

Transformation 2.0: Baseline Survey Summary Report

Authorized by:
The Presbytery of Cincinnati
Congregational Development Task Force

Conducted and Produced by The Missional Network

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Understanding How to Read and Interpret This Report	5
Section I: Who Took the Survey?	6
Summary of Key Findings:	6
Section I: Who Took the Survey?	7
Participation in Transformation 2.0:	7
Age:	7
Gender:.....	7
Ethnicity:.....	8
Size of Sunday Worship Attendance of Congregation:.....	8
Lay Persons Length of Time in Congregation:.....	9
Do you have an official elected role in your congregation?	9
Official Elected Role in local congregation:.....	10
Pastors Length of Time in Presbytery:.....	10
Elected or Appointed Role in Presbytery:	10
Role in the Presbytery:	11
Section II: Personal Faith and Ministry Practices	12
Summary of Key Findings:	12
Section II: Personal Faith and Ministry Practices	13
Q1: “Last year, how many times have you done the following?”	13
Q2: Would you say that the church has helped you discover opportunities to engage and/or serve in ministry within your local community context?	18
Q3: How active would you say you are in ministering/serving in your local community context?	18
Q4: Would you say your church has helped you understand your daily vocation/work as a way you can serve in ministry?.....	19
Q5: How often would you say you feel like you are partnering with God in the midst of your daily work?.....	19
Q6: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your relationships inside and outside the congregation.	20
Section III: Congregations and Their Practices	23
Summary of Key Findings:	23
Section III: Congregation	24
Part 1: Characteristics of Congregation	24
Q18: In what type of community is your church building located?.....	24
Q19: In what type of community is the home you live in located?	24
Q12: How would you assess your congregation at present?.....	25
Q13: To what do you attribute the growth in attendance?	25
Q14: To what do you attribute the decline in attendance?	25
Q15: To what do you attribute the plateau in attendance?.....	25
Part 2: Ministry of the Congregation	26
Q27: How important are each of the following in your understanding of what the church’s mission should be?	26
Q27: How important are each of the following in your understanding of what the church’s mission should be?	27

Q29: How engaged would you say your local congregation is in its local context?	32
Q30: How well would you say your congregation understands the challenges and opportunities of its local community context?.....	32
Q31: Do you believe that God is present and active in the community around your congregation?.....	33
Q32: How comfortable are you naming examples of ways you see God at work in the local context your congregation is in?	33
Q34: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your congregation and its local context.	34
Q35: What is the biggest obstacle to your congregation partnering with God’s work in your local context? (write in below).....	38
Section IV: Presbytery.....	39
Summary of Key Findings:.....	39
Section IV: Presbytery	41
Q7: Familiarity/Participation with Presbytery:.....	41
Q33: How would you evaluate the current state of your faith personally and the vitality of your local congregation?.....	42
Q33: How would you evaluate the current state of the Presbytery of Cincinnati and the PC(USA)?	43
Q36: Which best describes the CURRENT relationship between congregations and the Presbytery?	44
Q37: What SHOULD be the relationship between congregations and the Presbytery?	45
Q39: Please rank the following statements about the governance of the Presbytery of Cincinnati.....	46
Q39: Please rank the following statements about the governance of the Presbytery of Cincinnati.....	47
Q40: Rank the following statements about how differences are handled in the Presbytery.....	48
Q41: How hopeful are you about the future life and ministry of the Presbytery of Cincinnati?.....	52
Q42: How much hope do each of the following provide for the future of the Presbyterian Church in this area?.....	53
Q38: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the present organizational culture of the Presbytery of Cincinnati as a whole.....	60
Q43: Finally, please add your own comments about the present culture of the Presbytery of Cincinnati and it’s future.....	68

Transformation 2.0 Baseline Summary: Understanding How to Read and Interpret This Report

Who took this survey?

254 people took this survey. They were invited to participate in the survey by answer the questions online through a tool called Survey Monkey, primarily during the month of February 2015.

How to Read Statistical Tables:

Each table will show the variable label(s) in the left column. The “valid percent” column shows the percentage breakdown of the valid responses to each question. This column removes any “I don’t know” or “not sure” responses, as well as eliminating any responses that failed to answer the question.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	59	23.2	24.9	24.9
	No	178	70.1	75.1	100.0
	Total	237	93.3	100.0	
Missing	Missing	17	6.7		
Total		254	100.0		

Understanding “Mean”

The “Mean” score listed below each table will show the average of the all the scores collected. In general, a lower score will indicate less support for the statement, and a higher score will indicated more support for the statement.

Differences Between Groups

In Section IV this report will show whether or not there are significant differences between how people responded to the above questions based on Age, Participation in 2.0, Ethnicity, or Size of Worship Attendance.

Section I: Who Took the Survey?

Summary of Key Findings:

- **Total Participants:** A total of 254 persons completed this survey.
- **Transformation 2.0 Participants:** A total of 125 of the persons participating are involved in some way in the Transformation 2.0 process—52.5%.
- **Non-Participants Transformation 2.0:** There were 113 persons who took the survey who are not directly involved in some way in the 2.0 process—47.5%. 16 persons did not answer the questions related to their participating in Transformation 2.0.
- **Age of Participants:** Approximately 76% of the persons who took this survey (176) are age 55 or older, which represents those from the baby boom and traditional generations.
- **Gender of Participants:** The gender of those taking the survey was fairly equal—53% female and 47% male.
- **Race/Ethnicity of Participants:** The overwhelming majority of persons taking the survey were white—95%.
- **Congregation Size of Participants:** Approximately 50% of participants attend congregations with less than 100 in worship on a weekly basis; with 21% attending congregations with 200+ in worship.
- **Lay Participants and Their Length of Time of Lay Participants in Congregations:** Of the total of 182 lay participants taking the survey, 54.4 percent had been in their congregations for 20+ years.
- **Pastor Participants and Their Length of Time in the Presbytery:** Of the 40 pastors who took the survey, 47.5% have been in the Presbytery less than 10 years, while 27.5% have been present for over 20 years.
- **Elected or Appointed Role of Participants in Presbytery:** There were 59 persons, representing 25% of the participants, who had either an elected or appointed role in Presbytery.

Section I: Who Took the Survey?

Participation in Transformation 2.0:

The survey was completed by 254 people. Of that group, 125 people are participating in Transformation 2.0 in some form (and some in multiple ways), 113 people are not involved in the process (16 people did not answer the question about their participation).

Pres. Council Member	7.6% (17)
CDTF Member	8.0% (18)
Guiding Team Member	17.4% (39)
Pastoral Leader	5.8% (13)
Coach	3.6% (8)
Lay Person in 2.0 Cong.	28.6% (64)
Not Part of 2.0	47.5% (113)

Age:

The ages of respondents in the survey are summarized into four major age categories below. 75.8% of respondents were over 55 years of age.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 70+	56	22.0	25.6	25.6
55-70	110	43.3	50.2	75.8
40-55	39	15.4	17.8	93.6
Under 40	14	5.5	6.4	100.0
Total	219	86.2	100.0	
Missing Missing	35	13.8		
Total	254	100.0		

***The Mean birth year was 1953.**

Gender:

More female participants (53.5%) than male participants in the study.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Female	123	48.4	53.5	53.5
Male	107	42.1	46.5	100.0
Total	230	90.6	100.0	
Missing Missing	24	9.4		
Total	254	100.0		

Ethnicity:

The survey was completed predominantly by White participants (95.1%).

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid White	214	84.3	95.1	95.1
Black or African-American	8	3.1	3.6	98.7
Asian	2	.8	.9	99.6
From multiple races	1	.4	.4	100.0
Total	225	88.6	100.0	
Missing Missing	29	11.4		
Total	254	100.0		

Size of Sunday Worship Attendance of Congregation:

Churches with a Sunday attendance of 149 persons or less made up 72.9% of the responses.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Less than 50	65	25.6	28.4	28.4
50-99	49	19.3	21.4	49.8
100-149	53	20.9	23.1	72.9
150-199	6	2.4	2.6	75.5
200-249	13	5.1	5.7	81.2
250-299	17	6.7	7.4	88.6
300+	26	10.2	11.4	100.0
Total	229	90.2	100.0	
Missing Not sure	7	2.8		
Missing Missing	18	7.1		
Total	25	9.8		
Total	254	100.0		

Lay Persons Length of Time in Congregation:

More than half of the participants in this survey (54.4%) have been involved in their congregation for more than 20 years, while 14.3% have been in their congregation less than 4 years.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Less than 1 year	2	.8	1.1	1.1
1 to 2 years	12	4.7	6.6	7.7
3 to 4 years	12	4.7	6.6	14.3
5 to 9 years	21	8.3	11.5	25.8
10 to 14 years	16	6.3	8.8	34.6
15 to 19 years	20	7.9	11.0	45.6
20+ years	99	39.0	54.4	100.0
Total	182	71.7	100.0	
Missing I am not a lay person in my congregation	50	19.7		
Missing	22	8.7		
Total	72	28.3		
Total	254	100.0		

Do you have an official elected role in your congregation?

More than half (51.6%) of respondents to the survey have an elected role in their congregation?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	131	51.6	55.5	55.5
No	105	41.3	44.5	100.0
Total	236	92.9	100.0	
Missing Missing	18	7.1		
Total	254	100.0		

Official Elected Role in local congregation:
 65.5% of participants in the survey were Ruling Elders.

Deacon	14.4% (20)
Ruling Elder on Session	42.5% (59)
RE Not Currently Serving	18.0% (25)
Commissioned Ruling Elder	5.0% (7)
Teaching Elder	20.1% (28)

Pastors Length of Time in Presbytery:

The length of service in the Presbytery is combined into three groups below. Slightly less than half (47.5%) of the pastoral leaders have been in the Presbytery less than 10 years.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Less than 10 Years	19	7.5	47.5	47.5
10-19 Years	10	3.9	25.0	72.5
More than 20 Years	11	4.3	27.5	100.0
Total	40	15.7	100.0	
Missing I don't know	15	5.9		
Missing	199	78.3		
Total	214	84.3		
Total	254	100.0		

Elected or Appointed Role in Presbytery:

One quarter (24.9%) of the respondents were persons with an elected or appointed role in the Presbytery.

