus on encouraging habitual entrepreneurship will also provide a helpful and challenging stimulus to priests and congregations to resist settling into habitual or comfortable patterns of worship and mission, and instead to continually strive to attend to their part in the fulfilling of the Great Commission with a sense of deliberate urgency.

Rupert and Susan both pointed out that entrepreneurship in the parish could take place in simple ways. I suggest that priests and congregations will be more open to the possibility of acting entrepreneurially if they are helped to understand that, rather than feeling pressure to continually generate a stream of innovations, entrepreneurship at parish level can begin with recognising what is already happening and making a deliberate effort to see how ways of understanding, doing or organising things might be reconsidered and reshaped in order to produce more faithful and fruitful outcomes for the church and the wider community.

Dan talked about seeing people having to leave the Church of England in order to achieve things. He did not qualify his opinion or provide evidence or statistics and he did not talk about the kind of things that such people might go on to achieve once outside the Church of England. To some extent his comment echoed a point made by Kirby in chapter two who says that entrepreneurs in large organisations

---

[504] In my view encouraging an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry in the parish requires the use of the term 'entrepreneur' rather than just 'creativity' or 'innovation'. This is because the term 'entrepreneur' embraces and holds in tension a number of concepts, including creativity and innovation. These have particular potential when considered together.

[505] http://www.churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/texts/mvcontents/preface.aspx (11/03/13).

tend to leave.[506] None of the entrepreneurial priests that I interviewed expressed plans to leave the Church of England, although some expressed frustrations.

Responses to the use of the term 'entrepreneur' in relation to priestly ministry

Having asked respondents to give their instinctive response to Bolton and Thompson's definition, I then asked how they felt about the use of the term, entrepreneur, in relation to priestly ministry. All of the respondents were positive. Roger felt that to bring the word into the vocabulary of the Church would, 'do us a lot of good'. He also reflected on the French roots of the word, which I set out in chapter two, saying,

> in terms of its French roots, anything that's between, there's all sorts of gospel stuff in there. And it's to take up and yeah, we've got to grasp the opportunities. I'm thinking of Calvary; standing between.

Matt explained that what was being described fitted him 'to a tee'. And Rupert said that the word, entrepreneur 'describes in a very real way something which I understand from within'. Although positive about entrepreneurship in relation to priestly ministry, Matt, Jane, Rupert and Jim each made reference to the fact that others might not share this positive perception of the concept. Jane said simply 'I have no problem with it but I can see why others do.' In spite of being positive, Jim's response betrayed something of his own reservation, 'My head tells me this is absolutely right. My heart tells me, hang on, pause and stop and think about this.' Jim explained that his hesitation was a result of the association of the term with making money, an issue that was addressed at some length in chapter two. Rupert pointed out that there was no other word that served the same function and that it was a useful word in some conversations and would be a relevant thing to explore in the diocese. He went on to say,

> People who don't inhabit the place of the entrepreneur think of it as people who turn a fast buck; somehow unscrupulous, not necessarily very principled. They start businesses and go bust and employees suffer and they end up with the big house and big car. I can't think of any other label off the top of my

---

[506] David A. Kirby, *Entrepreneurship* (Maidenhead: McGraw Hill Education, 2003), 302.

head that would work nearly as well. It's a 'use with caution among the right audiences' kind of word, really.

Matt outlined the way in which he viewed himself as an entrepreneur but as he entered the discernment process for ordained ministry he learnt to underemphasise that aspect of himself. He said,

> I learnt pretty early on in that process that you didn't use that word, you know, that it was a word that made people wary of you. It was like a danger word. And so you found other ways of describing it. You wouldn't call yourself an entrepreneur because the church would feel uncomfortable. That's how I was made to feel, that the church would feel uncomfortable, bringing through into priesthood, people who fundamentally saw themselves as entrepreneurs. It seemed like a quality that belonged to a different world, not the world of Anglican priesthood.

It is interesting that, against a background of the kind of perceived institutional negativity towards entrepreneurial priests that Matt articulated, Susan expressed the opinion that all priests should be entrepreneurs. She said that 'all priests should be pioneering and responding to their communities' and added 'if there's not something of this in each of us [priests] we have no business leading community'. In his response Matt went on to argue that acting entrepreneurially was essential for priests. He qualified this by saying,

> What the Church of England doesn't need is thick-skinned, task-orientated, low-accountability, head-strong leaders. I've seen those operating and that's part of my reserve, if you like, about ever wanting to dub myself an entrepreneur. I don't want to be saying I'm one of those head-strong, determined people who manipulate others and drive things along. I don't do that at all.

But he followed this by reflecting on the context in which he was engaged in ministry as a parish priest and said,

> *But*, when you reinterpret that in a context like the place I've gone to, you think it's absolutely what the Church needs. Here and in loads and loads of places. People who can focus on what they're trying to achieve, who can spot what will work and what won't work, who can see new possibilities where people only see dead ends. We just need that left, right and centre really if the Church is going to get itself right up off its complete uppers. Because without it, just care and maintenance stuff without any adequate entrepreneurial drive, I just fear for the Church, actually.

Matt's response to this question provoked reflection on the calling of the Church of England and on the nature, scope and urgency of the missional task it currently faces. More concisely, Matt's response provoked reflection on the way in which the church understands priestly ministry, the categories by which it selects candidates for ordination and the implicit messages communicated to candidates as they are processed through the system. The fact that when asked to respond to the use of the word, entrepreneur, in relation to priestly ministry, Matt chose to expand on feeling that he needed to conceal this aspect of his nature is significant. His intuitive sense that revealing his entrepreneurial nature would make those involved in his selection uncomfortable must provoke those involved in the selection process to question whether, in fact, the Church of England does have some degree of prejudice towards entrepreneurial candidates for ordination and if so, to what extent this is true and whether this prejudice is communicated explicitly or whether it is implicitly implied in the church's general approach to discernment, the literature candidates are encouraged to read, the nature of the questions they are asked, the areas on which they are asked to reflect and the categories against which they are considered. In his responses Matt sets out an understanding of a situation in his current parishes that might justifiably be described as desperate. One of his buildings required expensive repairs, he had dwindling and elderly congregations and a local community blighted by wide-ranging social problems. In my opinion, Matt rightly pointed out that if the church in that particular place was to realise a hopeful future, it required entrepreneurial leadership. Based on my reading of the current mission literature and from personal engagement over the past decade and a half with a wide range of local and national mission forums, networks and conferences, I contend that Matt's situation is replicated across England. Entrepreneurial priests are not a 'quick-fix' solution for the Church of England's various problems. What is not required are heroic individuals to save the day. However, I suggest that candidates offering for ordination who have entrepreneurial ability should be encouraged to demonstrate this aspect of their nature and to explore it in relation to a call to priestly ministry. I suggest that the Church of England's senior leadership at national and local level, along with those involved in discerning vocation and overseeing the selection process look at ways in which a positive response might be communicated to those who have entrepreneurial flair who present themselves for consideration for priestly ministry without suggesting that the only route for them is to offer themselves as candidates

for Ordained Pioneer Ministry. While the church must continue to recognise the need to select, train and ordain individuals for ordained (and lay) pioneering ministries, it must also avoid the temptation of assuming that the only ministers with entrepreneurial flare are pioneers. Pioneers are required to demonstrate entrepreneurial ability but if the church limits its acceptance and encouragement of entrepreneurship to pioneers it risks missing out on a significant resource and release of energy in parish ministry. It is parish ministry which remains after all, the central focus of much of the Church of England's strategy and the locus of its efforts in terms of ministry and mission.

Buildings

During their interviews five of the seven respondents discussed issues of varying seriousness relating to their church buildings. These were Roger, Matt, Jane, Jim and Dan. At no point were respondents asked directly about their church buildings and they talked about buildings in response to different questions. Roger and Dan had both served in their parish for over a decade and during that time both had to close one of the two church buildings that they started out with. In her previous post Jane had been involved in a multi-million pound building project which involved the church being demolished and rebuilt along with a community centre, doctor's surgery, offices for social services, housing, an elderly day care centre, a children's centre and a computer centre. At the time of the interview Matt was facing the prospect of closing one of the two churches for which he was responsible. Jim, relatively new in post, was dealing with a broken heating system in his church as well as sharing the building with another local congregation whose own building had become unsafe. None of the five priests who talked about issues with their church buildings complained or spoke negatively about this. Roger and Dan both viewed the closure of buildings as positive opportunities and had seen positive involvement with local schools as a result. Jane spoke at length about the process of rebuilding and the ways in which this led to growth in her own skills, positive engagement with the local authority and community, better provision for the local community and a more appropriate and effective church building. Matt, whose building required repairs estimated at £100,000, was considering ways in which this could become a source of engagement with the local community. Jim viewed his issues with heating and

building sharing as opportunities to deepen relationships and work collaboratively. In the responses of the five priests who spoke about issues with their church buildings it was possible to identify various entrepreneurial traits.

In Roger's comments about closing a church building and re-evaluating engagement with the local primary school we see a person perceiving an opportunity and building something of recognised value by adopting a creative and innovative approach. Roger scored 7.7 for Creativity, 8.4 for Advantage and 10 for Team. These strengths are in evidence in his narrative, particularly the high Team score since, by using 'we' throughout his response Roger infers that this was a collaborative effort,

> We were closing a parish church that happened to be geographically close to, and very much involved with, one of the local primary schools, and we were going from two church buildings to one, but this easy connection between the school and the place of worship was being lost and on the other hand thinking, we need some new beginning for schools-based work and then the Godly Play resource fell into the basket of possibilities and it works and we've had lots of really profound time exploring the Bible with children for a few years. So we kept the connection with the school and going to one church building and one congregation in fact released a whole lot of energy for ministry out there as compared with previous Christian service keeping the show on the road being burdened with buildings.

Dan spoke of being helped through the more challenging aspects of closing a church building by members of his Church. Dan scored a maximum 10 in the Team facet of the FSEI and in the following comment we see evidence of a person who has built a strong team with whom to exercise ministry. Dan said,

> If I'd have not had a team of trusted colleagues that I love dearly I wouldn't have managed it as well as I did without them. They took ownership of it and they protected me from some of the things that happened. And the pastoral element of it has been marvellous.

Jane scored a maximum 10 on Focus. When I asked her about this she immediately referred to the huge building project that she had been involved with, stating, 'the situation I found in that parish, it was obvious that there were only two choices: sink or swim, so focus was both something I had but it was also a necessity. I think if I hadn't had it we would have just closed the parish down'. She went onto say,

> By the time I'd been in post six months it was apparent that the structural problems were huge. I actually wrote down 'mad plan' as a title for a paper

because I knew the church was going to have to be pulled down. It didn't have any long term life. I had to have a strategic plan because you know, either the parish closed on the council estate or we took it forward to something new. So we built an eight and a half, nine million pound project.

Matt scored 10 for 'Advantage' and 7.6 for Creativity. The way in which these two significant facets work together to enable Matt to spot potential opportunities in the coming together of taking services for the local community and discovering that his church building required expensive repairs are apparent in the following response,

> So, for example, having things like the Remembrance Day service or the miner's memorial service, or the miner's gala service with banners, coming together with having a quinquenial inspection that says, 'Your roof's shot and you need a hundred thousand pounds to put the building back together again'. It's seeing the synergies of those two events... and thinking, 'oh, actually these are linked'. Because, clearly one of the things that [the church] does for the community is to form a rallying point for a sense of community identity and a piece of shared history and so you suddenly see a link between those two and then you think, 'well, repairing the church, or at least making public the church's need and trying to rally the community in general around the church's need, is a way, actually, of making the connections here, and getting the community to perhaps reassess its relationship with the church' You're forcing the community to say, 'actually, we want you to be here.' So, the creativity isn't in thinking something utterly out of the ether, it's in making connections.

Jim outlined various building-related issues with which he was dealing but went on to say in his response that he felt that these things were not unusual for clergy. Since he scored 9.2 in Creativity, I asked him if he saw potential for new ways of doing things in the midst of dealing with challenging building issues. His positive response was enthusiastic and he talked about things being 'God given' and also the role of networking and 'firing things off each other'. The problems with the building had prompted deeper engagement with the congregation and Jim gave the example of working with his family service planning group in which he felt there was a lot of creativity and from which he got a lot of energy. He said,

> One of [the ideas] was nativity figures travelling round the community. The group came up with some fantastic ideas around that and it generated such a buzz and so much energy around the young folks. And these ideas transferred to a big community event. Sowing a few seeds and creating space and giving encouragement to people enables those exciting ideas to be generated. So, as a leader I'm being creative there but actually those ideas are coming from a wider set of people. And as Christians we believe that when we gather the Holy Spirit is there so that God's hand is in that as well.

Jim felt that dealing with building related issues was part and parcel of the priest's task and his creativity was enabling him to focus his attention on generating energy for outward focused activities from within his planning group rather than allowing problems with the building to become a focus for his energy.

With very few exceptions, Anglican parish priests will find themselves responsible (along with their church Wardens and PCCs) for the care and maintenance of a church building or buildings. Buildings are a resource but their care and maintenance, particularly if they are listed, can become burdensome and can detract from other aspects of a priest and congregation's ministry and mission among the local community. The responses of the five priests who spoke about church buildings implied a positive attitude to a building-based parish ministry rather than resentment, resignation or negativity. While acknowledging the challenges and difficulties of spending time and effort on resolving building-related issues with which they found themselves confronted, the five priests had been able to identify inherent opportunities and, while Matt was still discerning a way forward, the other four priests had responded creatively and innovatively and acted in order to see recognisable social and spiritual capital generated. Interview responses made it clear that this was not achieved by any of the priests working alone but rather with others. Roger, Matt, Jane and Dan all scored a maximum 10 on Team and Jim scored 8.[507] Bolton and Thompson tell us that,

> When the Team facet is strong the social capital will be within the team, producing a high level of mutual trust and a common purpose. The [initiative] will move forward at a rate that the entrepreneur could never achieve alone. When problems arise they will be shared.[508]

For the five priests, the problems thrown up by church buildings in need of closure, repair or rebuilding were shared with others. For Dan and Roger these 'others' were in teams which they had put together. Matt was eager to assemble teams. Jim worked with a planning group but did not use the language of team. Jane worked extensively with others but did not speak of teams in any of her responses. The variety of ways in which the respondents worked with others is considered in the following section.

---

[507] Rupert and Susan, neither of whom mentioned issues with buildings specifically, achieved Team scores of 10 and 8 respectively. The average score for Team for the seven priests was 9.4.

[508] Bill Bolton and John Thompson, *The Entrepreneur in Focus: Achieve Your Potential* (London: Thompson Learning, 2003), 130.

While a variety of challenging building-related issues are bound to demand time and attention from parish priests in the coming decades, the entrepreneurial priest will see in these the opportunity for creative and innovative solutions that have the potential to impact the wider community.

Working with others

Each of the seven priests spoke about working with (rather than working *for*) their congregations. In addition Roger, Rupert and Dan also spoke about working with other clergy, while only Jane and Susan spoke directly about working with bodies external to the church.