Q22ElectedRolePresby

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	59	23.2	24.9	24.9
No	178	70.1	75.1	100.0
Total	237	93.3	100.0	
Missing Missing	17	6.7		
Total	254	100.0		

Role in the Presbytery:

Some respondents have more than one role in the Presbytery (i.e RE on Council and CDTF).

RE on Pres. Council	13.2% (10)
RE on Pres. Committee	23.7% (18)
RE on CDTF	1.3% (1)
RE not currently serving	9.2% (7)
Commissioned RE	11.8% (9)
TE Serving a Cong.	27.6% (21)
TE in other service	9.2% (7)
Honorably Retired TE	3.9% (3)

Section II: Personal Faith and Ministry Practices

Summary of Key Findings:

- ***Participation in Local Ministry:*** Overall, the majority of participants are fairly active in and through their local church in ministering in their local community, 93% report being “occasionally active” to “very active,” and over 50% are “active” to “very active”
- ***Involvement of Participants in Ministry Activities:***
 - Almost half, 46.6%, serve at least monthly in a local community organization
 - Over half, 54.5%, engage 1-4 times yearly in community outreach, with 30% doing so at least monthly
 - Close to half, 44.4%, lead meetings or ministry team activities
 - Over a third, 36%, reach out to a neighbor in need at least monthly
 - Over 60% have been invited to neighbor’s house for a meal at least 1-4 times year
 - Approximately 65% share their faith story with a non-believer at least 1-4 times year
 - Approximately 84% listen to a neighbor or co-workers faith story at least 1-4 times a year
 - About 12% engage in a non-local cross cultural mission trip at least 1-4 times a year, while 30% engage in a local cross cultural mission activity at least 1-4 times a year
 - Over 70% invite a neighbor or co-worker to worship at their church at least 1-4 times a year
- ***Local Church Helped Ministry Participation in Local Community:*** Almost 80% report their congregation has helped them discover opportunities to serve in ministry in their local community area.
- ***Church Helped Understand Daily Vocation/Work as Service to Others:*** Over 75% report their church has helped them understand their daily work as being service in ministry.
- ***Partnering with God through Daily Work:*** Over 95% understand their daily work from the perspective of partnering with God in ministry.
- ***Relationships with Those Not in Congregation:***
 - Over 29% have developed most of their friendships outside of their congregation
 - Over 46% spend the majority of their free time with persons not in their congregation
 - Over 44% have significant relationships with neighbors in their local community and 55% have significant relationships with person who are not Christians

Section II: Personal Faith and Ministry Practices

Q1: “Last year, how many times have you done the following?”

“...served with a local community organization outside my church.”

Respondents to the survey are fairly active in serving in local community organizations. Almost half (46.6%) are serving at least monthly, some weekly and daily with local community organizations. This suggests there already exists a significant group of people who are positioned to begin naming what God is doing in these local communities outside of the church.

Q1ServeLocal

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	42	16.5	17.0	17.0
1-4 times this year	90	35.4	36.4	53.4
At least monthly	61	24.0	24.7	78.1
Weekly	42	16.5	17.0	95.1
Daily	12	4.7	4.9	100.0
Total	247	97.2	100.0	
Missing I don't know	2	.8		
Missing	5	2.0		
Total	7	2.8		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 2.56.**

“...participated in an outreach program in my church.”

The majority of respondents (54.5%) engage in an outreach program 1-4 times per year, and 29.9% engage in an outreach program at least monthly. It is interesting to compare the number of respondents engaged in a local community organization at least monthly (46.6%) with the number engaged at the same frequency in outreach programs (29.9%).

Q1Outreach

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	38	15.0	15.6	15.6
1-4 times this year	133	52.4	54.5	70.1
At least monthly	48	18.9	19.7	89.8
Weekly	21	8.3	8.6	98.4
Daily	4	1.6	1.6	100.0
Total	244	96.1	100.0	
Missing I don't know	6	2.4		
Missing	4	1.6		
Total	10	3.9		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 2.26.**

Q1: “Last year, how many times have you done the following?”
“...led a meeting or an activity of a ministry team.”

Respondents were evenly split on their experience of leading meetings or ministry team activities; 55.6% rarely lead in these ways, while 44.4% lead at least monthly.

Q1Led

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	86	33.9	36.0	36.0
	1-4 times this year	47	18.5	19.7	55.6
	At least monthly	66	26.0	27.6	83.3
	Weekly	31	12.2	13.0	96.2
	Daily	9	3.5	3.8	100.0
	Total	239	94.1	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	5	2.0		
	Missing	10	3.9		
	Total	15	5.9		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.29.**

“...personally reached out to a neighbor in need.”

Engaging with neighbors in need is not a regular practice for most of the respondents. 63.9% of respondents reach out to neighbors in need a few times a year or less. Only 10.7% engage with neighbors’ needs on weekly basis.

Q1NeighborNeed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	20	7.9	8.2	8.2
	1-4 times this year	136	53.5	55.7	63.9
	At least monthly	62	24.4	25.4	89.3
	Weekly	19	7.5	7.8	97.1
	Daily	7	2.8	2.9	100.0
	Total	244	96.1	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	7	2.8		
	Missing	3	1.2		
	Total	10	3.9		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 2.41.**

Q1: “Last year, how many times have you done the following?”
“...been invited over to a neighbor's house for a meal.”

A vast majority of respondents have eaten at a neighbor’s house in the last year (88.5%). Very few respondents (10.7%) are in the habit of eating at neighbors’ homes on a regular basis (monthly or more often).

Q1NeighborMeal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	95	37.4	39.1	39.1
	1-4 times this year	120	47.2	49.4	88.5
	At least monthly	26	10.2	10.7	99.2
	Weekly	2	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	243	95.7	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	7	2.8		
	Missing	4	1.6		
	Total	11	4.3		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 1.73.**

“...shared my faith story with a non-believer.” Respondents shared their faith very occasionally—49.3% shared less than 4 times in the last year, and 35.2% didn’t share their faith at all.

Q1SharedFaith

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	80	31.5	35.2	35.2
	1-4 times this year	112	44.1	49.3	84.6
	At least monthly	25	9.8	11.0	95.6
	Weekly	10	3.9	4.4	100.0
	Total	227	89.4	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	21	8.3		
	Missing	6	2.4		
	Total	27	10.6		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 1.85.**

Q1: “Last year, how many times have you done the following?”
“...listened to the faith story of a neighbor or co-worker.”

A vast majority of respondents have heard the faith story of a neighbor or co-worker in the last year (78.4%). For 21.6% of respondents, hearing faith stories of neighbors and co-workers is a regular practice (monthly or more often).

Q1ListenNeighbor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	38	15.0	16.1	16.1
	1-4 times this year	147	57.9	62.3	78.4
	At least monthly	34	13.4	14.4	92.8
	Weekly	16	6.3	6.8	99.6
	Daily	1	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	236	92.9	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	13	5.1		
	Missing	5	2.0		
	Total	18	7.1		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.13.**

“...participated in a non-local cross-cultural mission trip.”

There is very little non-local cross-cultural experience among the respondents. 87.5% of respondents have never been on a non-local cross-cultural mission trip. This could be an indicator of the capacity of respondents to engage cross-culturally on a regular basis, which is a key skill in discovering God at work in new spaces.

Q1NonLocalXCulture

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	196	77.2	87.5	87.5
	1-4 times this year	28	11.0	12.5	100.0
	Total	224	88.2	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	14	5.5		
	Missing	16	6.3		
	Total	30	11.8		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 1.13.**

Q1: “Last year, how many times have you done the following?”
“...participated in a local cross-cultural mission trip.”

The majority of respondents have not engaged in a local cross-cultural mission trip (70%). More people have had this experience than have had a non-local cross-cultural trip (26.5% have done this 1—4 times in the last year). Overall, experience cross-culturally is low for those who took the survey. This is important to examine more closely when we begin to move towards experimenting with engaging people in neighborhoods who are different from the congregations participating in Transformation 2.0.

Q1LocalXCulture

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	161	63.4	70.0	70.0
	1-4 times this year	61	24.0	26.5	96.5
	At least monthly	8	3.1	3.5	100.0
	Total	230	90.6	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	11	4.3		
	Missing	13	5.1		
	Total	24	9.4		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 1.33.**

“...invited a neighbor or co-worker to worship with me at my church.”

The vast majority of respondents rarely, if ever, invite neighbors or co-workers to worship with them (88.0%).

Q1InviteWorship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	69	27.2	29.6	29.6
	1-4 times this year	136	53.5	58.4	88.0
	At least monthly	22	8.7	9.4	97.4
	Weekly	4	1.6	1.7	99.1
	Daily	2	.8	.9	100.0
	Total	233	91.7	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	13	5.1		
	Missing	8	3.1		
	Total	21	8.3		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 1.86.**

Q2: Would you say that the church has helped you discover opportunities to engage and/or serve in ministry within your local community context?

A vast majority of respondents feel that their church has helped them discover opportunities to engage in their local context (79.5%). This is a significant strength of the local congregations represented in the survey.

Q2ChurchtoLocal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	194	76.4	79.5	79.5
	No	33	13.0	13.5	93.0
	Not Sure	17	6.7	7.0	100.0
	Total	244	96.1	100.0	
Missing	9.00	10	3.9		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 1.27.**

Q3: How active would you say you are in ministering/serving in your local community context?

About half of respondents (49.8%) do not consider themselves very active in serving within their local community context, while the other half (50.2%) are regularly engaged in their local community.