I noted in chapter three, in discussing the Preface to the Ordination of Priests, that it is the task of the priest to 'lead God's people in the offering of praise and the proclamation of the gospel'.[509] Although the Preface is clear that 'In baptism the *whole* Church is summoned to witness to God's love and to work for the coming of his kingdom',[510] this collaborative emphasis does not imply that the priest should build teams but rather that all those within the church should recognise the part that they must play in collaborating with the coming kingdom of God. Indeed, it is possible to interpret 'to lead' in a variety of ways, some of which would not take into account the possibility of teams at all. Taken in its entirety, the Preface sets out a ministry that is designed to build up and sustain the people of God in lives of worship. It is only in recent decades that ordained and lay people in some parts of the Church of England have made a connection between the task set out for the priest in the Preface and achieving this by building and sustaining teams within congregations. Although it is overly simplistic to divide the presence of teams in church along lines of churchmanship, it is interesting to note that, of the seven priests whose responses are analysed in this chapter, the four who described themselves as evangelical (Roger, Matt, Rupert and Dan) spoke of and gave evidence of encouraging teams as part of their ministry and, of the three who described themselves as Anglo-Catholic (Jane, Susan and Jim), two did not mention teams at all and the other (Susan) only

---

[509] From the Common Worship Preface to the Ordination of Priests, http://www.churchofengland.org/prayer-worship/worship/texts/ordinal/priests.aspx (10/03/13).
[510] From the Common Worship Preface to the Ordination of Priests (italics mine).

mentioned team once and this was in the context of wanting to enable teams rather than deliberately build them. Having said this, of these three, two, Jane and Susan, articulated high levels of collaboration with their local communities and placed enormous priority on creating partnerships with bodies external to the church, and the other, Jim, adopted a highly collaborative approach with his congregations and was the only priest to specifically mention the importance of networking in his responses. I also note that, of the four evangelical priests whose responses included references to teams, further exploration suggested that only two were involved with teams that appeared to be healthy and flourishing. This will be discussed in due course. I must state at this point that I am not making a value judgement in relation to the presence of teams within churches. I have deliberately titled this section 'working with others' rather than 'building teams', and have made it clear that the Preface does not explicitly require priests to build teams but that team building is an approach adopted by parts of the church in response to a particular understanding of the role of the priest and as one way of fulfilling what appears to be required by the Preface. Over the past several decades the Church of England has grown more familiar with language drawn from the world of business and although, as I discuss in chapter two, some continue to have an issue with the language around entrepreneurship, parts of the Church of England appear to have less of a problem embracing language around 'team'. It is interesting to note that Dan, Rupert, Jim and Matt each had commercial careers prior to ordination and Susan (although making minor reference to team) spent more than a decade working in education. Team working is standard practice in many areas of business and in education. Jim did not mention team but his responses included a positive account of working closely and fruitfully with the family-service planning group. Roger and Jane had always worked for the church in some capacity but in spite of this, Roger's comments about the presence of a team of volunteers in his congregation implied a taken-for-granted attitude. My point here is that all of the respondents (entrepreneurial priests) commented on working with others, although from the responses it is possible to discern differences in who those 'others' are, a range of reasons for working with others, a variety of approaches to working with them and a variation in levels of collaboration and power-sharing.

As mentioned above, only two respondents, Dan and Roger, made any significant comment about working with teams in their own congregations. Rupert

discussed building a team of clergy in the deanery as part of his role as Area Dean and this will be discussed in due course. Dan, who had previously worked in finance, talked at length about the four 'Ministry Development Teams' that he had overseen the emergence of in his congregation. The teams covered youth, pastoral care, administration and mission and they advised the PCC. The congregation nominated those who expressed a developing sense of vocation and team members were then selected on the basis of adapted Reader criteria by Dan, the Area Dean and the Archdeacon. Dan had taken the lead on this but, according to him, the result had been a highly collaborative ministry in which others appeared to have a genuine influence in the life of the church. Dan is an example of an entrepreneurial priest whose ability to work with others, and specifically to create and sustain functional teams, had the effect of multiplying the impact of his entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry. He said,

> I am a team member and a team player. I've worked very hard, and one of the best things I've done here is build a very committed team of people that have discovered their own vocation. Because I think this is what team building in churches is really all about. It's about trying to enable people to see that they've got a role and a ministry to fulfil in their own right with their own name on it and the church has flourished as a result of it.

He went on to discuss the nature of the teams and the effect that he believed they were having and he hinted at the fact that moving into a team mode was not straightforward for the church saying,

> It took some time to re-orientate the church in that direction because it isn't run by agendas and minutes. It's based on prayer and bible study, fellowship, relationships that are based on trust, pastoral concerns for the church and vision. And it makes a parish like this, where I'd be the only person running the show, but now, we do it collaboratively. It's a team where we are seeing people emerging into leadership; into readership and ordained ministry. It's a marvelous thing that happens right in the very core of the church.

The level of influence that Dan claimed team members were able to have in his dhurch was not echoed in the responses of the other six respondents. The closest discernible model was Roger, who had also encouraged a team, although not on the same scale as Dan. Dan said,

> These weren't going to be the vicar's little helpers. They were going to be people who were going to have a significant contribution to make to the direction of this church. Me and the congregation were going to be willing to

> allow the church to be shaped by them and not just by me, you know? And that's what's happened here and it's been a fantastic thing to do, you know? To be a part of, and I have a role within it.

Dan was the only respondent whose comments pointed to a genuine sharing of power and influence within the congregation. In this context it appeared that the teams allowed for a structured sharing of power and this had resulted in an increase in people becoming passionate about the mission of the church, had been a catalyst for the emergence of members of the congregation into lay and ordained leadership and had contributed to the numerical growth of the church. It had also shaped the way in which Dan understood his priestly ministry. He said,

> and my role has changed because of it. I've become almost a sort of facilitator, enabler, you know. My role has changed significantly in all sorts of ways.

Roger spoke of 'a great team of volunteers' within his congregation and he talked of being, 'accountable to a team in leadership'. However, he admitted to having a tendency to become distracted by other things that interested him. We see this in his comment,

> I'm not a good finisher and I am quite a good grasshopper, in terms of flitting from one thing to the next. The challenge for me is that because there are always more things to be giving time to in parochial ministry, it means that I fall prey to, at worst, choosing just what I fancy, rather than what is important or urgent.

Having a team in place meant that the various strands of the church operation did not collapse when Roger became interested in other church-related projects. Roger's responses included the following admission: 'I'm conscious that sometimes people get pretty close to burnout and on reflection I wasn't there for them. I think that's because I've got too much of my own agenda going on to stay with the team-enabling role.' Although the data does not allow me to comment in any real depth on each respondent's motivation, I suggest that, taken in their entirety, Roger's responses point to a priest whose entrepreneurial nature manifested in a habitual interest in a range of personally engaging projects, some of which he subsequently found it difficult to follow through on. However, his entrepreneurial nature had also led him to recognize the importance of the presence of a team of volunteers because this meant that while he gave his attention to a range of initiatives, the activity of the volunteers ensured that the church continued to function. From his responses it appeared that

rather than genuinely sharing power in the church and working towards collaborative leadership of the sort outlined by Dan, Roger might have been using the word, team, to refer to simply being amenable to having members of his congregation take responsibility for some of the tasks that required ongoing attention and to ensure that he did not leave things unfinished. He said,

> I thrive with having co-leaders and shared responsibility. As it happens one of my Church Wardens is such a finisher so that's my salvation, being accountable to her.

He stated that he was involved in shared ministry but also admitted that the power and influence lay with him saying,

> We have a massive commitment to being a shared ministry parish. Having said that, my ministry development team continue to look to me to be the prime envisioner, really.

He went onto say that the movement was away from him as prime visionary, 'That's changing. I think of one person in particular who is getting really good at completely outside-the-box ideas.' But even here it appeared that rather than a move towards something comparable to the sort of team situation outlined by Dan, the reality was closer to a willingness to encourage individuals to share ideas, a preparedness to allow those with enthusiasm to join in and relief that the Church Warden was prepared to hold him to account and act as a finisher.

Rupert looked after five parishes and was also Area Dean. He only commented briefly on working with his congregations and this was to express a sense of frustration. The deanery was the primary focus for his reflections on working with others, which was unsurprising given that he self-described as a 'big picture person' (as did Jane) and claimed to spend more than half of his time on the deanery. Rupert's interview responses suggested that he had adopted a highly collaborative approach in his previous career and this had continued in his priestly ministry. He said,

> I always valued and took teams for granted and the longest spell of my commercial career was with [a large, multinational corporation] but it wasn't very hierarchical. Lots of things had to happen through persuasion and the force of argument and good ideas.

In relation to his priestly ministry he said, 'I take it for granted that you work across the streams and across the denominations. You do unless you can't.' His comments

on team work were focused on the way in which he worked with the deanery clergy. He said,

> As area dean I've worked on trying to turn the clergy in the deanery into a real team where we actually pull together and support each other in practice in more than token ways because we realise that there's so few of us that working collaboratively is good for all of us and good for all of our parishes and good for the mission of the church.

Throughout his responses Rupert made reference to his previous commercial career. He made a number of comparisons between his experience of working with others in business, which he talked about in very positive terms, and his experience of working with others in the church, which he expressed a good deal of frustration about. For example, he said,

> In industry I was able to pick my team. It's just not like that in the church. You don't get to pick your team. You're into lay ministry. They're there. OK, you may draw more people in and you may develop people but it can be a very long haul. Their understanding of the organisation is completely different, and of its purpose and goals. And yes I do believe in a simple ministry of presence, that's lovely but you need a few people to be present, don't you?

These comments were made in the context of responding to a question about the sorts of things that hinder the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish. Rupert talked about the ongoing negative impact of his predecessor's (the previous parish priest) belief that it was not possible for the six parishes to work together as a collaborative group. Rupert had spent several years working towards achieving what his predecessor had believed was impossible and felt that he had made real progress. However, he commented, 'This is the hardest thing I've ever done, by a long way'. Rupert claimed that he naturally worked in teams and sought to do so as a result of having highly positive experiences of team work in his previous career in industry. He expressed frustration at working with others in the church and explained that people had a completely different understanding of the organisation. It was possible that this frustration led him to focus his natural desire to work collaboratively on building a sense of team with the clergy of his deanery. With this group he was able to directly shape and influence the direction of the team. In his estimation the result was positive. He said,

> Our deanery is going for an innovative deanery plan in the most obvious and determined way. That is partly a reflection of my approach; a longer-term and more change oriented view of things.

Interestingly, in terms of working with members of the congregation across his six parishes, he referenced the archdeacon's emphasis on having a recognised pastor in each community but he then flipped this around and made a highly innovative proposal. He said,

> I could manage the pastoral stuff if I had an entrepreneur in every parish. They don't need to be ordained, they don't need to be a lay reader. They might need some theological training and some equipping. But right now I think I would kill for an entrepreneur in every one of my parishes; a recognised entrepreneur.

He expanded on this radical proposal and provided a plausible rationale, saying,

> Community entrepreneurship rests on having the existing networks. As an incomer you don't have the existing networks. I'm starting to think, who are the people who could be my entrepreneur in that village? The people I can trust and say, 'Yeah, innovate here. Come and tell me what you want to do and we'll talk about it and, yes, let's go for it.' They are rooted in the community and will have the respect and trust and will be able to take some of those things forward or to gather other people around them. Being an entrepreneur on your own is pretty blooming lonely. I couldn't do that. I can pastor them, I can care for them, I can provide a framework.

This innovative response to the issue of offering ministry to six congregations and engaging in mission across six communities would involve Rupert in a significant sharing of power and influence. This was something that Rupert appeared to be comfortable with. In fact, he concluded his interview by lamenting the fact that as clergy numbers were reduced and parishes brought together in increasingly large groups, power was moving away from the local and becoming more distant. His suggestion of a recognised entrepreneur in each community is in line with the view, taken in the current study, that the exercise of entrepreneurship at parish level by priests and by those whom priests enable is not only desirable but is to be encouraged. Putting the suggestion into action would, like many entrepreneurial ventures, involve some degree of perceived risk. However, I suggest that it is a possibility that warrants further exploration because it appears to hold potential for reversing the movement of power away from local or parish level and returning it to those who are embedded in their communities and who have the knowledge, networks and trust to engage in faithful and transforming ministries.

In Rupert's responses, it was interesting to note the frustration present in the repeated comparison of his highly positive experience of working collaboratively in business with his very different experience of attempting to work with others in the church. In contrast, frustration was absent from Susan and Jane's comments about working with others in their congregations and communities. Unlike Dan and Rupert, Susan and Jane did not have previous experience in business with which to compare working with people in parish ministry. Susan had worked in education but did not hold a position that allowed her to exercise strategic influence in terms of forming teams. I note that Susan and Jane (with Social scores of 9 and 9.6 respectively) each articulated something about their motivation for ministry in the interview and made a direct connection between love and working with others by engaging with the wider community. In relation to her motivation in parish ministry, Susan remarked, 'The church is here to serve the community so I start by loving and living the community. I am driven by wanting the church and the community to know that God loves them'. On the same issue Jane claimed that 'we are motivated by our love of Christ to engage with our community'. As priests who spoke positively about working with others, Rupert and Dan may well have had similar motivations but these were not articulated in their interview responses. Although Jane and Susan were both focused, driven and motivated, neither spoke of being frustrated with any aspect of working with their congregations or communities. In fact, both spoke frankly about the neediness of those with whom they were working and their responses implied that enabling and encouraging others over time, without a particular set of expectations other than actively sharing God's love, was part of what they each understood to be the task of the priest. Jane and Susan both located themselves in the Anglo Catholic tradition and, from their responses, both appeared to be working from an understanding of priestly ministry that was comfortable with the priest leading 'from the front' on behalf of those for whom they were pastorally responsible. These 'others' included the local community as well as the congregation. Both Jane and Susan provided narratives that pointed to enabling ministries[511] focused on encouraging and building up the self-esteem and self-confidence of those within their congregations and on acts of loving service to those outside the church. Both priests were working in socially challenging areas with congregations and communities

---

[511] Jane scored 8 for Enabler while Susan scored 6.

comprised of those who were, on the whole, less educated and less skilled than either priest.[512] For example, Jane said, 'We are talking about council estates and those people [are], at best, blue collar workers.' From their responses, Susan and Jane both appeared to embody an autonomous model of priestly ministry and church leadership; that is, neither were working as part of a ministry team within their churches, although both encouraged high levels of congregational participation. From their responses it appeared that power in the church and in the engagement of the church with the local community remained with Jane and Susan as priests and both were exercising wide-ranging influence, albeit an apparently positive influence, as a result of their encouragement of congregation members and the energy they put into working with bodies outside the church. Both Susan and Jane talked about partnership with the local authorities. Jane's partnership experience was significantly greater than Susan's due to a multimillion pound rebuilding project in which she had taken the lead role.

Of the seven priests, Jane was the most extensively involved in partnerships with external bodies and it was here that her entrepreneurial drive and ability were most obviously apparent. From her responses, Jane's ministry could be described as one of spending significant time and energy on creating partnerships with external bodies to create financial and social capital that was beneficial to the church and the local community and which appeared to be a source of deep satisfaction and fulfilment for her personally alongside encouraging, building up and organising individuals within the congregation. In relation to creating partnerships with outside bodies, Jane explained that, 'I know what people will fund. I know what rings their bell.' She went on to say that in partnership 'you have to see the idea that will work'. She added that 'You can tick the local authority boxes and they will give you money.' She pointed out that in the parish 'It is easy to have the same people doing the same things', and she spoke about the importance of recognising skills within the congregation, saying that 'The sort of people I asked to be chalice assistants raised eyebrows but their confidence grew.' She went on to express her opinion that 'an important part of our [the priest's] job is enabling damaged people to become who God created them to be'.

---

[512] All seven respondents were university graduates.

Susan said she worked naturally with others and spoke of aiming to enable teams but in her examples she only alluded to particular individuals or existing groups and the way in which she aimed to encourage them or build up their self-esteem. Like Jane however, Susan's entrepreneurial ability and drive were most evident in the way she spoke extensively about working with outside bodies, particularly the local authority, on specific, community-related initiatives. Susan was not setting out to create teams but rather appeared to be attempting to leverage her influence as the parish priest and to maximize the potential of her ministry and the ministry of the parish church in the local community. She talked about 'walking beside people' to give them confidence and about helping people to know that God loves them by 'loving, trusting and valuing' them. She was clear that it was 'about asking who all this is for'. She talked about using 'we' instead of 'I' and mentioned being content for everything not to be 'perfect' in order to allow the congregation to join in. She talked about finding 'fun and creative ways to express passion' and said that this might be a chore but that things might emerge. She explained that even if she didn't see the growth she was content to keep doing things 'so that people know that God loves them'.

Like Susan and Jane, Matt, previously a chief executive, appeared to be leading from the front but spoke of being keen to create teams of 'critical individuals'. From the overall shape of Matt's responses, the extent to which these teams would ultimately share the vision and the leadership was not clear. Matt talked about being hurt by the way in which the PCC refused to support a particular change that he felt was necessary. In response he explained that he thought the following (he did not say this to the PCC): 'Right! I'll do it without you then. I need to do this. This needs to happen, mission will fail if we don't do this so if you won't help me I'll have to go and find somebody else to help me'. The sentiment contained in this comment is what one might typically expect from an entrepreneur but it provokes serious reflection in the context of parish ministry since one might argue that in order for anything of lasting impact to occur in a parish, a priest will need to gain the support of the PCC at some point. Matt spoke a good deal about the importance of articulating vision and building up trust within the congregation but the above comment pointed to the possibility that Matt's personal sense of the direction in which the church should be heading and his determination to achieve this would be the dominant driver. He

appeared to be willing to work with the PCC but only in so far as they were willing to lend support to his vision. When this failed he talked about working around them by finding others to help him. In his response he talked about creating teams, saying,

> One of the things I feel I absolutely must create, otherwise I will feel I've failed is a team or teams. I will not have succeeded if I don't create team. I may not yet know them. In fact, I have a strong suspicion I don't yet know them otherwise it really will not, whatever else I achieve, it won't be what I want and it won't be sustainable and it won't be anywhere near the right kind of satisfying outcome for me.

From Matt's responses it is possible to infer that he imagined that a team or teams might help him to achieve what the PCC would not. The existence of teams would also give him a personal sense of satisfaction and fulfilment. It is not clear that Matt would encourage or enable the teams to generate their own sense of vision. In fact, from the comments Matt made in relation to the PCC, we might infer that teams would ultimately be a vehicle for achieving Matt's vision for the parish in spite of the PCC rather than becoming an opportunity for genuinely collaborative ministry and the sharing of power and influence. It is interesting that Matt said,

> I thought as an entrepreneur I was being almost the antithesis of the team builder, you know, almost the person who causes a real tension in the team, an absolute pain in the bum. That's been my model of entrepreneur and I think well, actually, that doesn't describe me. I am someone who will tend to wait for the others to catch up with me. Not that I'm going to stop on the journey but I want people with me.

In the context of this particular parish, and in spite of the comments Matt made about not being the kind of entrepreneur who would 'cause real tension in a team' we might conclude from his responses, including the admission that he will 'wait for others to catch up' rather than giving them any genuine say in where they are going, and that he isn't going to 'stop on the journey', that the particular shape of Matt's entrepreneurial nature would make it difficult for him to form and sustain the types of teams he talked about and the types of team that would flourish in the context of the parish in which he is currently ministering. He went on to say, 'My preferred mode of operation is to gather people and be part of the team. I guess if I'm really honest, my really preferred mode is to lead teams. There we go. It sounds a bit egotistical, but that's that. That's when I'm at my best.'

Working with others is a requirement of being a priest. Priests are to share the oversight of the church with the Bishop and to shepherd those under their pastoral care in order that they grow as disciples of Jesus. The seven respondents all spoke about working with others but did so in a variety of ways, with different apparent motivations, and in order to achieve different outcomes. The FSEI and interview data do not allow me to comment with any authority on the ways in which theological positions, churchmanship and particular understandings of priestly ministry affected the priest's approaches to working with others.

Various negative factors emerged from the analysis of the respondent's comments on working with others. Roger admitted that team members had come close to burn out while he was involved in other initiatives. Matt had been hurt by the PCC's refusal to support his ideas and was intending to build a team in order to achieve his vision in spite of the PCC. Rupert expressed a sense of frustration at the time and energy taken to work with congregations on collaboration. I also note that, with the exception of Dan and Rupert, none of the priests expressed a desire to move towards a situation in which power and influence was more obviously or directly shared with the congregation. The positive factors emerging from the respondent's comments about working with others included:

1. Encouraging and energising the priest and the congregation.

2. Building up faith within the congregation.

3. Building up self-worth and self-confidence in the members of the congregation.

4. Encouraging and enabling leadership to emerge within the congregation.

5. Making contact and building positive relationships with the local community.

6. Discerning the needs of the local community.

7. Generating mutually beneficial relationships with external bodies such as the local authority.

8. Generating revenue through partnerships with external bodies.

9. Meeting the needs of the local community and local institutions such as schools.

In spite of what is set out in the Preface to the Ordination of Priests and in the Church of England's selection criteria, the respondent's comments, particularly those that are less than positive, along with my own experience of working with many priests and congregations in dioceses in England leads me to suggest that it does not go without saying that priests will naturally and effectively work with others, whether this is via simple collaboration with individuals, team-building or partnering with bodies outside the church. Analysis of Jane, Susan, Rupert, Jim and Dan's comments in relation to working with others suggest that as they have focused attention on spending time with their congregations (as well as outside agencies in Jane and Susan's cases), and as they have listened and attempted to encourage and enable people it has become possible for ideas to emerge, for trust to be built and for energy to be released in the priest, the congregation and the local community. It appears from the responses that such energy can become a driver for a range of spiritually and socially beneficial initiatives. Rupert, Susan, Jane and Dan's responses suggest that when priests work in a genuinely collaborative or team-focused way with their congregations they need to have the courage to acknowledge that things may not be done in the way that they might prefer and have the grace to cope with the resulting diversions from the priest's vision and with the accompanying personal frustrations. Dan's responses, which involved considered reflection on the building up and maintaining of teams in his church, included the observation that leaders had emerged as a result of involvement in team ministry. Providing an opportunity for church members to participate in teams in which they can take on genuine responsibility, grow in confidence and see the effect of their labours on the life of the church and the impact on the wider community is clearly positive. Dan claimed that his church had grown numerically since his arrival although the data collected in the current study does not allow me to conclude that there is a direct correlation between the presence of teams and the growth of the church congregation. This is an area where further research would be useful. Jane and Susan also claimed that their congregations had experienced limited growth and their responses lead me to suggest that working in partnership with local authorities and other bodies has the potential to generate previously unseen opportunities as well as revenue for the church while providing services for local people and breaking down perceived barriers to Church in the minds of the local community.

Factors respondents' felt might aid the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish

I was aware that the fact that I was conducting a study into entrepreneurship may have suggested that I viewed the concept positively and, although it is not possible for me to discern the effect of this on the interview responses, it is important to note it. It is also important to note the possibility that respondents were likely to be more rather than less positive about entrepreneurship since they had scored highly in the FSEI and were also aware that the bishop had identified them as being entrepreneurial and suggested that they be included in the current study.

When asked about what he felt would aid the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish Roger responded by talking about the need to strengthen and renew faith in congregations and said that he felt that if this happened it would equip people to be entrepreneurs within congregations. He said, 'We've got to believe that God is going to make a massive difference and that he'll be generous enough to involve us in that process and I think that is a matter of strengthening our faith in a dynamic God.' I note that Roger and Susan were the only respondents to mention God or faith in God in relation to this question. Matt's response focused around building vision and trust. He talked about the need for the priest to articulate a compelling vision that captivated rather than obliged, and expanded on how important he felt it was to develop trust. He said,

> Entrepreneurship inevitably entails taking people where they haven't been before and people won't go where they haven't been before unless they trust you, which is why just being a task oriented, purpose-driven person isn't gonna work in church because people pick that up straight away and run a mile from you really. You've got to be interested enough in them as them, listening as well as talking and proving that you care. If you don't do that enough quite simply they won't trust you and if they don't trust you it ain't gonna happen.

Jane made several responses in rapid succession, citing the need for accessible language, looking at how clergy are trained, the importance of focus and asking what the goals are and where the strategy is. It was not clear from her response whether it was the priest, the congregation or the wider church who should be asking themselves about goals and strategy. Jane explained that she felt that a lot of clergy would never be naturally entrepreneurial but said that,

> [if] you want an entrepreneurial spirit within the church you might find ways to enable them to recognise it's not their gift rather than forcing them to think that they should be like that [or] to enable them to reach the level of ability. And if it's not beyond a certain point, having people who will help a parish generate that entrepreneurial spirit [like] consultants.

But Jane went on to lament the fact that in spite of her extensive experience of involvement in partnerships, rebuilding and regeneration in her previous diocese, neither that diocese nor her current one (Durham) had invited her to share her expertise. She suggested that the scale of what she had been involved with, and had ultimately achieved, had made her previous bishop uncomfortable and said that he didn't seem to know what to do with her. In relation to this she said,

> I don't really think the church really wants entrepreneurs. Do they use the people with the skills? Nobody ever thought, 'Well, we should be having a conversation with these people'. No one ever did. And to this day doesn't.

She expanded on the way in which her entrepreneurial nature continued to drive her to work at making connections in order to generate revenue for the church, saying, 'I've just put a bid in for Diamond Jubilee money. If I tick the boxes I get the money and I can do things. Without that money I can't do it because our budget doesn't allow'. Building on her previous positive experiences of working with others and drawing on the tenacity and boldness that are part of her entrepreneurial nature, Jane reflected on both the process and the fruit of her efforts. She said,

> You've got to go out and wheel and deal. And my folks know I do it. Some of them won't approve, you know, because I'm not a traditional parish priest, but you know, we've had farmers markets in the church with over a thousand people through the doors in a building they've never been in even though they've lived in the town. People are becoming familiar with the building, they are living in the space. So actually, when they need us for their baptisms, for the funerals, you know, this is a familiar space.

She went on to talk about recognising a quality in herself that is central to effective entrepreneurship; the ability to see something through to completion. Bolton and Thompson discuss this in relation to 'building something of recognised value'. Jane said,

> In some respects I'm horribly conventional. I'm an old fashioned Anglo Catholic priest, but, I also recognise that in my skills base I'm not an ordinary parish priest because I have done *extra* ordinary things. Not extraordinary but *extra* ordinary things. And I've seen it through. Someone who wrote a reference for me said that… you get the visionary and the closer. Someone

that can actually have the vision and deliver and see it to the end. We will dream the dreams but we will also have the reality.

Rupert talked about the need for generating a permission giving culture from the bishop downwards. He talked about this in relation to perceived boundaries, mentioning Canon law as an example which, he said, could feel like a straightjacket to many. Although he added that for some it seemed that the perceived boundaries were a 'comforting straightjacket'.

In her response to this question Susan talked about the gift of the dog collar which, she said, 'enables us to get into places and into people's lives and into a group, a community where we've never set foot in before and where we're more or less accepted and respected'. She also mentioned the fact that priests do not have someone 'looking over their shoulder' and explained that this meant that there was freedom for the priest to harness their particular passion and 'use the motivation to turn those opportunities and those doors that might be opened by the collar into real chances to make a difference in that place'. She also discussed the importance, in her view, of the priest being themselves in a parish and explained that she felt that the Church of England was good at encouraging priests to minister within a parish as the person they were. She said,

> The Church of England respects the fact that God calls us to be each day more fully who we are, not to be somebody completely different. And I think the church does try to honour that. And I think if you've got a very unfortunate bishop or archdeacon, that's hard and you have to find a creative way round that. [But] where people are going to thrive as entrepreneurs, its where they're respected for who they are and allowed to be who they are with a huge amount of freedom within a context to go and build the kingdom.

Like Matt, Susan also mentioned the importance of trust, but rather than talking about gaining the trust of the congregation in order that they feel able to buy into the vision articulated by the priest, Susan talked about the priest trusting the congregation. She said,

> We have to see ourselves as part of that community and then lead in with absolute integrity and be led by them with absolutely integrity and trust in them. That's where people are going to flourish and that's where we're going to see real skills and real entrepreneurship and I think real growth and excitement.

Jim talked about the importance of having a focus on others rather than on yourself and gaining an understanding of the context. Related to this was the importance for the priest of being informed as to what the issues in the parish are and being provided with tools that help to develop an understanding of the issues for the church and community. He also discussed the importance of ongoing mental stimulation for the priest, giving the personal example of pursuing a part-time course of study for a Masters degree. He mentioned the importance that he placed on networks and networking for generating and realising ideas. Finally, Jim talked about the need for shared vision, although he admitted that, since he had only been in his current parish a short time he had not achieved this yet. He explained that it was important to have 'Good vision and a shared understanding of, you know, what the raison d'etre of the church is in that place and what the mission of the church is in that place.'

In summary, from the interview responses I identified nineteen factors that the seven priests felt aided the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish. The factors (not presented in a particular order) are:

1. Strengthening the faith of those in the church.
2. Creating a vision shared by the priest and the congregation.
3. Building mutual trust between the priest and congregation.
4. Using accessible language.
5. Looking at the selection, training and deployment of clergy.
6. Being able to focus.
7. Being clear about goals.
8. Being clear about strategy.
9. Using consultants to help priests and congregations to generate an entrepreneurial spirit.
10. Dioceses and deaneries ensuring that entrepreneurial expertise is shared.
11. Having the courage to go beyond the church and look for opportunities.
12. The priest being a visionary *and* a closer.
13. Creating a permission-giving culture at every level in the church.
14. Priests utilising their recognised status within the local community (dog-collar is a resource).

15. Encouraging entrepreneurial priests to be themselves and to minister out of their entrepreneurial nature.

16. The priest and congregation maintaining a focus on others rather than on themselves.

17. Priests understanding their context and the particular issues being faced by those in their parish.

18. Providing priests and congregations with tools to aid such understanding.

19. Building networks and engaging in networking with the intention of generating and realising appropriate ideas.

Three of the themes listed above are specific to entrepreneurship taking place in the context of Anglican ministry and mission. These are, strengthening faith (factor 1), looking at clergy selection, training and deployment (factor 5), and priests leveraging their recognised status (factor 14), particularly via visual cues such as dog-collars to generate opportunities. The remaining sixteen themes are transferable to entrepreneurial activity in a range of spheres and are, in essence, consistent with the approach and actions of the entrepreneur as Bolton and Thompson set them out in their definition and in their explanation of the entrepreneur's FACETS. Connecting and presenting the themes that emerged from the responses in the form of a narrative is a helpful way to imagine how the themes could potentially hang together in practice. Such a narrative might appear as follows:

As the Church of England engages with the complex realities of the current mission task, it increasingly recognises and addresses the need to select, train and deploy priests who are able to engage in entrepreneurial ministry in the parish. As a result bishops ordain parish priests who prioritise attending to strengthening their own faith in God and the faith of their congregations. Such priests communicate appropriately and work at generating trust and, as a result, a shared vision emerges in the congregation. Where appropriate and necessary, the shared vision is stimulated by the involvement of entrepreneurial consultants working with the priest and congregation. The shared vision is characterised by focus and by clarity in relation to goals and strategy. Both the priest and the congregation maintain a keen awareness of those beyond the church and use appropriate resources to discern the needs of the local community. The priest and the congregation have the courage to look for opportunities beyond the church and when projects are undertaken they are

completed. Ideas and energy for both the priest and the congregation are stimulated and realised through networks and networking. This process is helped by the existence of a permission-giving culture in the parish, deanery and diocese. Such a culture encourages entrepreneurial priests to embrace an entrepreneurial approach to ministry in line with their natural gifts and competencies. Entrepreneurial expertise is shared across the diocese and this, in turn, underpins the culture of permission and stimulates further entrepreneurial ministry.