Q3HowActiveLocal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not active at all	17	6.7	7.0	7.0
	Occasionally active	104	40.9	42.8	49.8
	Active	81	31.9	33.3	83.1
	Very active	41	16.1	16.9	100.0
	Total	243	95.7	100.0	
Missing		11	4.3		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 2.60.**

Q4: Would you say your church has helped you understand your daily vocation/work as a way you can serve in ministry?

Over 75% of respondents feel that their church has been helpful in understanding their daily vocation/work as a way they can serve in ministry. This is a critical capacity that needs to be explored in more detail as we continue to talk about God’s activity in spaces outside of church buildings.

Q4DailyVocation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	152	59.8	75.2	75.2
	No	50	19.7	24.8	100.0
	Total	202	79.5	100.0	
Missing	Not Sure	40	15.7		
	Missing	12	4.7		
	Total	52	20.5		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 1.25.**

Q5: How often would you say you feel like you are partnering with God in the midst of your daily work?

Respondents have a strong sense of partnership with God in their daily work, 72% said they sense this partnership “often” or “daily.”

Q5FreqPartnerGod

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	3	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Once or twice in my life	9	3.5	3.7	4.9
	Once in a while	56	22.0	23.0	28.0
	Often	92	36.2	37.9	65.8
	Daily	83	32.7	34.2	100.0
	Total	243	95.7	100.0	
Missing		11	4.3		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 4.0.**

Q6: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your relationships inside and outside the congregation.

“I have developed most of my friendships through connections made in my local congregation.”

Respondents are split pretty evenly on relational connections made in their local congregation. 37.6% have developed most of the relationships at church, but 29.1% have not.

Q6MostRelCong

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	18	7.1	7.7	7.7
Disagree	50	19.7	21.4	29.1
Both Agree and Disagree	78	30.7	33.3	62.4
Agree	53	20.9	22.6	85.0
Strongly Agree	35	13.8	15.0	100.0
Total	234	92.1	100.0	
Missing Missing	20	7.9		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.12.**

“I spend most of my free time with people who are not a part of my local congregation.”

Almost half (46.4%) of respondents said they spend most of their free time with people who are not part of their local congregation. Approximately one-quarter (23.4%) do spend the majority of their time with people in their congregation. Relationships with people outside of the local congregation are critical for discovering how God might be inviting us into new kinds of participation with God.

Q6MostRelOutCong

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	8	3.1	3.4	3.4
Disagree	47	18.5	20.0	23.4
Both Agree and Disagree	71	28.0	30.2	53.6
Agree	64	25.2	27.2	80.9
Strongly Agree	45	17.7	19.1	100.0
Total	235	92.5	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	2	.8		
Missing	17	6.7		
Total	19	7.5		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.39.**

Q6: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your relationships inside and outside the congregation.

“I have significant relationships with the people who live in my neighborhood.”

While a third of respondents said they don’t have significant relationships with people in their neighborhoods, 44.1% said they do have significant relationships with neighbors.

Q6SignRelNeighborhood

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	9	3.5	3.8	3.8
Disagree	70	27.6	29.7	33.5
Both Agree and Disagree	53	20.9	22.5	55.9
Agree	75	29.5	31.8	87.7
Strongly Agree	29	11.4	12.3	100.0
Total	236	92.9	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	1	.4		
Missing	17	6.7		
Total	18	7.1		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.19.**

“I highly value the relationships I have with people in my local congregation.”

Relationships within the local congregations represented in the survey are extremely valuable to almost all the respondents (90.2%). This likely represents the “tight-knit” nature of the congregations involved. While this is a great strength in many ways, it may be a challenge for communities to increase their capacity for engage new persons they encounter as they seek to look outside their current relationships into the neighborhoods they exist in.

Q6RelCongHighValue

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	2	.8	.9	.9
Disagree	2	.8	.9	1.7
Both Agree and Disagree	19	7.5	8.1	9.8
Agree	80	31.5	34.0	43.8
Strongly Agree	132	52.0	56.2	100.0
Total	235	92.5	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	2	.8		
Missing	17	6.7		
Total	19	7.5		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 4.44.**

Q6: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your relationships inside and outside the congregation.

“I have significant friendships with people who are not Christians.”

More than half of respondents (55%) have significant relationships with people who are not Christians. In contrast, 26.6% of respondents have little to no relationships with people who are not Christians.

Q6SignRelNonXian

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	7	2.8	3.1	3.1
Disagree	54	21.3	23.6	26.6
Both Agree and Disagree	42	16.5	18.3	45.0
Agree	72	28.3	31.4	76.4
Strongly Agree	54	21.3	23.6	100.0
Total	229	90.2	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	8	3.1		
Missing	17	6.7		
Total	25	9.8		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.49.**

Section III: Congregations and Their Practices

Summary of Key Findings:

- ***Location of Congregation Building and Member Homes:***
 - Just over 50% of the congregations of participants are located in suburbs while approximately 29% are located in the urban core and adjacent city neighborhoods.
 - Approximately 56% of the participant homes are located in a suburb while 20% live in city settings.

- ***Congregation Growth Patterns at Present:***
 - 17.5% of participants are in congregations growing in attendance
 - 39% of participants are in congregations declining in attendance
 - 43.5% of participants are in congregations plateaued in attendance

- ***Understanding the church's mission:***

The top four items selected were the following ...

 - Equip members for ministry in daily life—79.1% participants selected
 - Focus on preaching good news God's reign over life—77.6% participants selected
 - Create inclusive community where persons different not marginalized—77.3% participants selected
 - Bring persons into life transforming relationship with Jesus—71.9% participants selected

The next three highest scored items were the following ...

 - Meet peoples spiritual needs in our complex world—66.8% participants selected
 - Advocate for poor, marginalized, and oppressed—61.8% participants selected
 - Foster reconciliation within individuals, families, communities, and the world—61.8% participants selected

- ***Congregations and Their Local Context:***
 - 53.5% participants say congregations are engaged to very engaged in context
 - 47.8% participants say congregations are fairly well to very well in understanding
 - 98.1% participants say they see God active and present in local context
 - 60.4% participants are comfortable naming examples God in local context
 - 73.8% participants say congregation encourages engagement in local context
 - 52.7% participants say regularly hear stories how God working in local context
 - 48.8% participants see selves as sent as missionaries in local context
 - 72.7% participants say community would miss church if it were gone tomorrow
 - 56.4% participants say church would be dramatically different in another context
 - 45.8% participants say regularly try new ways to partner with God in context
 - 29.7% participants say church members live same neighborhood as church
 - 43.7% participants say church has meaningful relationships other local churches
 - 51.9% participants say church is very relevant within its local context

Section III: Congregation
Part 1: Characteristics of Congregation

Q18: In what type of community is your church building located?

Half of participating congregations (50.4%) are in a suburban setting, another 37.7% are located in a city setting (i.e. Downtown, Older City Neighborhood, or Urban Fringe), and 11.8% are in a small town or rural setting.

Q18WhereChurch

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Downtown	25	9.8	10.6	10.6
Older City Neighborhood	43	16.9	18.2	28.8
Suburban	119	46.9	50.4	79.2
Urban Fringe	21	8.3	8.9	88.1
Small Town	18	7.1	7.6	95.8
Rural	10	3.9	4.2	100.0
Total	236	92.9	100.0	
Missing Missing	18	7.1		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 2.97.**

Q19: In what type of community is the home you live in located?

55.7% respondents live in suburban communities, 30% live in city settings (i.e. Downtown, Older City Neighborhood, or Urban Fringe), and 14.4% in small town or rural settings.

Q19WhereLive

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Downtown	7	2.8	3.0	3.0
Older City Neighborhood	41	16.1	17.3	20.3
Suburban	132	52.0	55.7	75.9
Urban Fringe	23	9.1	9.7	85.7
Small Town	22	8.7	9.3	94.9
Rural	12	4.7	5.1	100.0
Total	237	93.3	100.0	
Missing Missing	17	6.7		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.20.**

Q12: How would you assess your congregation at present?

A vast majority (82.5%) of congregations represented in the Transformation 2.0 survey are either declining or plateaued in attendance. This is an important factor to consider when working towards experimenting with new forms of engaging with God, as the pressures of maintaining existing ministries and facilities can overwhelm new efforts.

Q12CurrentAssess

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Growing in attendance	39	15.4	17.5	17.5
Declining in attendance	87	34.3	39.0	56.5
Plateaued in attendance	97	38.2	43.5	100.0
Total	223	87.8	100.0	
Missing Don't know	14	5.5		
Missing	17	6.7		
Total	31	12.2		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean of this variable is 2.26.**

Q13: To what do you attribute the growth in attendance?

38 Respondents commented on why their church is growing, some gave multiple reasons:

- 24 attributed the growth the leadership of the Pastor
- 12 attributed to growth to a culture of invitation and welcome
- 5 attributed growth to strength of programming
- 4 attributed growth to the focus on young adults and families
- 3 attributed growth to community involvement

Q14: To what do you attribute the decline in attendance?

81 respondents gave comments about why their church was in decline, some gave multiple reasons:

- 33 attributed decline to an aging membership
- 21 attributed decline to issues with the PC(USA), internal strife, or church split
- 15 attributed decline to lack pastoral leadership of some kind
- 6 attributed decline to cultural changes
- 6 attributed decline to poor programming/worship offerings
- 4 attributed decline to loss of people to competing churches

Q15: To what do you attribute the plateau in attendance?

89 respondents gave comments about why their church attendance has plateaued, some gave multiple reasons:

- 16 people attributed the plateau to the aging of the membership
- 12 attributed the plateau to changes in culture and neighborhood
- 10 attributed the plateau to pastoral leadership challenges
- 6 attributed the plateau to lack of willingness/commitment by members
- 5 attributed the plateau to church split and internal strife
- 4 attributed the plateau to issues with the PC(USA)

Part 2: Ministry of the Congregation

Q27: How important are each of the following in your understanding of what the church's mission should be?