I note that each respondent contributed to the list of factors set out above and this is not, therefore, a list of factors being undertaken by any one entrepreneurial priest. I note also that the factors are drawn from responses to interview questions rather than from observations and that it is therefore not possible to ascertain what relation the factors suggested by each priest bear to the reality of that priest's parish ministry. Further, I note that the interview responses do not allow me to comment on whether and to what extent putting the factors into practice in ministry would result in an entrepreneurial approach to ministry becoming more possible or that doing so would result in particular outcomes such as spiritual or numerical growth, more effective loving service to the local community or the generation of social or financial capital. A diocese, deanery or parish reflecting on the factors mentioned here with the intention of considering how to encourage a more entrepreneurial approach to ministry should also reflect on the responses to the question relating to factors that hinder the exercise of entrepreneurship.

I suggest that the responses to the interview question relating to factors that might assist in the exercise of entrepreneurship are consistent with the literature on entrepreneurship considered in this study,[513] with the understanding of the entrepreneur set out in chapter two of the current study and, in particular, with Bolton and Thompson's definition. The factors are also consistent with the discussion of the

---

[513] I note particularly the following books: Bolton, Bill, and John Thompson, *Entrepreneurs: Talent, Temperament, Technique* (2nd ed.), (Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, 2004); Casson, Mark, et al. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship* (Oxford: OUP, 2008); Kirby, David A., *Entrepreneurship* (Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education, 2003); Kuratko, Donald F., and Richard M. Hodgetts, *Entrepreneurship: A Contemporary Approach* (5th ed.), (Sydney: Harcourt College Publishers, 2001); Read, Stuart, et al. *Effectual Entrepreneurship* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2011); Simms, Michael K., *Faith Entrepreneurs: Empowering People by Faith, Nonprofit Organizational Leadership, and Entrepreneurship* (Lincoln, NE: iUniverse, 2006), Swedberg, Richard, (ed.), *Entrepreneurship: The Social Science View* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

nature and shape of the mission task set out in the parts of chapter three of the current study that deal with the *Mission-Shaped Church* report, the Preface to the Ordination of Priests and mission-engagement in the local diocese. This is significant as it suggests that priests who demonstrate entrepreneurial potential through achieving high scores on the FSEI are also able to articulate to some extent an approach to ministry in the parish that is consistent with what the literature indicates that we may expect to witness. I have previously pointed out that each of the respondents mentioned only a few of the factors and, although they may have mentioned others had they been given more time or been helped to think about the question in greater depth, providing the opportunity for each respondent to reflect on and respond to the factors as a whole would be constructive. In light of this I suggest that it would be fruitful for dioceses to encourage the creation of forums for sharing entrepreneurial expertise and ongoing learning.

Factors respondents' felt might hinder the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish

Roger responded to this question with a qualified insight that was particularly helpful in the context of parish ministry. He said,

> I think the sheer weight of the bread and butter stuff can be a hindrance. And yet, we need to find the perceived opportunities in the bread and butter stuff, actually.

He went on to admit that this was a demanding balancing act but that entrepreneurial priests would have an advantage in achieving it.

Matt picked up on the theme that he had expanded on in his response to question 9, and said that he felt entrepreneurship was not part of the corporate ethos of the Church of England and this made it difficult for entrepreneurship to flourish. He said,

> Care, spirituality, however that's interpreted, you know, pastoral concern, respect for tradition, all that kind of thing, they're deep in the Anglican ethos but entrepreneurship isn't and if you're an entrepreneur and, boy am I an entrepreneur, you pick that up really.

He went on to talk about entrepreneurship being hindered by the low demands made by the Church of England and the accompanying low levels of personal discipleship. He said,

> The Church of England makes really, really low demands on people and that, in a way, is fantastic and in another way its potentially fatal. When you come into a context and you see need and you see opportunity, you find you've got very low currency to deal with because the grounds on which people belong to church are thin. Frankly their personal belonging to Jesus is thin so you've got not much to trade with. It is a bit like building bricks without straw.

Jane's immediate response to the question of what might hinder entrepreneurship in the parish was 'fear'. She did not expand on this but went on to say that she felt that in the current context, other factors were that priests could not have many dreams, were confused about what they were being asked to do, were being asked to do so many things that they felt disempowered or were the wrong person in the wrong place. She added that she felt that lots of priests simply could not be entrepreneurial and said, 'If you want an entrepreneurial church that has to be taken into account in terms of how you select and train people and certainly how the bishops look at how they are putting certain people to certain parishes.'

Rupert felt that entrepreneurship was hindered by those who were loyal to the institution rather than to 'the cause or the gospel'. He said, 'The people who are entrepreneurial are the ones who are loyal to the cause and to the gospel more than they are to the system or to any party within the system.' He went on say that in a parish an unhelpful sense of history, meaning what was or was not done by the priest's predecessor, could hinder entrepreneurship. Picking up on themes mentioned by Matt and Jane, he also talked about an undervaluing of entrepreneurship in the Church of England. He said,

> I think the qualities we bring as entrepreneurial clergy are not sufficiently valued in the Church of England. Many people find them irritating and annoying. I'm talking about senior people. There is a general undervaluing of those skills that people like myself, I was in my forties when I was ordained, bring in from pre-ordination experience. And that is really, really distressing and difficult for a lot of us.

Like Rupert, Susan also touched on the potential impact of senior leadership on entrepreneurship in the parish but her response was pragmatic. She said,

There might be barriers with the bishop or the archdeacon or somebody who wants to micromanage, and that's where you might see people fail as entrepreneurs because that permission's not there or because there's a block, but I think true entrepreneurship says 'OK, that's a block there, either I have to persuade them, I have to demonstrate it in the way that I'm living and working or I simply have to find a way round this block.

She also talked about the impact that a difficult PCC could have on entrepreneurship, saying, '[a difficult PCC] wouldn't shut entrepreneurship down but it would take an incredible amount of commitment and drive and energy and that in itself could become a factor which shuts it down'. Susan's responses also included themes that were similar to Jane's. She mentioned entrepreneurship being hindered where clergy had low morale, or who had forgotten why they are in the parish or were tired and lacking in motivation. She suggested that there was an ongoing need for priests to consider their vocation, saying,

This is the best job in the world if it's the right job. It might be about 'should I be a priest in *this* context?' Family, schooling might hold someone to a place but their job might be done there.

Jim's response to this question was brief. He mentioned four factors that were opposites of some of those he had mentioned for question 10. Jim cited lack of clarity, inward focus, poor relationships and lack of resource as factors that he felt hindered the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish.

In summary, from the interview responses I identified twenty-two factors that the priests felt hindered the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish. The factors (not presented in a particular order), are:

1. Weight of the 'bread and butter stuff' (although opportunities may be perceived within this).
2. Entrepreneurship not being part of the Church of England's corporate ethos.
3. The low demands made by the Church of England.
4. Low levels of personal discipleship.
5. Fear.
6. Priests being confused about their task.
7. Priests being asked to do too many things.
8. Priests feeling disempowered.

9. Being the wrong priest in that parish.

10. Those who are loyal to the institution rather than the Gospel.

11. The presence of too many non-entrepreneurial layers in the church.

12. The church's undervaluing of entrepreneurial qualities and pre-ordination experience.

13. Micromanagement.

14. A difficult PCC.

15. Priests having low morale.

16. Priests losing a sense of purpose.

17. Priests becoming tired.

18. Priests losing motivation.

19. Priests and congregations lacking clarity about their purpose.

20. An inward focus on the part of the priest and/or congregation.

21. Poor relationships between the priest and the congregation and/or within the congregation.

22. Lack of resources to assist in understanding the issues affecting the local community.

The table on the following page sets out the above factors in relation to their areas of relevance in the life of the church.

Responses to interview question 11, '*What factors do you feel hinder the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish?*' set out in table form in relation to their areas of relevance in the life of the church.

The Church of England	The congregation	Bishops and Archdeacons	The Priest
Fear.	Fear.	Fear.	Fear.
Entrepreneurship not part of corporate ethos.	Low levels of personal discipleship.	Asking priests to do too many things.	Weight of 'bread and butter stuff'.
Makes low demands on people.	A difficult PCC.	Loyalty to institution rather than Gospel.	Confusion.
	Lacking clarity about purpose.	Too many non-entrepreneurial layers.	Being asked to do too many things.
	Inward focus.	Undervaluing of entrepreneurial qualities and pre-ordination experience.	Feeling disempowered.
	Poor relationships.	Micromanagement.	Being in the wrong parish.
	Lack of resources for understanding local context.		A difficult PCC.
			Low morale.
			Loss of sense of purpose.
			Tiredness.
			Loss of motivation.
			Inward focus.
			Poor relationships.
			Lack of resources for understanding local context.

As with the consideration of factors that might assist entrepreneurship, I note that, since each respondent contributed to the factors, the above list does not reflect the view or experience of any one entrepreneurial priest. I also note that neither I, nor the respondents, suggest that responses to questions about factors that might hinder the exercise of entrepreneurship are, in fact, an accurate statement reflecting the reality of the situation, or are present in every case. For example, it is the view of one of the respondents that entrepreneurship is not part of the corporate ethos of the Church of England. The current study does not claim that this is actually the case, but seeks rather, to report this response and to present it for reflection by commenting on it in relation to the literature on entrepreneurship, contemporary mission and priestly ministry considered in chapters two and three; an evaluation of the present mission context as set out in chapter three, and the responses of the other priests that are set out in the present chapter. This is the case for each of the factors. I note that the responses do not allow me to comment on whether and to what extent practically

addressing the factors that have emerged might result in an entrepreneurial approach to ministry becoming more possible or whether dealing with some or all of these factors would have the effect of making spiritual or numerical growth, service to the local community or the generation of social or financial capital more likely. A diocese wishing to encourage an entrepreneurial approach to ministry may find it helpful to reflect on the above factors alongside those that emerged from responses to being questioned about factors that might assist entrepreneurship, and to engage in a wide ranging and frank discussion that includes parish priests who demonstrate an entrepreneurial approach to ministry and mission. I also note that the factors presented above are not exhaustive but are simply those that emerged from the responses of seven priests to being questioned about factors that might hinder entrepreneurship. In the first instance, I am able to say that, in the view of the respondents at the time of their interview, where one or more of the factors are present in the life of a priest or at some level in the church (parish, deanery, diocese or nationally), then an entrepreneurial approach to ministry may not flourish and may, to some degree, be hindered.

I suggest that when considered in the light of the relevant literature and the arguments set out in chapters two and three, none of the factors that emerged in relation to being questioned about what might hinder entrepreneurship are particularly surprising or out of step with the type of responses that might have been expected. A surprising omission is the issue of buildings. Roger's comment about the weight of the 'bread and butter stuff' was the only response that could potentially be understood to embrace various building-related issues, but even here Roger was not specific. In considering the theme of buildings earlier in this chapter, I noted that none of the respondents viewed dealing with building-related issues in a negative light. It is note-worthy that when setting out factors that they felt could potentially hinder the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish, none of the priests mentioned church buildings. The suggested factors were, in fact, all human factors and related either to the priest themselves, the congregation, the diocesan staff or the national church. In relation to the national church, although the perceived ethos of the institution was mentioned, the ethos of an institution is constructed, maintained and propagated by those within that institution so that even here we are dealing with human factors rather than something static or inert, such as a building.

I note that the factors have a cumulative effect in the sense that the presence of each will result in others so that individually the themes may frustrate the potential exercise of an entrepreneurial approach to parish ministry, but because each will cause others, it is likely that a number will be present and the effect of each on the potential for entrepreneurship will be multiplied. An example of the way in which this might occur, drawing on the responses to the question about factors that might hinder entrepreneurship, is as follows. If, as is claimed by one respondent, entrepreneurship is not part of the corporate ethos of the Church of England then this is likely to be evident at national, diocesan, deanery and parish level and will take in every aspect of the life of the institution. In light of the discussion of the definition of entrepreneurship set out in the latter part of chapter two and the aspects of chapters one and three dealing with *MSC's* view of missional task and the mission of the local diocese being well served by entrepreneurial clergy, I suggest that an absence of entrepreneurship in the ethos of the Church of England may be evidenced by the following factors: a general suspicion of and resistance to change; defence of the status quo; limited and limiting relationships between deanery and congregations, between deaneries within dioceses and between dioceses in England; limited connections between congregations and the wider community; limited evidence of growth in discipleship at congregational level; limited evidence of numerical growth, or decline at congregational level; decline in clergy numbers, and stagnating or dwindling finances. Where we see such evidence we may be led towards the view that entrepreneurship is not present since, although an entrepreneurial approach to ministry as described in chapters two and three, and as outlined by the respondents is not a guarantee of numerical and financial growth, it is evidenced by factors which in most cases, are the opposites of those just set out. Lack of entrepreneurship in the ethos of the Church of England will also be evident in the way in which priests and others who are given leadership roles are selected, trained and deployed. Since employed staff, including priests, but also taking account of key figures at diocesan level such as Diocesan Secretaries, have a significant hand in shaping the ongoing life of the institution, when selection, training and deployment does not deliberately seek to engage those with entrepreneurial ability or actively discourages the recruitment of individuals with such gifts, the net effect is likely to be the maintenance of an ethos that, generally speaking, is and will continue to be, non-entrepreneurial. When this is the case, it may follow that a significant number of those within the institution have

priorities that are shaped to a greater degree by loyalty to the institution and maintenance in its current form, than to other areas of priority, especially those perceived areas of priority that involve some degree of change. When this happens, as the surrounding culture changes and an accompanying need for (faithful and appropriate) change within the institution is not recognised or is resisted, the institution is likely to face declining numbers of participants and an accompanying decline in available financial resources. With diminishing resources, and the institution moving towards the perception of looming crises, change may be perceived by those with a vested interest in the system as an ever-greater risk and therefore less likely to be contemplated or to occur. Diminishing financial resources mean that clergy who leave or retire are less likely to be replaced. Tasks are divided up between fewer people who work harder but for less obvious gains.[514] It is here that we are able to identify the factors that emerged from the responses to being asked about what might hinder entrepreneurship. Clergy involved in such a cycle may become afraid, confused, discouraged, tired, inward focused, and lose a sense of purpose. Exhaustion and breakdown or a focus on moving on or retiring may follow. None of this is conducive to an entrepreneurial approach to ministry in the parish. The presence of each factor makes the others more likely and the possibility of entrepreneurship less so. It is my contention that in significant areas of the Diocese of Durham, something approaching the scenario outlined above, which takes account of the factors that emerged from responses to being asked about what might hinder entrepreneurship, is observable. This contention is based on the interview data generated for the current study, observations drawn from my own participation in the life of the Diocese of Durham and attention to current literature dealing with the missional implications of cultural change for the Church of England.