The following table represents the number of respondents who said the following mission emphases were "very important" or "absolutely essential." See below for definitions of each mission choice.

Mission I	79.1% (182)
Mission H	77.6% (173)
Mission B	77.3% (174)
Mission A	71.9% (164)
Mission E	66.8% (147)
Mission G	61.8% (141)
Mission D	61.8% (139)
Mission C	41.3% (85)
Mission F	39.8% (90)

When asked for which of these mission choices were most important to them, Mission A was most selected by respondents. Mission I was most selected by respondents as their second choice.

- A. Local congregations need to bring people into a life-transforming relationship with Jesus as Savior and Lord.
- B. Local congregations need to create an inclusive community in which persons who are different are not marginalized.
- C. Local congregations need to engage in healing the sick.
- D. Local congregations should foster reconciliation within individuals, families, communities, and the world.
- E. Local congregations need to meet people's spiritual needs in today's competitive spiritual marketplace.
- F. Local congregations should focus on building and supporting educational, social service and other community service institutions.
- G. Local congregations need to advocate for the poor, marginalized, and oppressed.
- H. Local congregations should focus on preaching the good news of God's reign over the whole of human life.
- I. Local congregations need to equip the church's members for ministry in daily life.

Q27: How important are each of the following in your understanding of what the church's mission should be?

“A. Local congregations need to bring people into a life-transforming relationship with Jesus as Savior and Lord.” 71.9% of respondents said that this version of the mission of the church was “very important” or “absolutely essential.” Only 9.6% of respondents thought this wasn't an important focus for the church.

Q27MissionA

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not important	7	2.8	3.1	3.1
Somewhat important	15	5.9	6.6	9.6
Important	42	16.5	18.4	28.1
Very important	62	24.4	27.2	55.3
Absolutely Essential	102	40.2	44.7	100.0
Total	228	89.8	100.0	
Missing I don't know	3	1.2		
Missing	23	9.1		
Total	26	10.2		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 4.04.**

“B. Local congregations need to create an inclusive community in which persons who are different are not marginalized.” 77.3% of respondents said that this version of the mission of the church was “very important” or “absolutely essential.” Inclusivity is a high value for most respondents when thinking about the church's mission.

Q27MissionB

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Not important	1	.4	.4	.4
Somewhat important	16	6.3	7.1	7.6
Important	34	13.4	15.1	22.7
Very important	80	31.5	35.6	58.2
Absolutely Essential	94	37.0	41.8	100.0
Total	225	88.6	100.0	
Missing I don't know	5	2.0		
Missing	24	9.4		
Total	29	11.4		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 4.11.**

Q27: How important are each of the following in your understanding of what the church's mission should be?

“C. Local congregations need to engage in healing the sick.” 41.3% of respondents said that this version of the mission of the church was “very important” or “absolutely essential.” This was one of the lower selections among the mission statements.

Q27MissionC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not important	17	6.7	8.3	8.3
	Somewhat important	45	17.7	21.8	30.1
	Important	59	23.2	28.6	58.7
	Very important	67	26.4	32.5	91.3
	Absolutely Essential	18	7.1	8.7	100.0
	Total	206	81.1	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	20	7.9		
	Missing	28	11.0		
	Total	48	18.9		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.12.**

“D. Local congregations should foster reconciliation within individuals, families, communities, and the world.” 61.8% of respondents said that this version of the mission of the church was “very important” or “absolutely essential.” Only 8.4% of respondents thought this mission was only “somewhat important” or “not important.”

Q27MissionD

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not important	1	.4	.4	.4
	Somewhat important	18	7.1	8.0	8.4
	Important	67	26.4	29.8	38.2
	Very important	78	30.7	34.7	72.9
	Absolutely Essential	61	24.0	27.1	100.0
	Total	225	88.6	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	5	2.0		
	Missing	24	9.4		
	Total	29	11.4		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.80.**

Q27: How important are each of the following in your understanding of what the church's mission should be?

“E. Local congregations need to meet people’s spiritual needs in today’s competitive spiritual marketplace.” 66.8% of respondents said that this version of the mission of the church was “very important” or “absolutely essential.” This value comes through in some of the comments about how the Presbyterian church in the Cincinnati area has faced “competition” from larger non-denominational congregations.

Q27MissionE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not important	6	2.4	2.7	2.7
	Somewhat important	17	6.7	7.7	10.5
	Important	50	19.7	22.7	33.2
	Very important	82	32.3	37.3	70.5
	Absolutely Essential	65	25.6	29.5	100.0
	Total	220	86.6	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	11	4.3		
	Missing	23	9.1		
	Total	34	13.4		
Total		254	100.0		

*Mean for this variable is 3.83.

“F. Local congregations should focus on building and supporting educational, social service and other community service institutions.” 39.8% of respondents said that this version of the mission of the church was “very important” or “absolutely essential.” This mission focus received the lowest score among all the mission choices.

Q27MissionF

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not important	10	3.9	4.4	4.4
	Somewhat important	55	21.7	24.3	28.8
	Important	71	28.0	31.4	60.2
	Very important	62	24.4	27.4	87.6
	Absolutely Essential	28	11.0	12.4	100.0
	Total	226	89.0	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	4	1.6		
	Missing	24	9.4		
	Total	28	11.0		
Total		254	100.0		

*Mean for this variable is 3.19.

Q27: How important are each of the following in your understanding of what the church's mission should be?

“G. Local congregations need to advocate for the poor, marginalized, and oppressed.”

61.8% of respondents said that this version of the mission of the church was “very important” or “absolutely essential.”

Q27MissionG

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not important	3	1.2	1.3	1.3
	Somewhat important	28	11.0	12.3	13.6
	Important	56	22.0	24.6	38.2
	Very important	70	27.6	30.7	68.9
	Absolutely Essential	71	28.0	31.1	100.0
	Total	228	89.8	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	1	.4		
	Missing	25	9.8		
	Total	26	10.2		
Total		254	100.0		

*Mean for this variable is 3.78.

“H. Local congregations should focus on preaching the good news of God's reign over the whole of human life.” 77.6% of respondents said that this version of the mission of the church was “very important” or “absolutely essential.” This was the second choice for respondents in comparison with the other mission statements. There is a clear value placed on preaching among the respondents.

Q27MissionH

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not important	4	1.6	1.8	1.8
	Somewhat important	9	3.5	4.0	5.8
	Important	37	14.6	16.6	22.4
	Very important	63	24.8	28.3	50.7
	Absolutely Essential	110	43.3	49.3	100.0
	Total	223	87.8	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	5	2.0		
	Missing	26	10.2		
	Total	31	12.2		
Total		254	100.0		

*Mean for this variable is 4.19.

Q27: How important are each of the following in your understanding of what the church's mission should be?

“I. Local congregations need to equip the church’s members for ministry in daily life.”

79.1% of respondents said that this version of the mission of the church was “very important” or “absolutely essential.” This was the top choice for respondents among these mission choices. They see the church’s primary task as equipping its members for ministry in every day life. This is a very significant insight that will be explored in more detail in the work of Transformation 2.0.

Q27MissionI

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat important	12	4.7	5.2	5.2
	Important	36	14.2	15.7	20.9
	Very important	74	29.1	32.2	53.0
	Absolutely Essential	108	42.5	47.0	100.0
Total		230	90.6	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	1	.4		
	Missing	23	9.1		
	Total	24	9.4		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 4.21.**

Q29: How engaged would you say your local congregation is in its local context?

Most respondents feel their congregations are engaged in their local context (53.5%). Only 5.3% said they don't think their congregations are engaged at all.

Q29EngagedLocal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not engaged at all	12	4.7	5.3	5.3
	Somewhat engaged	93	36.6	41.2	46.5
	Engaged	65	25.6	28.8	75.2
	Very engaged	56	22.0	24.8	100.0
	Total	226	89.0	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	4	1.6		
	Missing	24	9.4		
	Total	28	11.0		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 2.73.**

Q30: How well would you say your congregation understands the challenges and opportunities of its local community context?

Almost half of respondents (47.8%) feel their congregation understands well the challenges and opportunities of its local context. Only 3.5% feel the congregation doesn't understand its context at all.

Q30CongUnderstand

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very well	33	13.0	14.6	14.6
	Fairly well	75	29.5	33.2	47.8
	Somewhat well	64	25.2	28.3	76.1
	Only slightly well	46	18.1	20.4	96.5
	Not at all	8	3.1	3.5	100.0
	Total	226	89.0	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	5	2.0		
	Missing	23	9.1		
	Total	28	11.0		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 2.65.**

Q31: Do you believe that God is present and active in the community around your congregation?

Almost everyone (98.1%) believes God is present and active in the community near their congregation. This is a major theological strength that likely underlies the significant involvement congregations have locally.

Q31GodActive

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	208	81.9	98.1	98.1
	No	4	1.6	1.9	100.0
	Total	212	83.5	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	21	8.3		
	Missing	21	8.3		
	Total	42	16.5		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 1.02.**

Q32: How comfortable are you naming examples of ways you see God at work in the local context your congregation is in?

The majority (60.4%) of respondents feel comfortable naming examples of God at work in their local context. Only 5.7% don't feel comfortable with this at all.

Q32NamingGod

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all comfortable	11	4.3	5.7	5.7
	Somewhat comfortable	65	25.6	33.9	39.6
	Comfortable	64	25.2	33.3	72.9
	Very comfortable	52	20.5	27.1	100.0
	Total	192	75.6	100.0	
Missing	I am not sure	15	5.9		
	Missing	47	18.5		
	Total	62	24.4		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 2.82.**

Q34: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your congregation and its local context.

“My congregation encourages us to be engaged in our local context.” 73.8% participants say their congregation encourages engagement in their local context. This may be one reason why the majority of respondents are engaged monthly in partnership with local community organizations or in outreach programs.

Q34EncourageLocal

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	3	1.2	1.3	1.3
Disagree	14	5.5	6.2	7.6
Both Agree and Disagree	42	16.5	18.7	26.2
Agree	103	40.6	45.8	72.0
Strongly Agree	63	24.8	28.0	100.0
Total	225	88.6	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	1	.4		
Missing	28	11.0		
Total	29	11.4		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.93.**

“I regularly hear stories about how God is working in our local context.” 52.7% of respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” with this statement. These stories are an important source of data and imagination when thinking about how to partner with God in local contexts.

Q34HearGodStories

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	4	1.6	1.8	1.8
Disagree	43	16.9	19.4	21.2
Both Agree and Disagree	58	22.8	26.1	47.3
Agree	90	35.4	40.5	87.8
Strongly Agree	27	10.6	12.2	100.0
Total	222	87.4	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	4	1.6		
Missing	28	11.0		
Total	32	12.6		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean of this variable is 3.42.**

Q34: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your congregation and its local context.

“I think of myself as sent by God as a missionary into our local context.” 48.9% of respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” with this statement. Only 16% don’t think of themselves this way at all.

Q34SentAsMissionary

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	6	2.4	2.7	2.7
Disagree	29	11.4	13.2	16.0
Both Agree and Disagree	77	30.3	35.2	51.1
Agree	75	29.5	34.2	85.4
Strongly Agree	32	12.6	14.6	100.0
Total	219	86.2	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	7	2.8		
Missing	28	11.0		
Total	35	13.8		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean of this variable is 3.45.**

“If our church was gone tomorrow the local community would miss us.” 72.7% of respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” with this statement. This implies strong ties to local community groups, which could be a good connection for experiments in the Transformation 2.0 process.

Q34CommunityWouldMiss

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	7	2.8	3.2	3.2
Disagree	26	10.2	12.0	15.2
Both Agree and Disagree	48	18.9	22.1	37.3
Agree	81	31.9	37.3	74.7
Strongly Agree	55	21.7	25.3	100.0
Total	217	85.4	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	9	3.5		
Missing	28	11.0		
Total	37	14.6		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.70.**

Q34: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your congregation and its local context.

“Our church would be dramatically different if our church building was located in a different context.” 56.4% of respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” with this statement. This implies that about half of the congregations see their ministry as context dependent.

Q34ContextMatters

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	7	2.8	3.4	3.4
Disagree	35	13.8	17.2	20.6
Both Agree and Disagree	47	18.5	23.0	43.6
Agree	70	27.6	34.3	77.9
Strongly Agree	45	17.7	22.1	100.0
Total	204	80.3	100.0	
MissingI Don't Know	21	8.3		
Missing	29	11.4		
Total	50	19.7		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.54.**

“We regularly try new ways of partnering with God in our local context.” 45.8% of respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” with this statement. Some comments in other parts of the baseline survey imply the need for more risk taking at the local and Presbytery level. This variable indicates some risks are being taken with new partnership, but there is room for growth in this area.

Q34TryNewPartnerGod

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	11	4.3	5.2	5.2
Disagree	47	18.5	22.2	27.4
Both Agree and Disagree	57	22.4	26.9	54.2
Agree	77	30.3	36.3	90.6
Strongly Agree	20	7.9	9.4	100.0
Total	212	83.5	100.0	
MissingI Don't Know	12	4.7		
Missing	30	11.8		
Total	42	16.5		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.23.**

Q34: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your congregation and its local context.

“Most of the people in our congregation live in the same neighborhood as the church building.” Only 29.7% of respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” with this statement. This is important to note as we continue to discuss what “neighborhood” God is inviting the various congregations to discern new ways of being the church in.

Q34LiveNearChurchBuilding

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	31	12.2	14.2	14.2
Disagree	72	28.3	32.9	47.0
Both Agree and Disagree	51	20.1	23.3	70.3
Agree	40	15.7	18.3	88.6
Strongly Agree	25	9.8	11.4	100.0
Total	219	86.2	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	7	2.8		
Missing	28	11.0		
Total	35	13.8		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 2.80.**

“We have meaningful ministry relationships with other churches in our neighborhood.” 43.7% of respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” with this statement. This indicates a fairly high value on partnership across congregations. Some comments in the survey suggest a lack of connection with churches outside the Presbyterian tradition, so it would be interesting to know if these partnership cross theological and traditional lines.

Q34PartnerOtherChurches

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	18	7.1	8.5	8.5
Disagree	45	17.7	21.1	29.6
Both Agree and Disagree	57	22.4	26.8	56.3
Agree	61	24.0	28.6	85.0
Strongly Agree	32	12.6	15.0	100.0
Total	213	83.9	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	13	5.1		
Missing	28	11.0		
Total	41	16.1		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.21.**

Q34: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your congregation and its local context.

“Our mission as a church is very relevant within our local context.” 51.9% of respondents “agree” or “strongly agree” with this statement. About half of the respondents think their mission is relevant to its context. Another 29.2% both agree and disagree with this statement.

Q34RelevantContext

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	10	3.9	4.7	4.7
Disagree	30	11.8	14.2	18.9
Both Agree and Disagree	62	24.4	29.2	48.1
Agree	76	29.9	35.8	84.0
Strongly Agree	34	13.4	16.0	100.0
Total	212	83.5	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	10	3.9		
Missing	32	12.6		
Total	42	16.5		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable is 3.44.**

Q35: What is the biggest obstacle to your congregation partnering with God’s work in your local context? (write in below)

The major obstacles identified by respondents were:

- Lack of Resources
 - Including Time, Size, Building, Finances, Member Energy, Aging Membership
- Lack of Education
 - Including knowledge of local context, opportunities, theological truths
- Lack of Willingness
 - Members not engaging, competition for time with other activities/interests, unwillingness to change
- Lack of Leadership and Vision
 - Including lack of pastoral leadership, clarity about focus and direction

Section IV: Presbytery

Summary of Key Findings:

- ***Familiarity with and Participation in Presbytery:***
 - 46% of the participants are very familiar to extremely familiar with Presbytery while 24.7% are only slightly familiar or not at all
 - 53.4% of participants have participated in a Presbytery event in past year
- ***Vitality Comparisons:***
 - 87.7% of participants report their personal faith discipleship as being vital
 - 76.8% of participants report their local congregation as being vital
 - Less than 34% of participants see the current state of the Presbytery as being vital
 - Less than 37% of participants see the current state of PCUSA as being vital
- ***Relationship Between Congregations and Presbytery:***
 - 50.3% participants view congregations primarily serving Presbytery at present with 34.5% view the relationship as being mutual partnership
 - 2.0% think congregations SHOULD primarily serve Presbytery and 70.4% think that the relationship SHOULD be a mutual partnership
- ***Current Structure and Role of Presbytery:***
 - Less than 21% believe Presbytery currently shares power in equitable way
 - Less than 16% believe Presbytery's staffing model effectively serves the Presbytery
 - Less than 18% believe Presbytery's committee structure is effective
 - 67.6% believe that significant change in governance practices is needed
- ***Presbytery Handling Differences:***
 - Less than 34% feel Presbytery handles socio-economic differences well
 - Less than 40% feel Presbytery handles racial/ethnic differences well
 - Less than 33% feel Presbytery handles differences of congregation size well
 - Less than 36% feel Presbytery handles congregation geographic differences well
- ***Hopefulness about the Future:*** Approximately 63% are either not hopeful to only somewhat hopeful about the future of the life and ministry of the Presbytery
- ***Reasons to Be Hopeful***
 - 66.1% feel the history of the Presbytery offers some to a great deal of hope
 - 70.8% feel evidence of the Spirit's leading offers some to a great deal of hope
 - 58.9% feel current elected leaders offers some to a great deal of hope
 - 49.5% feel current paid staff offer some to a great deal of hope
 - 39.1% feel record of implementing effective strategies offers some to a great deal of hope
 - 73.6% feel the vitality of their local congregation offers some to a great deal of hope
- ***Present Organizational Culture of the Presbytery:***
 - Less than 28% feel Presbytery focuses enough on sharing and celebrating the good

- Less than 26% feel persons from congregations are willing to serve in Presbytery
- Less than 23% feel Presbytery budget reflects high value ministry in context
- Less than 6% feel people in congregations speak positively about Presbytery
- Less than 16% feel Presbytery leaders take risks and give permission to risk
- Less than 30% feel there is less conflict today in Presbytery than in the past
- Less than 14% feel the structure of Presbytery effectively supports local ministry
- Less than 28% feel Presbytery meetings make persons aware of what God is “up to” in our region
- Less than 13% feel there is excitement about the future of our Presbytery
- ***Differences Between Groups*** - This section below will show whether or not there are significant differences between how people responded to the above questions based on Age, Participation in 2.0, Ethnicity, or Size of Worship Attendance.
 - Age: Groups broken up into the following ages: Under 40, 40-55, 55-70, and 70+. In general, younger groups were more likely to see the need for change and advocate for mutual partnership. Older groups had more confidence in the historical presence of the church and its structures.
 - Participation in Transformation 2.0: People participating in 2.0 felt generally more positive about Presbytery and more hopeful about the future.
 - Ethnicity: All ethnicities that were not white were combined due to their small numbers to provide a comparison between “white” and “non-white” groups. The “non-white” group was both more likely to see the need for change and also more likely to have hope in the Presbytery’s ability to change.
 - Size of Worship Attendance: Larger churches had more confidence in their own vitality and were more likely to think their primary relationship with the Presbytery was to benefit the Presbytery.

Section IV: Presbytery

Q7: Familiarity/Participation with Presbytery:

Many of those who participated in the survey (46%) were very familiar with the Presbytery. More than half (53.4%) participated in a Presbytery event within the last year.