---

[514] Alan Roxburgh and Fred Romanuk present a compelling account of what they describe as 'Reactive Zone' leadership in chapter three, *Change and Transition: Navigating the Challenges,* in *The Missional Leader: Equipping Your Church to Reach a Changing World* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2006).

Responses to being asked about the extent to which the presence (or lack) of entrepreneurship in the senior leadership in a diocese affects the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish

As I explain when writing about the methodological approach of current study in chapter four, in analysing the themes that emerged in response to this question, it is important to note that I was directed to my respondents by the Bishop of Jarrow. This was in response to my request for names of clergy whom he felt were acting entrepreneurially in the parish. I keep sight of the fact that my respondents were those who had caught the attention of the bishop and were potentially among those whom the bishop felt at least reasonably positive about. I therefore note that each respondent's view of senior leadership in general and their attitudes about the effect that senior leadership might have on entrepreneurship in particular, will have been shaped to some extent by their relationship with the Bishop of Jarrow and also by the fact that they were selected by the bishop for inclusion in the current study.

All of the responses to this question were relatively brief. Susan's reflections on the effect of senior leadership on entrepreneurship in the parish were articulated in her response to being asked about what she felt might hinder entrepreneurship, in which she talked about the way in which a 'difficult' bishop or archdeacon could block entrepreneurship or simply not give permission. But she went on to talk about finding ways around this. Jane also talked about senior leadership in response to being asked about what might hinder entrepreneurship and suggested, as I have previously noted, that bishops who wanted to encourage an entrepreneurial church needed to think about selection, training and deployment of clergy. Dan felt that in his parish there was scope for him to experiment and to re-imagine and to give permission and encouragement to his congregation to do things. He also talked about being asked to take on an additional parish but he pointed out that the stated intention of the senior staff was that this addition would be for growth rather than managing decline. Reflecting on this in a statement which echoes themes set out in response to the question about what might hinder entrepreneurship, Dan said,

> The structures have got to be eased a little bit in order that we can become the kind of church that making those changes will allow. Otherwise what you'll get if you're not careful is just overstretched, overtired clergy who can't do it

because it's too much, you know? We've got to try and change the way we are in order to adapt to the circumstances that we're in today.

Dan felt that the structures were not serving the mission of the church and that adapting the structures needed to take account of the role of archdeacons. He said,

> I just don't think that [archdeacons] are allowed to think beyond the structures. I think if they allowed themselves to see beyond their own structures we might see change and development happen in a more creative way than we're seeing right now. I just think that when we're talking about church development and mission we need a fresh conversation about what we're prepared to support and what we're not prepared to support. And this word, risk, is an interesting one coming from archdeacons, you know. Well the greater risk is carrying on doing what you've always done.

In relation to the impact that an entrepreneurial bishop might have on ministry at parish level, Dan went on to say that 'We need resourcing and we need encouraging and we need inspiring leaders to help us to be inspired.'

Jim felt that the structure of the Church of England allowed priests to bury their heads in their parishes and not to be hugely affected by whether or not the senior leadership was entrepreneurial. In the context of Jim's other comments, I understood this to mean that priests could get on with being entrepreneurial at local level without paying too much attention to what might be happening elsewhere in the diocese. Jim felt that 'sponsorship from the top' was necessary in order for initiatives at parish level to be more than simply 'islands' and to be sustainable once the priest had moved on.

Rupert, an Area Dean, described himself as 'middle management' and said that he felt that in this capacity he was able to do a lot to make it possible for the clergy in his deanery to innovate and think differently. However, he felt that this could only go so far and that it helped if the senior leadership's mode of operation was entrepreneurial. Rupert felt that non-entrepreneurial archdeacons could be a block to innovation. Reflecting on this, he said,

> If there are too many layers in the organisation that are non-entrepreneurial then it's like a fire-blanket which deadens everything. One layer you can probably work through that, or even a couple.

He explained that he felt that an entrepreneurial bishop could enable entrepreneurial clergy in the parishes to 'punch through what is effectively a glass ceiling at the archdeacon level and make connections that actually turn out to be transformational'.

Matt spoke about the advantage he felt of being asked by the bishop to take on his current parish. He felt that having the invitation, and by extension, the backing of the bishop was 'an enabling thing'. He said, 'For somebody to say, 'We, as an institution want you to go and do that job there' is massively enabling. And that's part of where I get my energy from.' He went on to explain that he had considered the fact that, while the institution, in the person of the bishop supported him and that this was, 'the episcopal system at its best', he did not feel that ongoing support was guaranteed and that it was possible the senior leadership would have a change of heart. Matt reflected on this, saying,

> The institution could chicken out and say 'actually the only way we as an institution can justify paying you a stipend is by asking you to do pastoral maintenance for an impossibly large number of people. And that's our normal mode of operation and you're not quite fitting that normal mode of operation, so I'm sorry, you're going to have to take on four more parishes or whatever and do nothing but low-level maintenance'.

Roger felt that in order for entrepreneurship to flourish at parish level it was important that the senior leadership were enabling but did not need to necessarily be entrepreneurial themselves. He said,

> The clergy who are going to be entrepreneurial in their ministry need to be given the freedom to do so as well as all the other aspects of what enabling means. It's fine if your archdeacon, meanwhile, is looking after money and drains.

The responses suggest that it is possible for priests to act entrepreneurially in the parish regardless of whether or not those in senior positions, archdeacons and bishops in particular, are entrepreneurs themselves. Rupert's response suggested that it was possible for entrepreneurial Area Deans to use their limited influence to encourage and support an entrepreneurial approach to parish ministry in the clergy within their deanery. The presence of a non-entrepreneurial archdeacon in itself would not appear to be a particular hindrance to entrepreneurship in the parish, but an archdeacon who, rather than seeking ways to enable or encourage innovative thinking and practice, tended towards asking limiting or restricting questions of priests who were seeking to act entrepreneurially could become a block to the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish. From Rupert, Dan and Susan's responses I note that a non-entrepreneurial archdeacon could have a potentially dampening effect on

entrepreneurship in the parish and deanery. Entrepreneurial priests who find themselves working with an archdeacon who is obstructive towards entrepreneurial efforts (rather than supportive, tolerant or neutral) may find that they have to spend additional time and energy in finding ways to innovate in the parish in spite of the archdeacon. Although the respondents did not feel that the presence of a non-entrepreneurial bishop in a diocese would prevent the exercise of entrepreneurship in parishes, they felt that the presence of a bishop who demonstrated a positive attitude towards an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry would help to create permission and this in turn would have the effect of encouraging and enabling entrepreneurship. From the responses, it seemed that the presence in a diocese of an overtly entrepreneurial bishop (rather than being sympathetic, tolerant, neutral or, at worst, obstructive towards entrepreneurship), who made it clear that an entrepreneurial approach to ministry was valued and important, could potentially have the effect of creating a culture of permission within the diocese which would allow entrepreneurial priests and congregations to flourish, to actively share their experiences and to work across a range of perceived geographical, ecclesial, ecumenical, social and spiritual boundaries. An entrepreneurial bishop could use his influence to encourage a culture of initiative-taking and ideas-generation in the diocese and from the responses it would appear that the perception was that such a culture would potentially have a significant impact at parish level. I suggest that the creation of an entrepreneurial culture in a diocese could potentially have the effect of drawing entrepreneurs into the system. Bolton and Thompson explain that it is the number of entrepreneurs in an area or region that really make the difference. A culture of permission for entrepreneurship in a diocese, in which lay and ordained were encouraged and helped to recognise the importance of enabling entrepreneurship would potentially stimulate spiritual, numerical and financial growth, draw in other entrepreneurs and create momentum for significant local and even regional transformation. I am not suggesting that bishops should encourage the creation of a culture in which there is a pressure, either stated or inferred, for all priests or congregations to be entrepreneurial. As previously noted, this would contradict research, which shows that entrepreneurs are likely to make up a relatively small percentage of a given population. However, the current study supports the notion that a shift towards a culture in the church in which entrepreneurship is recognised and valued and in which entrepreneurial priests and congregations are encouraged,

supported and even rewarded, rather than discouraged, blocked, frustrated and undervalued would be coherent with aspects of God's nature, consistent with the approach to ministry of many individuals throughout Christian history, helpful as a way of understanding the nature and purpose of priestly ministry and appropriate in terms of addressing the current missional challenge faced by the Church of England. The interview responses lead me to suggest that senior leadership can have a significant impact on the extent to which entrepreneurship is enabled to flourish at every level in a diocese and that, whether or not they are themselves entrepreneurs, bishops and archdeacons should be encouraged to consider actively pursuing a policy of encouraging entrepreneurship where it is found rather than ignoring, inhibiting or opposing it.

Chapter summary

This chapter has dealt with the analysis of FSEI scores and interview data. Themes and collection of themes that emerged from interview responses have been considered in seven sections. I noted that responses to Bolton and Thompson's definition of the entrepreneur were generally positive, as were priests responses to the association of the entrepreneur with priestly ministry. I identified the possibility that the Church of England did not appear to want entrepreneurial priests. I noted that five respondents spoke about finding creative and innovative solutions to challenges raised by church buildings. I discussed the way in which all of the respondents talked about working with others, including noting the frustrations and benefits that were articulated. I noted the different approaches to working with the congregation, with other clergy and with external bodies. I discussed the possibility of commissioning 'recognised mission entrepreneurs' in rural parishes which was raised by one respondent. Asking respondents about factors that they felt might aid the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish resulted in a list of nineteen points. Those that I felt were most pertinent are considered in the concluding chapter. Asking respondents about factors that they felt might hinder the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish resulted in a list of twenty-two points. Again, those that I felt were most pertinent are considered in the concluding chapter. I noted that entrepreneurial priests felt that they could act entrepreneurially regardless of whether those in senior positions in the

church were entrepreneurs. However, I noted that the responses suggested that participants felt that a difficult archdeacon could become a drain on a priest's entrepreneurial resources. The responses also suggested that participants felt that an entrepreneurial bishop could help to create a culture of permission in which entrepreneurial approaches to ministry in the parish would be viewed as acceptable and become more likely.

Chapter Six

Summary and concluding comments

In the introduction to this thesis I stated that I was an Anglican priest and an entrepreneur. I explained that I was using the term, entrepreneur, to refer to a way of being in the world that is characterised by a relentless and energetic pursuit of opportunities to do things in new ways in order to achieve improved outcomes for those involved. I noted the different types of capital that entrepreneurs produce. I articulated two central drivers for this research study. First, my experience of being an entrepreneurial priest and second, my understanding, drawn from personal experience and engagement with the relevant literature, of the nature and shape of the mission context in England in which Anglican priests seek to engage in appropriate and faithful ministry. I explained that it was the contention of this thesis that a faithful and effective response to the mission situation by the Church of England required the contribution of entrepreneurial priests. I located my use of the term, entrepreneur, in the *Mission-Shaped Church* report's recommendation that the church identify and deploy 'mission entrepreneurs'. I stated that it is the contention of this thesis that it would be expedient for the Church of England to identify and invest in entrepreneurial parish priests, recognising them as a potential resource, rather than settling for the notion that it will primarily be Ordained Pioneer Ministers who will exercise ministries characterised by entrepreneurship. This thesis does not suggest that all priests should be entrepreneurs or that entrepreneurial priests are a one-stop solution for the challenges currently faced by the Church of England. This thesis is rooted in the assumption that entrepreneurial priests are present in the church, that they are able to make a positive difference and are therefore a potential resource for the Church of England as it seeks to engage in ministry and mission. This thesis proposes that the concept of entrepreneurship offers the church a helpful lens through which to view the exercise of priestly ministry. In light of these points, the research objective which this thesis set out to address was:

> To explore the articulated experience of a sample of entrepreneurial priests in the Diocese of Durham with a view to producing appropriate and informed suggestions for future practice in relation to the exercise of entrepreneurship by parish priests in the Church of England.

After the first (introductory) chapter, this objective was addressed over four chapters. In the first of these (chapter two) the contested nature of the term 'entrepreneur' in relation to Christian ministry and mission was considered. This was followed by a discussion of an understanding of the entrepreneur set out by Bolton and Thompson, who define the entrepreneur as:

> A person who habitually creates and innovates to build something of recognised value around perceived opportunities.[515]

In chapter three, reasons for encouraging an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry in the parish were considered. I argued that an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry is consistent with some of the characteristics exhibited by God. Examples were provided of figures in the Bible and Christian history who adopted an entrepreneurial approach to collaborating with God. The Preface to the Ordination of Priests, the Declaration of Assent and the Five Marks of Mission were each considered and drawn upon in order to argue that the exercise of priestly ministry in a time of rapid cultural change will be well served by an entrepreneurial approach. Chapter three also included a section in which the challenges facing dioceses of the Church of England as they seek to engage in mission were considered through the lens of the Diocese of Durham. The methodological approach adopted in the current study was set out in the fourth chapter and the strengths and weaknesses of the approach to participant selection, the choice of tools used for data generation and the decision to engage in thematic analysis were considered. In chapter five the themes that emerged from data generated through online testing and semi-structured interviews were discussed and analysed. Findings were noted and initial suggestions and recommendations were set out. In this sixth, and final chapter, the research findings are summarised and concluding comments are set out. The research objective stated the aim of, 'producing appropriate and informed suggestions for future practice in relation to the exercise of entrepreneurship by parish priests in the Church of England'. The suggestions are set out after the summary of the research findings and are followed by a note of areas in which further research might prove fruitful. An

---

[515] Bill Bolton and John Thompson, *Entrepreneurs: Talent, Temperament, Technique* (2nd ed.), (Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, 2004), 16.

outline of the ways in which the findings of this thesis have been, and will be disseminated is also included.

Summary of research findings

Responses to Bolton and Thompson's definition were generally positive and four of the respondents said that they could relate the definition to their own ministries.

The responses of two of the priests suggested that discussion of the term 'entrepreneur' in the context of completing the FSEI and participating in an interview, had led to a shift in their perception of the term from negative to positive.

When asked to articulate their feelings about the use of the term 'entrepreneur' in relation to priestly ministry, all of the respondents were positive, although four explained that they could see why others might have an issue with this association. Of these, three mentioned negative associations of entrepreneurship with greed.

One respondent expressed the opinion that all priests should be entrepreneurs and another had the view that all priests should act entrepreneurially (which is a slightly different thing). One respondent spoke of their experience of feeling the need to underemphasise the entrepreneurial aspect of themselves for fear of making the church uncomfortable. Three respondents articulated the view that the Church of England did not appear to want entrepreneurs.

Three respondents identified positively with the word, *habitually* in Bolton and Thompson's definition and of these, two identified positively with the word, *opportunities*. One respondent explained that it was important that such opportunities were spotted by the entrepreneur themselves and not by those in authority on behalf of others. The same two respondents also discussed the presence of the words, *creates* and *innovates,* pointing out that in the parish, this didn't need to involve starting big projects from scratch or reinventing the wheel. One talked about discovering synergy and the other spoke about priests using what they found around them and developing things to their full potential.

One respondent felt that entrepreneurs had always been in the church but expressed the belief that many have to leave the Church of England to achieve things. This respondent articulated a sense of frustration about things being blocked and the church's inability to change things.