Q7FamiliarPresby

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Extremely familiar	48	18.9	20.1	20.1
Very familiar	62	24.4	25.9	46.0
Moderately familiar	70	27.6	29.3	75.3
Slightly familiar	42	16.5	17.6	92.9
Not at all familiar	17	6.7	7.1	100.0
Total	239	94.1	100.0	
Missing	15	5.9		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.66.**

Q8ParticipatePresby

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	127	50.0	53.4	53.4
No	111	43.7	46.6	100.0
Total	238	93.7	100.0	
Missing	16	6.3		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 1.47.**

Presbytery Events in which Respondents Participated (124 Responses):

- Presbytery Meeting/Committee Meetings - 89 Respondents said they participated in regularly scheduled meetings related to committee work, COM, Council, CDTF, quarterly Presbytery meetings, and Session meetings.
- Training Events – 11 Respondents stated they had attended a Presbytery sponsored training in the last year.
- Transformation 2.0 – 10 Respondents had participated in a Transformation 2.0 event in the last year.
- Presbyterian Women – 3 Respondents had participated in Presbyterian Women events in the last year
- Youth Event – 3 Respondents had participated in a youth event and/or outreach in the last year.
- Pastor Commissioning – 2 Respondents participated in a pastor’s commissioning in the last year.
- Missions Trip – 1 Respondent participated in a PDA Mission Trip in the last year.

Q33: How would you evaluate the current state of your faith personally and the vitality of your local congregation?

A large majority of respondents to the survey said their personal faith and discipleship is in a healthy place (87.7%). They also said that their local congregations are in vital or very vital place (76.8%).

Q33CurrentStPersFaith

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Vital	2	.8	.9	.9
	Somewhat Vital	26	10.2	11.4	12.2
	Vital	80	31.5	34.9	47.2
	Very Vital	121	47.6	52.8	100.0
	Total	229	90.2	100.0	
Missing	I Don't Know	1	.4		
	Missing	24	9.4		
	Total	25	9.8		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 3.40.**

Q33CurrentStLocalCong

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Vital	10	3.9	4.4	4.4
	Somewhat Vital	43	16.9	18.9	23.2
	Vital	100	39.4	43.9	67.1
	Very Vital	75	29.5	32.9	100.0
	Total	228	89.8	100.0	
Missing	I Don't Know	3	1.2		
	Missing	23	9.1		
	Total	26	10.2		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 3.05.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences

Participation in 2.0: Those not participating in 2.0 rated the vitality of their personal faith significantly higher than those who were participating.

Ethnicity: No significant differences.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q33: How would you evaluate the current state of the Presbytery of Cincinnati and the PC(USA)?

In strong contrast to the confidence expressed in personal faith and the local congregation, respondents said they do not think the Presbytery of Cincinnati is in a vital position (66.7%). Similarly, confidence in the PC(USA) was also low (63.5% “somewhat” or “not” vital).

Q33CurrentStCincPresby

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Vital	40	15.7	19.9	19.9
	Somewhat Vital	94	37.0	46.8	66.7
	Vital	52	20.5	25.9	92.5
	Very Vital	15	5.9	7.5	100.0
	Total	201	79.1	100.0	
Missing	I Don't Know	31	12.2		
	Missing	22	8.7		
	Total	53	20.9		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.21.**

Q33CurrentStPCUSA

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Vital	38	15.0	19.0	19.0
	Somewhat Vital	89	35.0	44.5	63.5
	Vital	61	24.0	30.5	94.0
	Very Vital	12	4.7	6.0	100.0
	Total	200	78.7	100.0	
Missing	I Don't Know	32	12.6		
	Missing	22	8.7		
	Total	54	21.3		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.24.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences

Participation in 2.0: Those participating in Transformation 2.0 rated the vitality of the local Presbytery and the PC(USA) significantly higher than those who did not participate.

Ethnicity: The mean of “Non-White” respondents was 2.70 on the questions about the current state of the Presbytery of Cincinnati, indicating this category sees slightly more vitality than the mean.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q36: Which best describes the CURRENT relationship between congregations and the Presbytery?

The majority of respondents think that currently local congregations serve the Presbytery (50.3%) rather than the Presbytery primarily equipping congregations (15.2%). Roughly a third or respondents (34.5%) see the current relationship as a mutual partnership.

Q36CurrentRelationship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Local congregations primarily serve the Presbytery	73	28.7	50.3	50.3
	The Presbytery primarily serves local congregations	22	8.7	15.2	65.5
	Local congregations and the Presbytery partner mutually	50	19.7	34.5	100.0
	Total	145	57.1	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	77	30.3		
	Missing	32	12.6		
	Total	109	42.9		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 1.84.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: No significant differences.

Size of Worship Attendance: Churches above 200 persons in worship attendance were more likely to say that the primary relationship is one where local congregations serve the Presbytery.

Q37: What SHOULD be the relationship between congregations and the Presbytery?

A strong majority of respondents believe that the relationship between congregations and the Presbytery should be primarily one of mutual partnership (70.4%). Slightly more than a quarter of respondents think the Presbytery should primarily exist to serve congregations (27.6%). Only 2% of respondents said that the primary relationship should be one where congregations serve the Presbytery, despite the majority saying that's how they think the relationship currently functions.

Q37ShouldRelationship

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Local congregations primarily serve the Presbytery	4	1.6	2.0	2.0
The Presbytery primarily serves local congregations	55	21.7	27.6	29.6
Local congregations and the Presbytery partner mutually	140	55.1	70.4	100.0
Total	199	78.3	100.0	
Missing I don't know	24	9.4		
Missing	31	12.2		
Total	55	21.7		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.68.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: Respondents under 40 years of age were much more likely than those 40-55 to say the primary relationships should be that of mutual partnership. Respondents 40-55 were significantly more likely to choose "Presbytery primarily serves local congregations," than those under 40 years of age.

Participation in 2.0: Those participating in 2.0 were more likely to choose partnership as the primary expression of relationship than those who are not participating in 2.0.

Ethnicity: No significant differences.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant difference.

Q39: Please rank the following statements about the governance of the Presbytery of Cincinnati.
“The authority structure of the Presbytery shares power in ways that effectively empower the ministry of local congregations.”

“The current staffing model effectively serves the needs of the Presbytery.”

More respondents felt the authority structure of the Presbytery of Cincinnati did not share power in ways that effectively empower the ministry of local congregations (45.2%) than those who did feel the structure share power in this way (20.6%). Similarly, 58.6% of respondents did not feel the current staffing model serves the needs of the Presbytery, compared with 15.5% who thought the current structure is adequate.

Q39SharesPower

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	28	11.0	18.1	18.1
Disagree	42	16.5	27.1	45.2
Both Agree and Disagree	53	20.9	34.2	79.4
Agree	29	11.4	18.7	98.1
Strongly Agree	3	1.2	1.9	100.0
Total	155	61.0	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	67	26.4		
Missing	32	12.6		
Total	99	39.0		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.59.**

Q39StaffingModel

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	26	10.2	22.4	22.4
Disagree	42	16.5	36.2	58.6
Both Agree and Disagree	30	11.8	25.9	84.5
Agree	18	7.1	15.5	100.0
Total	116	45.7	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	106	41.7		
Missing	32	12.6		
Total	138	54.3		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.34.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: Non-white respondents had a mean of 3.00 on the question related to staffing model, meaning that group feels more strongly that the current staffing model doesn't serve the needs of the Presbytery.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant difference.

Q39: Please rank the following statements about the governance of the Presbytery of Cincinnati. **“The current committee structure is effective in fulfilling the governance and ministry needs of the Presbytery.”** While 42.1% of respondents both agreed and disagreed with this statement, 40.5% believe the current committee structure is not working. Only 17.5% of respondents believe it is working well. When asked to about the need for change in the Presbytery, 67.6% of respondents said **“Significant changes to the governance and ministry structure of the Presbytery are needed to meet the challenges we are facing,”** while only 13.6% disagreed with the need for change.

Q39CommitteeStructure

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	16	6.3	12.7	12.7
Disagree	35	13.8	27.8	40.5
Both Agree and Disagree	53	20.9	42.1	82.5
Agree	21	8.3	16.7	99.2
Strongly Agree	1	.4	.8	100.0
Total	126	49.6	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	95	37.4		
Missing	33	13.0		
Total	128	50.4		
Total	254	100.0		

*Mean for this variable was 2.65.

Q39ChangeNeeded

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	3	1.2	2.3	2.3
Disagree	12	4.7	9.0	11.3
Both Agree and Disagree	28	11.0	21.1	32.3
Agree	47	18.5	35.3	67.7
Strongly Agree	43	16.9	32.3	100.0
Total	133	52.4	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	86	33.9		
Missing	35	13.8		
Total	121	47.6		
Total	254	100.0		

*Mean for this variable was 3.86.

Differences Between Groups

Age: The mean for the ChangeNeeded variable for those under 40 was 4.6, signaling those in this age category felt more strongly than the average respondent about the need for change.

Participation in 2.0: Those not participating in 2.0 felt significantly more strongly that the committee structures are not effective in serving the needs of the Presbytery. Those not participating also felt significantly more strongly that significant changes are needed (Mean 4.06).

Ethnicity: Non-white respondents had a mean of 3.50 on the question related to committee structure, meaning that group feels more strongly that the current committee structure is effective.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant difference.

Q40: Rank the following statements about how differences are handled in the Presbytery.

“The Presbytery recognizes and addresses differences related to the socio-economics realities of congregations in the Presbytery.” Respondents were pretty evenly split on their views on this statement with 38.1% feeling the Presbytery doesn’t do this well, and 33.1% feeling that they do.

Q40SocioEconomic

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	20	7.9	14.4	14.4
Disagree	33	13.0	23.7	38.1
Neither Agree or Disagree	40	15.7	28.8	66.9
Agree	41	16.1	29.5	96.4
Strongly Agree	5	2.0	3.6	100.0
Total	139	54.7	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	81	31.9		
Missing	34	13.4		
Total	115	45.3		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.84.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: Those participating in Transformation 2.0 had a significantly higher mean on this variable, indicating they believe Presbytery handles these differences better than those not participating in 2.0.

Ethnicity: No significant differences.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q40: Rank the following statements about how differences are handled in the Presbytery.
“The Presbytery recognizes and addresses differences related to the racial makeup of congregations in the Presbytery.” 39.1% of respondents agree that the Presbytery is recognizing and addressing racial differences, but 31.6% do not think the Presbytery is aware of the racial differences that are affecting the Presbytery. The fact that roughly 1/3rd of respondents feel there is a need for improvement in addressing concerns related to race is significant.

Q40Race

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	18	7.1	13.5	13.5
	Disagree	24	9.4	18.0	31.6
	Neither Agree or Disagree	39	15.4	29.3	60.9
	Agree	47	18.5	35.3	96.2
	Strongly Agree	5	2.0	3.8	100.0
	Total	133	52.4	100.0	
Missing	I Don't Know	87	34.3		
	Missing	34	13.4		
	Total	121	47.6		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.98.**

Differences Between Groups

- Age: No significant differences.
- Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.
- Ethnicity: No significant differences.
- Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q40: Rank the following statements about how differences are handled in the Presbytery.

“The Presbytery recognizes and addresses differences related to the size of congregations in the Presbytery.” 37.8% of respondents do not feel the Presbytery is recognizing and addressing difference related to the size of congregations. A large number of comments about the culture of the presbytery at the end of the survey had to do with this issue, especially related to how the Presbytery attends to the needs of smaller churches.

Q40Size

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	18	7.1	12.6	12.6
Disagree	36	14.2	25.2	37.8
Neither Agree or Disagree	43	16.9	30.1	67.8
Agree	43	16.9	30.1	97.9
Strongly Agree	3	1.2	2.1	100.0
Total	143	56.3	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	78	30.7		
Missing	33	13.0		
Total	111	43.7		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.84.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: No significant differences.

Size of Worship Attendance: The smaller churches (<50 in worship) were significantly more likely to disagree (Mean 2.43) that the Presbytery recognizes and addresses differences related to congregational size. The highest mean (3.26) belonged to the group with 100-199 persons in worship, meaning they were more likely to choose “neither agree or disagree.”

Q40: Rank the following statements about how differences are handled in the Presbytery.

“The Presbytery recognizes and addresses differences related to the geography of congregations in the Presbytery (i.e. urban, suburban, rural, East, West).” 35.8% of respondents said the Presbytery does a good job handling differences related to geography, while 31.3% disagree that this is the case. Given the significant differences in Cincinnati related to geography, this is also an area that needs further attention.

Q40Geography

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	14	5.5	10.4	10.4
Disagree	28	11.0	20.9	31.3
Neither Agree or Disagree	44	17.3	32.8	64.2
Agree	46	18.1	34.3	98.5
Strongly Agree	2	.8	1.5	100.0
Total	134	52.8	100.0	
Missing I Don't Know	86	33.9		
Missing	34	13.4		
Total	120	47.2		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.96.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: No significant differences.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q41: How hopeful are you about the future life and ministry of the Presbytery of Cincinnati?

Most people fell towards the “somewhat hopeful” category on this question. 34.7% felt “fairly” or “very” hopeful, while 33.2% felt slightly or not at all hopeful. Combined with other feedback, it does seem as if the Presbytery is at a critical juncture in its life where it needs to regain trust and clarity about its focus.

Q41Hopeful

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all hopeful	25	9.8	12.6	12.6
	Slightly hopeful	41	16.1	20.6	33.2
	Somewhat hopeful	64	25.2	32.2	65.3
	Fairly hopeful	41	16.1	20.6	85.9
	Very hopeful	28	11.0	14.1	100.0
	Total	199	78.3	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	22	8.7		
	Missing	33	13.0		
	Total	55	21.7		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 3.03.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: Those participating in Transformation 2.0 are significantly more hopeful (Mean 3.29) than those who are not participating (Mean 2.71).

Ethnicity: No significant difference.

Size of Worship Attendance: The churches with 200+ in Sunday worship were the least hopeful on this question (Mean 2.76). Churches with less than 50 in worship were also less hopeful than churches between with worshipping attendance of 50-99 and 100-199.

Q42: How much hope do each of the following provide for the future of the Presbyterian Church in this area?

The highest means in the following six categories belong to hope in the Holy Spirit’s work and the vitality of the local congregation. Generally, the most hope across the survey respondents was found in these two areas.

“Our historical presence and ministry in the area.” 66.2% of respondents have “some” or “a great deal” of hope related to the historical presence and ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the area, while 33.8% have little to no hope related to this category.

Q42History

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid None	27	10.6	13.6	13.6
A little	40	15.7	20.2	33.8
Some	82	32.3	41.4	75.3
A great deal	49	19.3	24.7	100.0
Total	198	78.0	100.0	
Missing I don't know	22	8.7		
Missing	34	13.4		
Total	56	22.0		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.77.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: The under 40 group and the 40-55 year old group were significantly less hopeful in relation to the history than the 55-70 and 70+ group. The older groups have more hope based on the historical presence and ministry of the Presbyterian Church.

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: No significant differences.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q42: How much hope do each of the following provide for the future of the Presbyterian Church in this area?

“Signs of the active leading of the Holy Spirit in our midst.” A vast majority of respondents have “some” or a “great deal” of hope related to signs of the active leading of the Holy Spirit (70.8%), while 29.2% have little to no hope related to the Holy Spirit’s activity.

Q42HolySpirit

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	13	5.1	6.8	6.8
	A little	43	16.9	22.4	29.2
	Some	72	28.3	37.5	66.7
	A great deal	64	25.2	33.3	100.0
	Total	192	75.6	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	29	11.4		
	Missing	33	13.0		
	Total	62	24.4		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.97.**

Differences Between Groups

- Age: No significant differences.
- Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.
- Ethnicity: No significant differences.
- Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q42: How much hope do each of the following provide for the future of the Presbyterian Church in this area?

“The elected leaders of our Presbytery.” 58.9% of respondents said they have “some” or a “great deal” of hope related to the elected leaders of the Presbytery. This indicates a level of confidence in the elected leadership that could help create cultural change.

Q42Leaders

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	27	10.6	16.6	16.6
	A little	40	15.7	24.5	41.1
	Some	68	26.8	41.7	82.8
	A great deal	28	11.0	17.2	100.0
	Total	163	64.2	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	56	22.0		
	Missing	35	13.8		
	Total	91	35.8		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.60.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: Respondents participating in Transformation 2.0 had significantly more hope in the elected leadership of the Presbytery than those not involved (Mean 2.73).

Ethnicity: Those in the “non-white” categories had significantly more hope related to the elected leaders of the Presbytery (Mean 3.11).

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q42: How much hope do each of the following provide for the future of the Presbyterian Church in this area?

“The paid staff of our Presbytery.” 49.3% of respondents said they have “some” or a “great deal” of hope related to the paid staff of the Presbytery. The respondents are split almost half and half on this aspect of the life of the Presbytery. Based on other comments in the survey, many believe the structure and leadership of the Presbytery needs to change to prepare well for the future.

Q42PaidStaff

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	39	15.4	26.0	26.0
	A little	37	14.6	24.7	50.7
	Some	55	21.7	36.7	87.3
	A great deal	19	7.5	12.7	100.0
	Total	150	59.1	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	70	27.6		
	Missing	34	13.4		
	Total	104	40.9		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.36.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: Those in the “non-white” categories had significantly more hope related to the paid staff of the Presbytery (Mean 3.00).

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q42: How much hope do each of the following provide for the future of the Presbyterian Church in this area?

“Our record for implementing effective strategies for ministry and growth.” 60.8% of respondents had little or no confidence in the Presbytery’s record of implementing strategies for ministry and growth. It would be good to consider why these efforts have failed in the past, if the survey accurately reflects the success of those efforts.

Q42ChangeRecord

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	55	21.7	33.1	33.1
	A little	46	18.1	27.7	60.8
	Some	48	18.9	28.9	89.8
	A great deal	17	6.7	10.2	100.0
	Total	166	65.4	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	54	21.3		
	Missing	34	13.4		
	Total	88	34.6		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.16.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: Those in the “non-white” categories had significantly more hope based on the Presbytery’s ability to implement strategies for ministry and growth (Mean 2.88).

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q42 How much hope do each of the following provide for the future of the Presbyterian Church in this area?

“The vitality of my local church.” 73.7% of respondents said they have “some” or a “great deal” of hope related to the elected leaders of the Presbytery. This speaks volumes about where the hope and confidence of respondents exists. They have significant hope the life of their local church.

Q42CongVital

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	19	7.5	9.3	9.3
	A little	35	13.8	17.1	26.3
	Some	80	31.5	39.0	65.4
	A great deal	71	28.0	34.6	100.0
	Total	205	80.7	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	16	6.3		
	Missing	33	13.0		
	Total	49	19.3		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean for this variable was 2.99.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: No significant differences.

Size of Worship Attendance: The larger the worshipping size of the congregation, the more hopeful about the future they were because of the vitality of their local congregation.

Q38: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the present organizational culture of the Presbytery of Cincinnati as a whole.

“The Presbytery focuses on sharing and celebrating the good things happening in and through congregations.” The response to this question is split between 40.4% of people who do not think the Presbytery shares good things happening congregations well, and 27.7% who do think the Presbytery does this well.

Q38SharesCongStories

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	15	5.9	9.0	9.0
	Disagree	52	20.5	31.3	40.4
	Both Agree and Disagree	53	20.9	31.9	72.3
	Agree	41	16.1	24.7	97.0
	Strongly Agree	5	2.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	166	65.4	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	56	22.0		
	Missing	32	12.6		
	Total	88	34.6		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean of this variable is 2.81.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: The older age group (70+) had a significantly higher mean (3.17) than the other age groups. This indicates that that group primarily “both agree and disagree” with the statement that the Presbytery focuses on sharing and celebrating the good things happening in and through congregations.