Five respondents discussed issues relating to their church buildings. In their accounts it was possible to recognise the presence of some of the entrepreneurial character themes identified in the respondent's First Screening Entrepreneur Indicator (FSEI) scores. In particular I noted the evidence of high Creativity, Advantage and Team scores in the way in which respondents talked about addressing building-related challenges by working with others and discerning ways in which creative and innovative solutions could be found for a range of problems. Many parish priests will be required to engage with building-related issues. Analysis of the responses leads me to suggest that the extent to which a priest is able to identify an approach to building-related issues that has the potential to generate social and spiritual capital in the congregation and local community is likely to be dependent on four factors. The first of these is the priest's ability to understand and accept that dealing with building-related issues is part of their task and not simply an unwelcome burden. The second is the priest's ability to see the potential for a range of fruitful, although perhaps unusual, connections on a variety of levels in the process of addressing building-related issues. Third is the priest's ability to facilitate a release of energy by working with others via high levels of collaboration and partnership and in some cases by building and maintaining functional teams characterised by mutual trust and a common purpose. The fourth factor is the priest's ability to maintain a clear focus on people, both in the congregation and outside it, rather than allowing the building and related issues to become their primary focus.

Alongside buildings, 'working with others' was another prominent theme that emerged during analysis of the data. Each of the respondents talked about working with their congregations (rather than working *for* them). Three respondents talked about working with other clergy and two discussed working with bodies external to the church. A variety of approaches to working with others were apparent in the responses, as were variations in levels of collaboration and power-sharing. Only two respondents talked about working with teams within their congregations. There was a significant contrast between the two respondent's approaches, with one having

invested significant time and effort over several years into facilitating four teams with responsibility for different areas of the life of the church, and the other respondent discussing a single team in broad terms that did not allow a clear assessment of the extent to which the existence of the team was part of a particular strategy or whether the team had a particular remit within the life of the congregation. The first of these two respondents was the only one whose comments suggested a genuine sharing of power and influence in the congregation. This respondent also spoke about an increase in the numbers of people becoming passionate about the mission of the church and claimed that the church had experienced numerical and spiritual growth.

One respondent, responsible for a number of rural parishes, suggested having a recognised entrepreneur in each rural parish rather than a recognised pastor. The respondent highlighted the fact that, in his opinion, this might not be an effective approach in urban contexts. He suggested that with some theological training, a trustworthy person in each rural parish with a local network and the respect of the community could potentially gather people around them. The respondent suggested that, as the priest, he could then provide pastoral support, care and a framework for the recognised entrepreneurs. The rationale provided by the respondent for the notion of recognised entrepreneurs in rural parishes was based firstly on the fact that each recognised entrepreneur would have local understanding and networks and secondly, on the perceived importance, articulated by the respondent, of reversing the movement of power away from rural parishes and returning it to those who are embedded in their communities.

It was interesting to note that the three respondents who expressed some level of frustration at the challenges and difficulties of working with others in a church context each had significant positive experiences of working in business prior to being ordained. Of these three respondents, one talked about wanting to form a team that would support him in achieving things in the parish that the PCC had refused to sanction.

None of the three respondents who did not have previous experience in business expressed frustration at working within a church context. Two of these made explicit connections between love and working with those in the wider community. Both of these respondents provided examples of involvement in significant

partnerships with external bodies such as the local authority. One respondent talked at some length about the priority given to developing partnerships with external bodies and seeking funding from a range of sources. The two respondents who discussed partnerships with external bodies articulated a limited link between this and numerical or spiritual growth in the church.

It was possible to identify positive and negative aspects of working with others in the respondents' comments. The experience of frustration has been highlighted, above. Positive factors associated with working with others that emerged from the responses were as follows:

1. Encouraging and energising the priest and the congregation.

2. Building up faith within the congregation.

3. Building up self-worth and self-confidence in the members of the congregation.

4. Encouraging and enabling leadership to emerge within the congregation.

5. Making contact and building positive relationships with the local community.

6. Discerning the needs of the local community.

7. Generating mutually beneficial relationships with external bodies such as the local authority.

8. Generating revenue through partnerships with external bodies.

9. Meeting the needs of the local community and local institutions such as schools.

From the responses to being questioned about the factors that participants felt might aid the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish, it was possible to compile a list of nineteen factors. These were as follows:

1. Strengthening the faith of those in the church.

2. Creating a vision shared by the priest and the congregation.

3. Building mutual trust between the priest and congregation.

4. Using accessible language.

5. Looking at the selection, training and deployment of clergy.

6. Being able to focus.

7. Being clear about goals.

8. Being clear about strategy.

9. Using consultants to help priests and congregations to generate an entrepreneurial spirit.

10. Dioceses and deaneries ensuring that entrepreneurial expertise is shared.

11. Having the courage to go beyond the church and look for opportunities.

12. The priest being a visionary *and* a closer.

13. Creating a permission-giving culture at every level in the church.

14. Priests utilising their recognised status within the local community (dog-collar is a resource).

15. Encouraging entrepreneurial priests to be themselves and to minister out of their entrepreneurial nature.

16. The priest and congregation maintaining a focus on others rather than on themselves.

17. Priests understanding their context and the particular issues being faced by those in their parish.

18. Providing priests and congregations with tools to aid such understanding.

19. Building networks and engaging in networking with the intention of generating and realising appropriate ideas.

The nineteen factors intersect with each other at multiple points and each is pertinent. As noted in chapter five, the factors are consistent with the literature on entrepreneurship and with an understanding of the entrepreneur set out in chapter two. The factors are also consistent with the discussion of the nature and shape of the task of mission in which the Church of England is called to engage, as outlined in chapter three. In relation to the discussion in the first three chapters of the current study and in light of the research objective, which aimed to produce 'appropriate and informed suggestions for future practice'*,* in my view factors 5 (Looking at the selection, training and deployment of clergy), 9 (Using consultants to help priests and

congregations to generate an entrepreneurial spirit), 10 (Dioceses and deaneries ensuring that entrepreneurial expertise is shared), 13 (Creating a permission-giving culture at every level in the church) and 15 (Encouraging entrepreneurial priests to be themselves and to minister out of their entrepreneurial nature) are particularly significant since they suggest action that might be considered at a strategic level (i.e. diocesan or national level). Other factors might also relate to action that might be considered at a strategic level (being clear about goals or strategy for example), but I suggest that the entrepreneurial parish priest or congregation might be expected to be able to recognise and attend to these factors at a local level. In relation to the implementation of the five factors to which I have drawn attention, parish priests might be expected make a small-scale contribution to implementing decisions taken at diocesan or national level. However, I have drawn attention to these factors in particular because any meaningful move to implement them would require a significant shift in the institutional culture of the Church of England generated, sustained and resulting from a series of strategic decisions designed to generate appropriate policies and resources. In relation to factors 5 (Looking at the selection, training and deployment of clergy) and 15 (Encouraging entrepreneurial priests to be themselves and to minister out of their entrepreneurial nature), I suggest that the Church of England should make efforts to ensure that candidates with entrepreneurial gifts are encouraged to offer themselves for selection for 'regular' priestly ministry (rather than only as OPMs), and are then selected, trained, deployed and encouraged to minister out of their entrepreneurial ability. In relation to factor 13 (Creating a permission-giving culture at every level in the church), I suggest that any effort made within the Church of England to create and sustain a 'culture of permission' would be consistent with what it means to be Anglican and would contribute to the emergence of innovative approaches to ministry and mission, appropriate for the diverse range of contexts in which Anglican priests and congregations are attempting to engage in faithful witness. In relation to factors 9 (Using consultants to help priests and congregations to generate an entrepreneurial spirit) and 10 (Dioceses and deaneries ensuring that entrepreneurial expertise is shared), and based on my own experience, I suggest that the regular sharing of stories (and best practice) of entrepreneurial endeavour by priests and congregations has the effect of stimulating further initiatives and encouraging others to attempt similar things in their own contexts.

From the responses to being questioned about the factors that participants felt might hinder the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish, it was possible to compile a list of twenty-two factors. These were as follows:

1. Weight of the 'bread and butter stuff' (although opportunities may be perceived within this).
2. Entrepreneurship not being part of the Church of England's corporate ethos.
3. The low demands made by the Church of England.
4. Low levels of personal discipleship.
5. Fear.
6. Priests being confused about their task.
7. Priests being asked to do too many things.
8. Priests feeling disempowered.
9. Being the wrong priest in that parish.
10. Those who are loyal to the institution rather than the Gospel.
11. The presence of too many non-entrepreneurial layers in the church.
12. The church's undervaluing of entrepreneurial qualities and pre-ordination experience.
13. Micromanagement.
14. A difficult PCC.
15. Priests having low morale.
16. Priests losing a sense of purpose.
17. Priests becoming tired.
18. Priests losing motivation.
19. Priests and congregations lacking clarity about their purpose.
20. An inward focus on the part of the priest and/or congregation.
21. Poor relationships between the priest and the congregation and/or within the congregation.
22. Lack of resources to assist in understanding the issues affecting the local community.

As with the list of factors that respondents felt might aid the exercise of entrepreneurship, each of the twenty-two factors in this second list are pertinent. Again, they intersect with each other at multiple points. In relation to the discussion in

the first three chapters of the current study and in light of the research objective, which aimed to produce 'appropriate and informed suggestions for future practice', in my view factors 2 (Entrepreneurship not being part of the Church of England's corporate ethos) and 12 (The church's undervaluing of entrepreneurial qualities and pre-ordination experience) are particularly significant. Efforts to highlight the value of entrepreneurial competence, to shape a more positive perception of entrepreneurship and to make entrepreneurship a more acceptable part of the Church of England's corporate ethos (factor 2) along with a greater focus on valuing pre-ordination experience (factor 12) will require a major shift in the institutional culture of the Church of England. A series of strategic decisions and the generation of appropriate policies and resources might assist such a shift, would certainly need to accompany such a shift and may be expected to result from such a shift. The implementation of appropriate policies can be assisted at parish level by those who are sympathetic to this agenda but any significant shift will require a significant commitment at strategic level both nationally and in dioceses.

When asked about the extent to which the presence (or lack) of entrepreneurship in the senior leadership in a diocese affected the exercise of entrepreneurship in the parish, the responses suggested that participants felt that it was possible for priests to act entrepreneurially in the parish regardless of whether or not those in senior positions, such as archdeacons and bishops, were entrepreneurs themselves. The responses suggested that archdeacons who tended towards asking limiting or restricting questions of entrepreneurial priests could potentially dampen the exercise of entrepreneurship and become a drain on a priest's entrepreneurial resources, as the priest would have to invest additional time and energy in finding ways to innovate in spite of the archdeacon.

Respondents felt that an overtly entrepreneurial bishop could encourage initiative-taking and ideas-generation and that their presence could potentially have the effect of creating a culture of permission which would allow entrepreneurial priests and congregations to flourish, share experiences and expertise and to work across a variety of perceived boundaries.

Suggestions for future practice in relation to the exercise of entrepreneurship by parish priests in the Church of England

Firstly, suggested avenues for further research, set out below, should be pursued and the findings and conclusions disseminated to Ministry Division, selection secretaries, vocations advisers and senior diocesan staff for consideration and possible action. Secondly, congregations, priests, archdeacons, bishops and those with diocesan and national roles should be encouraged to reassess negative perceptions of the language around entrepreneurship. It is hoped that this will contribute to broader recognition of the appropriateness of an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry in the current cultural context and assist in the emergence of a culture within the church in which there is greater permission for adopting an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry in the parish. Thirdly, dioceses should actively identify, affirm and support priests adopting an entrepreneurial approach to ministry and mission in parish contexts. In addition, dioceses should assist entrepreneurial priests to network with other entrepreneurial priests locally and nationally. My fourth suggestion is that senior Anglican leaders at national and diocesan level, along with selection secretaries and vocations advisers should consider ways in which a positive perception of entrepreneurship can be communicated to those demonstrating entrepreneurial flair who present themselves for consideration for priestly ministry. The temptation to suggest that the only route for entrepreneurial ordinands is as candidates for Ordained Pioneer Ministry should be resisted unless a vocation to pioneering ministry is absolutely clear. Fifthly, I suggest that dioceses resource the creation of forums for sharing ideas, stories and best practice in relation to an entrepreneurial approach to priestly ministry in the parish. My sixth suggestion is that dioceses circulate accounts of creative approaches to building-related issues and the use of church buildings with the intention of assisting priests and congregations as they seek to discern innovative ways of approaching building-related challenges. The seventh suggestion is that dioceses encourage their entrepreneurial priests to act as consultants to priests and congregations who are eager to explore ways in which they might adopt a more entrepreneurial approach to ministry and mission. My eighth suggestion is that priests and congregations should be given assistance and guidance in creating appropriate and effective partnerships with external bodies such as local authorities. My ninth suggestion is that in rural deaneries 'recognised mission entrepreneurs' should be

identified, equipped, commissioned and supported in engaging in appropriate local ministry and mission. My tenth and final suggestion is that a suitably experienced, qualified and networked person should be appointed with a national brief in relation to entrepreneurship and priestly ministry in the parish. The role would include facilitation, encouragement, support and advocacy, as well as enabling and ideas-sharing across dioceses and denominations, commissioning of appropriate research and publication and dissemination of findings.

Suggested avenues for further research

This doctoral research study has necessarily maintained a clear focus on a particular research objective. However, the findings set out in this chapter suggest a number of potential avenues for further research. These are as follows:

An exploration of the extent to which previously negative perceptions of entrepreneurship in Anglican priests might be altered as a result of in-depth discussion and reflection on alternative understandings of the term, rooted in a range of positive examples.

A study of the experience of a sample of priests, identified as entrepreneurs, during the process of discernment, selection and training for ordained ministry.

An exploration of the understanding of the nature of priestly ministry and the requirements of mission in the current culture held by those involved in discernment and selection for Anglican ordination.

An analysis of reasons (other than retirement or illness) for priests leaving the Church of England with the aim of establishing whether entrepreneurial priests are, in fact, leaving and if so, their motivations for doing so.

An analysis of the impact and effect of significant church building-related issues on priests, congregations and the wider community.

A study of the relationship between the dissemination of power and influence in churches through teams and numerical and spiritual growth. It would also be

fruitful to explore the experience, spirituality, theological position and personality type of priests who have facilitated teams in their congregations.

An analysis of the feasibility and potential challenges, impact and effect of identifying, releasing and supporting recognised mission entrepreneurs in rural parishes.

An exploration of the expectations held by those entering ordained ministry after previous careers and the extent to which these expectations are managed and/or adapted in light of the experience of exercising priestly ministry in the church.

An exploration of the relationship between partnership with external bodies and the creation of social and/or spiritual capital in the wider community. And also between partnerships with external bodies and growth (both spiritual and numerical), in church congregations.

A study of approaches that different priests model to working with congregations, other clergy, local communities and external bodies. It would be helpful to study the effect of different approaches to working with others over time and in a range of contexts. It would be helpful if the factors that prompt and enable priests to work with others and those that keep priests from doing so could be identified and evaluated.

A study in which the presence of factors identified as, 'aiding the exercise of an entrepreneurial approach to ministry in the parish' were discerned and evaluated in churches demonstrating an entrepreneurial approach to ministry and mission. It would be interesting to reflect on the presence or absence of factors identified as 'hindering the exercise of an entrepreneurial approach to ministry in the parish', in churches demonstrating an entrepreneurial approach.

A study in which the presence of factors identified as, 'hindering the exercise of an entrepreneurial approach to ministry in the parish' were discerned and evaluated in churches experiencing numerical decline in the congregation, a lack of engagement with the local community, a general sense of confusion or financial difficulties.