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: No significant differences.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q38: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the present organizational culture of the Presbytery of Cincinnati as a whole.

“Persons from local congregations are willing to serve in the work of the Presbytery.”

There are slightly more respondents who find persons not willing to serve in Presbytery work (36.5%) than those who think people are willing (25.8%).

Q38ServingInPresby

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	17	6.7	9.6	9.6
	Disagree	48	18.9	27.0	36.5
	Both Agree and Disagree	67	26.4	37.6	74.2
	Agree	39	15.4	21.9	96.1
	Strongly Agree	7	2.8	3.9	100.0
	Total	178	70.1	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	44	17.3		
	Missing	32	12.6		
	Total	76	29.9		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean of this variable is 2.84.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: No significant differences.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q38: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the present organizational culture of the Presbytery of Cincinnati as a whole.

“The Presbytery budget reflects a high value for ministry engagement within the local context.” Almost twice as many respondents think the Presbytery budget does not reflect a high value for local ministry (42.5%) as those who do (22.5%).

Q38BudgetReflects

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	18	7.1	15.0	15.0
	Disagree	33	13.0	27.5	42.5
	Both Agree and Disagree	42	16.5	35.0	77.5
	Agree	25	9.8	20.8	98.3
	Strongly Agree	2	.8	1.7	100.0
	Total	120	47.2	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	100	39.4		
	Missing	34	13.4		
	Total	134	52.8		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean of this variable is 2.67.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: The mean for those from a “non-white” background was higher (3.25) than the “white” group (2.67), suggesting “non-white” respondents think the budget values the local congregation’s ministry more than the “white” group.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q38: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the present organizational culture of the Presbytery of Cincinnati as a whole.

“Most people in congregations speak positively about the Presbytery.” A vast majority of respondents state that most people do not speak positively about the Presbytery (71.7%). Only 1.7% strongly agree that people speak well of the Presbytery. This suggests that the image of the Presbytery and possibly the trust of the Presbytery are low among the congregations.

Q38SpeakPositively

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	35	13.8	20.2	20.2
	Disagree	89	35.0	51.4	71.7
	Both Agree and Disagree	39	15.4	22.5	94.2
	Agree	7	2.8	4.0	98.3
	Strongly Agree	3	1.2	1.7	100.0
	Total	173	68.1	100.0	
Missing	I don't know	48	18.9		
	Missing	33	13.0		
	Total	81	31.9		
Total		254	100.0		

***Mean of this variable is 2.16.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: Those participating in Transformation 2.0 had a significantly higher mean (2.29) than those who are not in 2.0 (2.00). Both means fall into the “disagree” response category.

Ethnicity: The mean for those from a “non-white” background was higher (2.71) than the “white” group (2.15), suggesting “non-white” respondents think the more people speak positively of the Presbytery than the “white” group.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q38: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the present organizational culture of the Presbytery of Cincinnati as a whole.

“Presbytery leaders take risks and give permission for congregations to take risks.” More than half of respondents (53.8%) do not think Presbytery leaders are taking risks and giving permission to take risks. Only 15.2% think Presbytery leaders are taking these risks and giving permission for others to do so.

Q38TakeRisks

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	18	7.1	12.4	12.4
Disagree	60	23.6	41.4	53.8
Both Agree and Disagree	45	17.7	31.0	84.8
Agree	19	7.5	13.1	97.9
Strongly Agree	3	1.2	2.1	100.0
Total	145	57.1	100.0	
Missing I don't know	77	30.3		
Missing	32	12.6		
Total	109	42.9		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean of this variable is 2.51.**

Differences Between Groups

- Age: No significant differences.
- Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.
- Ethnicity: No significant differences.
- Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q38: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the present organizational culture of the Presbytery of Cincinnati as a whole.

“There is less conflict in our Presbytery today than there has been in the past.” Almost half do not see conflict lessening (45.9%), while 29.3% do see a decrease in conflict.

Q38LessConflict

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	25	9.8	18.8	18.8
Disagree	36	14.2	27.1	45.9
Both Agree and Disagree	33	13.0	24.8	70.7
Agree	29	11.4	21.8	92.5
Strongly Agree	10	3.9	7.5	100.0
Total	133	52.4	100.0	
Missing I don't know	85	33.5		
Missing	36	14.2		
Total	121	47.6		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean of this variable is 2.72.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: No significant differences.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q38: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the present organizational culture of the Presbytery of Cincinnati as a whole.

“The structure of the Presbytery is effectively supporting local ministry.” More than half (56.9%) do not think the current structure is effective. Only 13.7% do think it is effective.

Q38SupportiveStructure

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	33	13.0	21.6	21.6
Disagree	54	21.3	35.3	56.9
Both Agree and Disagree	45	17.7	29.4	86.3
Agree	18	7.1	11.8	98.0
Strongly Agree	3	1.2	2.0	100.0
Total	153	60.2	100.0	
Missing I don't know	68	26.8		
Missing	33	13.0		
Total	101	39.8		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean of this variable is 2.37.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: Those participating in Transformation 2.0 had a significantly higher mean (2.55) in this area, indicating they see the structure as more supportive than do those not participating in 2.0.

Ethnicity: The mean for those from a “non-white” background was higher (3.00) than the “white” group (2.37), suggesting “non-white” respondents think the structure of Presbytery is supporting the local congregation’s ministry more than the “white” group.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q38: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the present organizational culture of the Presbytery of Cincinnati as a whole.

“The meetings of the Presbytery make participants more aware of what God is ‘up to’ in our region.” 43.7% of respondents don’t believe the Presbytery meetings highlight God’s action, while 27.5% do think meeting accomplish this goal.

Q38GodInMeetings

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	21	8.3	14.8	14.8
Disagree	41	16.1	28.9	43.7
Both Agree and Disagree	41	16.1	28.9	72.5
Agree	37	14.6	26.1	98.6
Strongly Agree	2	.8	1.4	100.0
Total	142	55.9	100.0	
Missing I don't know	80	31.5		
Missing	32	12.6		
Total	112	44.1		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean of this variable is 2.70.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: No significant differences.

Ethnicity: No significant differences.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q38: Please check how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the present organizational culture of the Presbytery of Cincinnati as a whole.

“There is excitement about the future of the Presbytery.” More than half (53.1%) do not think there is excitement about the future of Presbytery. Only 12.5% think there is excitement.

Q38ExcitementFuture

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Strongly Disagree	37	14.6	23.1	23.1
Disagree	48	18.9	30.0	53.1
Both Agree and Disagree	55	21.7	34.4	87.5
Agree	20	7.9	12.5	100.0
Total	160	63.0	100.0	
Missing I don't know	62	24.4		
Missing	32	12.6		
Total	94	37.0		
Total	254	100.0		

***Mean of this variable is 2.36.**

Differences Between Groups

Age: No significant differences.

Participation in 2.0: Those participating in Transformation 2.0 had a higher mean (2.63) than those who are not participating (2.10), indicating that those participating in the process sense more excitement about the future of the Presbytery.

Ethnicity: The mean for those from a “non-white” background was higher (3.00) than the “white” group (2.36), suggesting “non-white” respondents think there is more excitement about the future of Presbytery than the “white” group.

Size of Worship Attendance: No significant differences.

Q43: Finally, please add your own comments about the present culture of the Presbytery of Cincinnati and its future.

117 Respondents offered comments at the end of the survey. Some offered comments that fall into more than one category. These comments can be summarized into the following categories.

- **Don't Know Enough** – 22 respondents said they didn't know enough about the Presbytery to provide substantive comment on its present culture.
 - Representative Comment: "Taking this survey has revealed how little I know about the Presbytery and its governance."
- **Need to Focus on the Local** – 14 respondents commented on the need for the Presbytery to focus on supporting the local congregations. Most comments indicated a lack of such focus presently.
 - Representative Comment: "There still exists a culture of "us vs. them" in that Presbytery representatives are not seen by the local church as helpful, only as creating more busy work for us and making us jump through hoops."
- **Controversy** – 10 respondents commented on how the culture of the Presbytery has been impacted by controversies; many mentioned controversies related to decision made at the National level, including decision related to human sexuality.
 - Representative Comment: "I think there are some very sensitive issues related to people's deep personal beliefs about Scripture that continue to be very divisive. This weighs heavily on me personally and others I know. I pray regularly for God's leading and will to be done. I suppose I'm in a place where I fear further weakening of the Presbytery on both local and national levels."
- **Leadership Concerns** – 10 respondents commented on the need for leadership to be strong in the Presbytery. Most do not feel that the present culture of the Presbytery includes strong leadership.
 - Representative Comment: "I do not think most of the leaders know what to do."
- **Concern over Cultural Changes** – 6 respondents felt that widespread cultural changes were exerting a strong influence over the present culture of the Presbytery.
 - Representative Comment: "As a 'main line' denomination - it appears we are shrinking in size, and aging. Our adult children, do not seem to feel a need to 'join' and therefore, it is difficult to see how we will grow as a congregation and as a denomination."
- **Trust** – 6 respondents commented on the need for rebuilding trust and regaining confidence as a key part of the Presbytery culture. These comments indicated that trust and confidence are not a core part of the current Presbytery culture.
 - Representative Comment: "I'm not certain that the weakness of the presbytery is its structure but in the lack of trust and communication. If we did a better job of establishing and nurturing relationships and improved communication, then the current committee and staffing structure might be very effective."
- **Hopeful** – 7 respondents made comments about the hope they find in Presbytery culture. Several comments mentioned the hopefulness of Transformation 2.0.
 - Representative Comment: "While the present culture of the Presbytery is in dire need of change, I am greatly reassured that we as the Presbytery are undergoing an open-ended and adaptive process to be a partner in God's changing of us."

- **Negative Emotion** – There were 8 respondents who expressed some form of negative emotion(s) with respect to their views on the Presbytery.
 - Representative Comment: “Mistrust and apathy.”