An interesting (and potentially ethically challenging) avenue for further research would be an exploration of the relationship between the presence of

entrepreneurial and non-entrepreneurial archdeacons and the impact and effect on the exercise of entrepreneurship in their archdeaconries. Such a study would take account of the presence of entrepreneurial priests and would need to adopt a comparative methodology.

As with the potential avenue for further research with archdeacons, an exploration of the relationship between the presence of entrepreneurial and non-entrepreneurial bishops and the impact and effect on the exercise of entrepreneurship in their dioceses would be potentially fruitful. Such a study would also take account of the presence of entrepreneurial priests and would need to adopt a comparative methodology, perhaps studying a diocese over time and alongside one or more other dioceses.

Dissemination of research findings

In the academic year 2012 – 2013, during which I completed the writing-up of this doctoral thesis, I presented suitably adapted versions of my findings at the following:

- A conference for young evangelists gathered by the Archbishop of York.
- A gathering of priests from the Church of Sweden.
- The national Vocations Advisers conference.
- The Council for World Mission, Utrecht, Netherlands.
- Durham City Deanery Synod.
- Diocese of Durham CME curate training weekend.
- Methodist Church vision day for Venture FX pioneers.
- CMS Missional Communities and Hubs training day.

The research and findings have impacted on my professional practice as a theological educator and have had a direct impact on the mission and pioneering aspects of the content of the curriculum taken by Anglican ordinands and Methodist student ministers at Cranmer Hall, Durham.

I am a member of the Mission Module Working Group for the Church of England's Common Awards process and co-designed a module on mission

entrepreneurship. This was shaped by the research findings in this thesis. The module is likely to be offered as an option for Anglican ordinands in training in England from 2014.

A working definition of the entrepreneur that I drafted while engaged in this doctoral research study was published in, John Adair, et al., *101 Great Ideas for Growing Healthy Churches* (London: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2012).

I presented the findings of this doctoral research study at the annual Faith in Research Conference at Church House, London on 20 June 2013. The conference

> Aims to present current results from research in contemporary theology so that evidence based policy can develop to influence key change agents in dioceses. It also aims to develop networks of informed practitioners in this area of research.[516]

I am actively exploring the publication of an appropriately adapted version of this thesis as a textbook[517] and an adapted and significantly edited version as a Grove booklet or similar.

Concluding comment

This doctoral thesis is rooted in reflection on my personal experience as a priest and an entrepreneur and draws on deep engagement with the relevant literature and findings emerging from thematic analysis of qualitative interviews with entrepreneurial priests. The thesis has argued that the concept of entrepreneurship offers the Church of England a helpful lens through which to view priestly ministry and an understanding of an approach to priestly ministry in the parish that is well fitted for the current mission task in England. It is hoped that the suggested potential avenues for further research will be pursued and that the findings of this research study will be considered by those within the Church of England who are in a position to implement the suggestions set out, above. I am optimistic about these hopes because during the process of writing up this thesis, the Bishop of Durham, Justin Welby, moved to Lambeth to take up the post of Archbishop of Canterbury. In

---

[516] http://faithinresearch2013.eventbrite.co.uk/ (21/06/13).
[517] At the time of writing I was in negotiations with SPCK about publishing an adapted version of the thesis as part of their Library of Ministry series.

chapter three I noted that Justin Welby is an entrepreneur and, if what we observed of his approach to ministry and mission in Durham continues to mark his approach to leading the Anglican Communion, an entrepreneurial approach to the Christian life, including priestly ministry, is likely to be in evidence. I close with a quotation taken from an interview that I conducted with Justin Welby in January 2012, while he was Bishop of Durham.

> *Entrepreneur*? It's a useful word. I think it's a very useful word because it reminds us that we're meant to innovate and create. It is essential that an entrepreneurial example is set by the people who are responsible for the leading and the organizing.

Bibliography

Adair, John, and John Nelson, (eds.), *Creative Church Leadership* (London: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2004).

Adair, John, *Effective Leadership: How to Grow Leaders: The Seven Key Principles of Effective Leadership Development* (London: Kogan Page, 2005).

Adair, John, *Effective Innovation: The Essential Guide to Staying Ahead of the Competition* (London: Pan Books, 2009).

Adair, John, *Effective Leadership: How to be a Successful Leader* (London: Pan, 2009).

Adair, John, *Leadership for Innovation: How to Organize Team Creativity and Harvest Ideas* (London: Kogan Page, 2009).

Adair, John, et al., *101 Great Ideas for Growing Healthy Churches* (London: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2012).

Aldcroft, Derek H., (1964). 'The Entrepreneur and the British Economy, 1870 – 1914'. *Economic History Review* (2nd ser.), 17: 113-34.

Allen, Diogenes, *Christian Belief in a Postmodern World: The Full Wealth of Conviction* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1989).

Amabile, Teresa M., (1997) *Motivating Creativity in Orgnaisations: On Doing What You Love and Loving What You Do,* California Management Review, 40 (1), 39-58.

Andrews, Molly, Corinne Squire, and Maria Tamboukou, *Doing Narrative Research* (London: Sage, 2008).

Armstrong, Regis J., *Clare of Assisi: The Lady* (New York: New City Press, 2006).

Avis, Paul, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church: An Introduction* (London: SPCK, 2000).

Babbie, Earl, *The Practice of Social Research* (11th ed.) (Belmont, CA: Thomson Higher Education, 2007).

Ballard, Paul, and John Pritchard, *Practical Theology in Action* (London: SPCK, 1996).

Baumol, William J., (1968). 'Entrepreneurship in Economic Theory'. *American Economic Review,* Papers and Proceedings, 58: 64-71.

Barbour, Rosaline, *Introducing Qualitative Research: A Student Guide to the Craft of Doing Qualitative Research* (London: Sage, 2008).

Barth, Karl, *Church Dogmatics: The Doctrine of the Word of God.* (Volume 1.) (1.1) (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark Ltd, 1956).

Bartlett, Alan, *A Passionate Balance: The Anglican Tradition* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd, 2007).

Bartlett, Alan F., *Profile of the Entrepreneur or Machiavellian Management* (Leatherhead: Ashford Press, 1988).

Barton, John, and John Muddiman, (eds.), *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (Oxford: OUP, 2001).

Bayes, Paul, and Tim Sledge, *Mission-Shaped Parish: Traditional Church in a Changing Context* (London: Church House Publishing, 2006).

Bell, Judith, *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First Time Researchers in Education, health and Social Science* (5th ed.), (Maidenhead: McGraw Hill Education, 2010).

Bevans, Stephen B., and Roger P. Schroeder, *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission for Today* (New York: Orbis Books, 2004).

Bloom, Paul N., and Edward Skloot, *Scaling Social Impact: New Thinking* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Boff, Leonardo, and Clodovis Boff, *Introducing Liberation Theology* (New York: Orbis Books, 1996).

Bolton, Bill, and John Thompson, *The Entrepreneur in Focus – Achieve Your Potential* (London: Thomson, 2003).

Bolton, Bill, and John Thompson, *Entrepreneurs: Talent, Temperament, Technique* (2nd ed.), (Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, 2004).

Bolton, Bill, *The Entrepreneur and the Church* (Grove Pastoral Series. P.107) (Cambridge: Grove Books, 2006).

Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams, *The Craft of Research* (3rd ed.), (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).

Bosch, David J., *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (New York: Orbis Books, 1991).

Brafman, Ori, and Rod A. Beckstrom, *The Starfish and the Spider: The Unstoppable Power of Leaderless Organizations* (New York: Penguin, 2006).

Breen, Mike, *Building a Discipling Culture* (Pawleys Island, SC: 3 Dimension Ministries, 2011).

Brockhaus, Robert, H., et al. (eds.), *Entrepreneurship Education: A Global View* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2001).

Brueggemann, Walter, *The Prophetic Imagination* (2nd ed.), (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001).

Caird, Sally, (1991) *The Enterprising Tendency of Occupational Groups.* International Small Business Journal **9** (4), 75-81.

Cameron, Helen, et al., *Talking About God in Practice: Theological Action Research and Practical Theology* (London: SCM Press, 2010).

Cantillon, Richard, *Essai Sur La Nature du Commerce* (London: Macmillan, 1931).

Carey, S. Pearce, and Peter Masters, *William Carey* (London: Wakeman Trust, 1993).

Carr, Wesley, *The Priestlike Task* (London: SPCK, 1985).

Casson, Mark, *The Entrepreneur: An Economic Theory* (Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1982).

Casson, Mark, et al. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship* (Oxford: OUP, 2008).

Checkland, Sydney George, *The Rise of Industrial Society in England 1815-1885* (London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1964).

Chell, Elizabeth, et al., *The Entrepreneurial Personality: Concepts, Cases and Categories* (London: Routledge, 1991).

Chia, Robert, (1996) Teaching Paradigm Shifting in Management Education: University Business Schools and the Entrepreneurial Imagination. *Journal of Management Studies* **33** (4), 409-28.

Cocksworth, Christopher, and Rosaline Brown, *Being a Priest Today: Exploring Priestly Identity* (Norwich: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2002).

Cohen, Louis, Lawrence Manion, and Keith Morrison, *Research Methods in Education* (6th ed.) (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007).

Cole, Neil, *Organic Church: Growing Faith Where Life Happens* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2005).

Collins, Jim, *Good to Great* (London: Random House, 2001).

Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England (London: Church House Publishing, 2000).

Corrie, John, (ed.), *Dictionary of Mission Theology: Evangelical Foundations* (Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2007).

Craddock, Fred B., *Luke: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1990).

Creswell, John, W., *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (3rd ed.) (London: Sage, 2009).

Croft, Steven, (ed.), *Evangelism in a Spiritual Age: Communicating Faith in a Changing Culture* (London: Church House Publishing, 2005).

Croft, Steve, (ed.), *The Future of the Parish System: Shaping the Church of England for the Twenty-first Century* (London: Church House Publishing, 2006).

Croft, Steven, *Ministry in Three Dimensions: Ordination and Leadership in the Local Church* (revised ed.) (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2008).

Croft, Steven, (ed.), *Mission-Shaped Questions: Defining Issues for Today's Church* (London: Church House Publishing, 2008).

Croft, Steven, and Ian Mobsby, *Ancient Faith, Future Mission: Fresh Expressions in the Sacramental Tradition* (London: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2009).

Cromie, Stanley, and John O'Donoghue, (1992) *Assessing Entrepreneurial Inclinations.* International Small Business Journal **10** (2), 66-73.

Czarniawska, Barbara, *Narratives in Social Science Research* (London: Sage, 2004).

Davie, Grace, *Religion in Britain Since 1945: Believing Without Belonging* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1994).

Davis, Oliver, *The Creativity of God: World, Eucharist, Reason* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Davison, Andrew and Alison Milbank, *For the Parish: A Critique of Fresh Expressions* (London: SCM Press, 2010).

Dawson, Catherine, *Introduction to Research Methods* (Oxford: How to Books Limited, 2009).

Deci, Edward L. and Richard M. Ryan, *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behaviour. (*New York: Plenum Press, 1985).

Delmar, Frederic, and Frederic, C. Witte., *The Psychology of the Entrepreneur* in Sarah Carter, and Dylan Jones-Evans, (eds.), *Enterprise and Small Business: Principles, Practice and Policy* (Harlow: Prentice Hall, 2000).

Denscombe, Martyn, *The Good Research Guide: For Small-Scale Social Research Projects* (3rd ed.) (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2007).

Denzin, Norman K., and Yvonna, S. Lincoln, (eds.), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials,* (2nd ed.), (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998).

Doornenbal, Robert, *Crossroads: An Exploration of the Emerging Missional Conversation with a Special Focus on 'Missional Leadership' and its Challenges for Theological Education* (Delft, NL: Eburon Academic Publisher, 2012).

Drane, John, *Cultural Change and Biblical Faith: The Future of the Church. Biblical and Missiological Essays for the New Century* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2000).

Drucker, Peter F., *The New Realities* (London: Heinemann, 1989).

Drucker, Peter F., *Innovation and Entrepreneurship* (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2007).

Duncan, W. Jack, Peter M. Ginter, Andrew C. Rucks, and T. Douglas Jacobs, (1988) Intrapreneurship and the Reinvention of the Corporation. *Business Horizons* **31** (3), 16-21.

Dunn, James D. G., (ed.), *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible* (Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003).

Elkington, John, and Pamala Hartigan, *The Power of Unreasonable People: How Social Entrepreneurs Create Markets That Change the World* (Harvard: Harvard Business School Press, 2008).

Elliot, Jane, *Using Narrative in Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (London: Sage, 2005).

English, Donald, *The Message of Mark* (Leicester: IVP, 1992).

Fayolle, Alain, *Entrepreneurship and New Value Creation: The Dynamic of the Entrepreneurial Process* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Fiddes, Paul S., *Participating in God: A Pastoral Doctrine of the Trinity* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2000).

Fisher, James L., and James V. Koch, *Born not Made: The Entrepreneurial Personality* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2008).

Ford, David, *A Very Short Introduction to Theology* (Oxford: Oxford Paperbacks, 2000).

Ford, David, (ed.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology Since 1918* (3rd ed.), (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005).

Frost, Michael, *Exiles: Living Missionally in Post Christian Culture*, (Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2006).

Frost, Michael and Alan Hirsch, *The Shaping of Things to Come,* (Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2003).

Frost, Rob, David Wilkinson, and Joanne Cox, (eds.), *The Call and the Commission: Equipping a New Generation of Leaders For a New World* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2009).

Gay, Doug, *Remxing the Church: Towards and Emerging Ecclesiology* (London: SCM Press, 2011).

Gibb, Allan A., (1996) Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management: Can We Afford to Neglect Them in the Twenty First Century Business School? *British Journal of Management* **7** (4), 309-22.

Gibb, Allan A., (1990) Entrepreneurship and Intrapreneurship – Exploring the Differences, in Donckels, R. and A. Miettinen (eds) *New Findings and Perspectives in Entrepreneurship.* Aldershot: Gower.

Gibbs, Eddie and Ryan Bolger, *Emerging Churches*, (London: SPCK, 2006).

Gibson, William J. and Andrew Brown, *Working with Qualitative Data* (London: Sage, 2009).

Goodhew, David, (ed.), *Church Growth in Britain: 1980 to the Present* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012).

Goodhew, David, Andrew Roberts, and Michael Volland, *Fresh: An Introduction to Fresh Expressions of Church and Pioneer Ministry* (London: SCM Press, 2012).

Green, Joel, B., *The Gospel of Luke* (Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1997).

Green, Michael, *The Message of Matthew* (Leicester: IVP, 1998).

Greenwood, Robin, *Transforming Priesthood: A New Theology of Mission and Ministry* (London: SPCK, 1994).

Greenwood, Robin, *Being Church: The Formation of Christian Community* (London: SPCK, 2013).

Grundy, Malcolm, *Leadership and Oversight: New Models for Episcopal Ministry* (London: Mowbray, 2011).

Gunton, Colin E., (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Gutierrez, Gustavo, *A Theology of Liberation* (new ed.) (London: SCM Press, 2001).

Handy, Charles, *The Age of Unreason: New Thinking for a New World* (2nd ed.) (London: Random House, 2002).

Harding, Jamie, *Qualitative Data Analysis From Start to Finish* (London: Sage, 2013).

Hare, Douglas A., *Matthew: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1993).

Harrer, Heinrich, *The White Spider: The Story of the North Face of the Eiger* (London: Harper Perennial, 2005).

Harvard Business Review on Entrepreneurship (Boston: HBS Press, 1999).

Harvard Business Review on Innovation (Boston: HBS Press, 2001).

Hattersley, Roy, *Blood and Fire: William and Catherine Booth and the Salvation Army* (London: Abacus, 1999).

Healy, Nicholas M., *Church, World and the Christian Life: Practical-Prophetic Ecclesiology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Heaton, Janet, *Reworking Qualitative Data* (London: Sage, 2004).

Hebert, Robert F., and Albert N. Link, *The Entrepreneur: Mainstream Views and Radical Critiques* (New York: Praeger, 1988).

Hedges, Chris, and Joe Sacco, *Days of Destruction: Days of Revolt* (New York: Nation Books, 2012).

Hennink, Monique, Inge Hutter, and Ajay Bailey, *Qualitative Research Methods* (London: Sage, 2011).

Herman, Luc, and Bart Vervaeck, *Handbook of Narrative Analysis* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2005).

Hirsch, Alan, and Lance Ford, *Right Here, Right Now: Everyday Mission for Everyday People* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2011).

Hirsch, Alan, and Tim Catchim, *The Permenent Revolution: Apostolic Imagination and Practice for the 21st Century Church* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2012).

Hisrich, Robert D., and Michael P. Peters, *Entrepreneurship: Starting, Developing and Managing a New Enterprise* (Homewood IL: Irwin, 1992).

Hockerts, Jeffery, Kai Mair, and Johanna Robinson, (eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship* (Palgrave Macmillian, 2005).

Hockerts, Jeffery, Kai Mair, and Johanna Robinson, (eds.), *Values and Opportunities in Social Entrepreneurship* (Palgrave Macmillian, 2010).

Hollinghurst, Steve, *Mission Shaped Evangelism: The Gospel in Contemporary Culture* (London: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2010).

Honey, Peter, and Alan Mumford, *The Manual of Learning Styles* (London: Peter Honey Publications, 1986).

Hoselitz, Bert, *The Early History of Entrepreneurial Theory: Explorations in Entrepreneurial History 3* (1951).

Hughes, Jonathan, *The Vital Few* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973).

Hull, John, *Mission Shaped Church: A Theological Response* (London: SCM Press, 2006).

Isba, Anne, *The Excellent Mrs Fry: The Unlikely Heroine* (London: Continuum Books, 2010).

Jackson, Bob, *The Road to Growth: Towards a Thriving Church* (London: Church House Publishing, 2005).

Johnson, Spencer, *Who Moved My Cheese?* (London: Vermilion, 1999).

Johnson, Steven, *Where Good Ideas Come From: The Natural History of Innovation* (London: Penguin, 2010).

Jupp, Victor, (ed.), *'Validity'* in *The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods* (London: Sage, 2006a).

Kagawa, Toyohiko, *Living out Christ's Love (Upper Room Spiritual Classics Series 2)* (London: Upper Room Books, 1998).

Kanter, Rosabeth M., *The Change Masters: Corporate Entrepreneurs at Work* (London: Unwin, 1984).

Kao, Raymond, W., *An Entrepreneurial Approach to Corporate Management* (London: Prentice Hall, 1997).

Keck, Leander E., et al., (eds.), *The New Interpreter's Bible* (Vol. 9) *Luke, John* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1995).

Kilby, Peter, M., (ed.), *Entrepreneurship and Economic Development* (New York: Macmillan, 1971).

Kim, Philip, H., and Howard, E. Aldrich, *Social Capital and Entrepreneurship* (Now publishers inc, 2005).

Kirby, David A., and David Mullen. (1989) Developing Enterprising Undergraduates. *Journal of European Industrial Training* **14** (2), 27-32.

Kirby, David A., (1992) Developing Graduate Entrepreneurs: The UK Graduate Enterprise Programme. *Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Change* **1** (2), 165-75.

Kirby, David A., *Entrepreneurship* (Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education, 2003).

Kirzner, Israel M., *Competition and Entrepreneurship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973).

Knight, Frank H., *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1921).

Kolb, Deborah A., *Experiential Learning* (Englewood-Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984).

Kuratko, Donald F., and Richard M. Hodgetts, *Entrepreneurship: A Contemporary Approach* (5th ed.), (Sydney: Harcourt College Publishers, 2001).

Ladd, George Eldon, *A Theology of the New Testament,* (revised ed.), (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 1994).

Landes, David S., Joel Mokyr, and William J. Baumol, (eds.), *The Invention of Enterprise: Entrepreneurship from Ancient Mesopotamia to Modern Times* (Princeton: PUP, 2010).

Lane, Tony, *A Concise History of Christian Thought* (London: T and T Clark, 2006).

Lane, William L., *The Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974).

Lawrence, James, *Growing Leaders: Reflections on Leadership, Life and Jesus* (Oxford: BRF, 2004).

Lee, Nancy Jane, *Achieving Your Professional Doctorate: A Handbook* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2009).

Lessem, Ronnie, *Intrapreneurship: How to be a Successful Individual in a Successful Business* (Aldershot: Wildwood House, 1986b).

Lessem, Ronnie, *Enterprise Development* (Aldershot: Gower, 1986a).

Light, Paul C., *The Search for Social Entrepreneurship* (New York: Brookings Institution, 2008).

Lindbeck, George A., *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1984).

Livesay, Harold C., *Entrepreneurial History*, in Calvin A. Kent, Donald L. Sexton and Karl H. Vesper (eds.) *Enclyclopedia of Entrepreneurship* (Englewood-Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall, 1982).

Male, Dave, (ed.), *Pioneers for Life: Explorations in Theology and Wisdom for Pioneering Leaders* (Abingdon, Oxon: Bible Reading Fellowship, 2011).

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *A History of Christianity: The First Three Thousand Years* (London: Penguin, 2010).

Mc Clelland, David C., *The Achieving Society* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1961).

McGrath, Alister E., *The Genesis of Doctrine: A Study in the Foundation of Doctrinal Criticism* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1990).

McGrath, Alister E., *Christian Theology: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001).
McIntosh, Mark A., *Divine Teaching: An Introduction to Christian Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 2008).

McNiff, Jean, and Jack Whitehead, *Doing and Writing Action Research* (London: Sage, 2009).

Mill, John S., *Principles of Political Economy* The People's Edition. (London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1898).

Milne, Bruce, *The Message of John* (Leicester: IVP, 1993).

Mobsby, Ian J., *Emerging and Fresh Expressions of Church: How Are They Authentically Church and Anglican?* (London: Moot Community Publishing, 2007).

Moynagh, Michael, *Changing World, Changing Church: New Forms of Church* (London: Monarch Books, 2001).

Moynagh, Michael, *Church for Every Context: An Introduction to Theology and Practice* (London: SCM Press, 2012).

Murray, Stuart, *Church After Christendom* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2004).

Murray, Stuart, *Post-Christendom: Church and Mission in a Strange New World* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2004).

Myers, Joseph R., *Organic Community* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2007).

Nelson, John, Michael Lofthouse, and Anton Muller, *101 Great Ideas for Growing Healthy Churches* (London: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2012).

Nelstrop, Louise, and Martyn Percy, (eds.), *Evaluating Fresh Expressions: Explorations in Emerging Church. Responses to the Changing Face of Ecclesiology in the Church of England* (London: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2008).

Newbigin, Lesslie, *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* (London: SPCK, 1989).

Nicholls, Alex, (ed.), *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

NRSV Harper Study Bible (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991).

O'Loughlin, Thomas, *Saint Patrick: The Man and his Works* (London: SPCK, 1999).

Patterson, L. G., *Methodius of Olympus: Divine Sovereignty, Human Freedom, and Life in Christ* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1997).

Pattison, George, *A Short Course in Christian Doctrine* (London: SCM Press, 2005).

Peters, Tom, *Thriving on Chaos: Handbook for a Management Revolution* (London: Pan Books, 1987).

Peters, Tom, *Re-Imagine! Business Excellence in a Disruptive Age* (London: Dorling Kindersley, 2009).

Pritchard, John, *The Life and Work of a Priest* (London: SPCK, 2007).

Rae, David M., (1997) Teaching Entrepreneurship in Asia: Impact of Pedagogical Innovation. *Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Change* **6** (3), 193-227.

Rae, David M., *Entrepreneurship: From Opportunity to Action* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

Ramsey, Michael, *The Christian Priest Today* (revised ed.), (London: SPCK, 1985).

Read, Stuart, et al. *Effectual Entrepreneurship* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2011).

Redfern, Alastair, *Being Anglican* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2004).

Riessman, Catherine K., *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences* (London: Sage, 2008).

Robson, Colin, *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993).

Robson, Michael J. P., *The Cambridge Companion to Francis of Assisi* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Rothwell, Roy, (1983) Innovation and Firm Size: A Case for Dynamic Complementarity; or is Small really Beautiful? *Journal of General Management* **8** (3), 5-25.

Rowland, Christopher, (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Liberation Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Rowland, Deborah, and Malcolm Higgs, *Sustaining Change: Leadership that Works* (San Fancisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2008).

Roxburgh, Alan J., and Fred Romanuk, *The Missional Leader: Equipping Your Church to Reach a Changing World* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2006).

Roxburgh, Alan J., *Missional Map-Making: Skills for Leading in Times of Transition* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010).

Roxburgh, Alan J., *Missional: Joining God in the Neighborhood* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2011).

Sarachek, Bernard, (1978). 'American Entrepreneurs and the Horatio Alger Myth'. *Journal of Economic History,* 38: 439-56.

Sarasvathy, Saras, D., *Effectuation: Elements of Entrepreneurial Expertise* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd, 2008).

Savage, Sarah, and Eolene Boyd-Macmillan, *The Human Face of the Church: A Social Psychology and Pastoral Theology Resource for Pioneer and Traditional Ministry* (London: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2007).

Sayers, Dorothy, L., *The Mind of the Maker* (London: Continuum, 2004).

Schumpeter, Joseph A., *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy* (New York: Harper and Row, 1942).

Schumpeter, Joseph A., *The Theory of Economic Development* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1911, reprinted 1934).

Sedgwick, Peter, *The Enterprise Culture: A Challenging New Theology of Wealth Creation for the 1990's* (London: SPCK, 1992).

Shane, Scott, *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship: The Individual – Opportunity Nexus.* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2003).

Shier-Jones, Angela, *Pioneer Ministry and Fresh Expressions of Church* (London: SPCK, 2009).

Silverman, David, *Doing Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.) (London: Sage, 2010).

Simms, Michael K., *Faith Entrepreneurs: Empowering People by Faith, Nonprofit Organizational Leadership, and Entrepreneurship* (Lincoln, NE: iUniverse, 2006).

Sloyan, Gerard, *John: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1988).

Spencer, Nick, *Parochial Vision: The Future of the English Parish* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2004).

Standing, Roger, (ed.), *As a Fire by Burning: Mission as the Life of the Local Congregation* (London: SCM Press, 2013).

Stevenson, Howard H., and David E. Gumpert, (1985) 'The Heart of Entrepreneurship'. *Harvard Business Review* (March-April), pp.85-94.

Swedberg, Richard, (ed.), *Entrepreneurship: The Social Science View* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Swinton, John, and Harriet Mowatt, *Practical Theology and Qualitative Research* (London: SCM Press, 2006).

Sykes, Stephen, John Booty, and Jonathan Knight, *The Study of Anglicanism* (London: SPCK, 1998).

Taussig, Frank W., *Inventors and Moneymakers* (New York: Macmillan, 1915).

Teresa of Avila (Translated by J. M. Cohen), *The Life of Saint Teresa of Avila by Herself* (London: Penguin Classics, 1987).

Thompson, J. Milburn, *Introducing Catholic Social Thought* (New York: Orbis Books, 2010).

Timmons, Jeffry A., *The Entrepreneurial Mind* (Andover MA: Brick House Publishing, 1989).

Tomkins, Stephen, *John Wesley: A Biography* (London: Lion Books, 2003).

Torry, Malcolm, (ed.), *The Parish. People, Place and Ministry: A Theological and Practical Exploration* (London: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2004).

Van Gelder, Craig, and Dwight J. Zscheile, *The Missional Church in Perspective: Mapping Trends and Shaping the Conversation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011).

Volland, Michael, *Through the Pilgrim Door: Pioneering a Fresh Expression of Church* (Eastbourne: Survivor, 2009).

Von Hayek, Friedrich A., (1937) 'Economics and Knowledge'. *Economica* (New ser.), 4: 33-54.

Von Mises, Ludwig, *Human Action: A Treaties on Economics* (London: Hodge, 1949).

Walker, Andrew, *Telling the Story: Gospel, Mission and Culture* (London: SPCK, 1996).

Walker, Simon P., *Leading out of Who You Are: Discovering the Secret of Undefended Leadership* (Carlisle: Piquant Editions Ltd, 2007).

Walker, Simon P., *Leading With Nothing to Lose: Training in the Exercise of Power* (Carlisle: Piquant Editions Ltd, 2007).

Walker, Simon P., *Leading With Everything to Give: Lessons from the Success and Failure of Western Capitalism* (Carlisle: Piquant Editions Ltd, 2009).

Ward, Frances, *Lifelong Learning: Theological Education and Supervision* (London: SCM Press, 2005).

Ward, Pete, *Liquid Church* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2002).

Ward, Pete, *Participation and Mediation: A Practical Theology for the Liquid Church* (London: SCM Press, 2008).

Weber, Robert E., *Ancient-Future Faith: Rethinking Evangelicalism for a Postmodern World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999).

Wells, Samuel and Sarah Coakley, (eds.), *Praying for England: Priestly Presence in Contemporary Culture* (London: Continuum, 2008).

Wheatley, Margaret J., *Leadership and the New Science: Discovering Order in a Chaotic World* (3rd ed.), (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc, 2006).

Wickham, Philip A., *Strategic Entrepreneurship: A decision-Making Approach to New Venture Creation and Management.* (London: Pitman Publishing, 1998).

Williams, Rowan, *On Christian Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2000).

Wittgenstein, Ludwig, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (London: Routledge Classics, 2001).

Wright, Christopher J. H., *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative* (Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 2006).

Wright, N. T., *The New Testament and the People of God* (London: SPCK, 1992).

Wright, N. T., *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 2004).

Wright, Walter C., *Relational Leadership: A Biblical Model for Leadership Service* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster Press, 2000).

Reports

The Archbishop's Council, *Breaking New Ground: Church Planting in the Church of England* (London: Church House Publishing, 1994).

Okorocha, Cyril C., (ed.), *The Cutting Edge of Mission: A Report of the Mid-Point Review of the Decade of Evangelism* (London: Anglican Communion Publications, 1996).

National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. *Higher Education in the Learning Society: Report of the National Committee.* (London: HMSO, 1997).

The Archbishop's Council, *Mission Shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expression of Church in a Changing Context* (London: Church House Publishing, 2004).

The Ministry Division of the Archbishop's Council, *Formation for Ministry Within a Learning Church. Shaping the Future: New Patterns of Training for Lay and Ordained* (London: Church House Publishing, 2006).

Fresh Expressions Presentation to the General Synod (London, 2007).

Ministry Council Report: *Review of the Selection Procedures for Ordained Pioneer Ministry* (London, The Archbishop's Council, 2010).

Graham Cray, *Ordained Pioneer Ministry: A Report for the Ministry Council* (2011).

The Archbishop's Council and the Trustees for Methodist Church Purposes, *Fresh Expressions in the Mission of the Church: Report of an Anglican-Methodist Working Party* (London: Church House Publishing, 2012).

Stephen Ferns, *Report on Attendance at Bishop's Advisory Panels for Ministry Council* (2013).