

REV. TIMOTHY R. PULS, LAVERNE L. LUDDEN,
AND JAMES FREEMYER

AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO MINISTERIAL EFFECTIVENESS

Abstract: Sometimes bright, well-intentioned pastors fail at building effective, credible, transparent, and trusting social relationships with the laity they lead. Pastoral training programs do not always formally address development of critical parish and team leadership skills that enhance the shared working relationships of pastors and congregational leaders. This study examined the authentic leadership of clergy and discovered significant relationships of predictability as well as positive correlations with ministerial effectiveness. A survey of 58 experienced ordained pastors of the Indiana District of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod and 164 of their lay leaders was conducted. The pastors and lay leaders completed the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) by Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, and Peterson (2008) and the Ministerial Effectiveness Inventory (MEI) developed by Majovski (1982). Results indicate that there is a significant relationship between authentic leadership and ministerial effectiveness. Leaders should be encouraged by this research to practice authentic leadership because it should increase how their effectiveness is perceived by followers.

Keywords: *Authentic leadership, interpersonal, intrapersonal, self-awareness, transparency, balanced processing, and ministerial effectiveness*

Introduction

The concept of personal authenticity is well documented and can be traced as far back as ancient Greek philosophy when Socrates referred to it. It also exists as a strong theme in Jewish biblical text (Erickson, 1995; Harter, 2002; Hughes, 2005; Terry, 1993). Authenticity is also a significant concept in early Christian literature and eastern sacred texts (Klenke, 2005). Despite this historical basis for personal authenticity, Harter (2002) noted that “there is no single, coherent body of literature

Rev. Timothy R. Puls, Ed.D., is Director of Alumni and Church Relations at Concordia Theological Seminary in Fort Wayne, Indiana, and is Adjunct Professor at Indiana Wesleyan University in Marion, Indiana.

LaVerne L. Ludden, Ed.D., is Professor of Graduate Studies in Leadership at Indiana Wesleyan University in Marion, Indiana.

James Freemyer, Ed.D., is Professor of Graduate Studies in Leadership at Indiana Wesleyan University in Marion, Indiana.

on authentic-self behavior, no bedrock of knowledge” (p. 382). However, in recent years personal authenticity has become the focus of research in leadership studies driven by organizations’ interest in genuine integrity in leaders. Authentic leadership has become a focus in leadership studies within the last two to three decades and continues to grow and mature as well (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang, & Avey, 2009; Erickson, 1995; George, 2003). Avolio and Gardner (2005) indicated that to know one’s self is perhaps the most critical first step for any leader. They further indicated that the correlations of positive psychological capital, positive moral perspective, leader self-awareness, and leader self-regulation (which include relational transparency and positively embodying authentic behavior) are all essential ingredients for authentic leadership.

Authentic Leadership

Authentic leadership theory has generated much debate in light of the corporate world’s renewed prerequisite for genuineness (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang, & Avey, 2009; George, 2003). Authentic leadership is a quality which exists on a continuum in which all people have varying degrees, ranging from very low to very high, which can grow, deepen, and develop within all individuals (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May 2004; Chan, Hannah & Gardner, 2005). The four components which undergird authentic leadership are self-awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency (Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005; Luthans & Avolio, 2003). Authentic leadership encompasses both intrapersonal elements and interpersonal ones (Northouse, 2010). The intrapersonal dimension of authentic leadership unveils how a person’s self-awareness, worldview, and balanced processing shape one’s moral reasoning. The interpersonal dimension stresses how psychological capital (confidence, hope, optimism and resiliency) and emotional intelligence are outwardly exhibited as well as exchanging trust and transparency with followers. Self-awareness and an internalized moral perspective tend to be more intrapersonal, while balanced processing and relational transparency tend to engage people interpersonally. However, there is mutual interplay in the way all these elements interact.

An authentic leader’s worldview governs one’s self-awareness and the way one thinks, values, and processes matters. “Self-awareness is having conscious knowledge of one’s self, about one’s beliefs, assumptions, organizing principles, and structure of feelings . . . Self-awareness is a prerequisite for self-authorship” (Eriksen, 2009, pp. 748-749).

Moral reasoning indicates that a leader has an internal, conscious, ethical perspective, based on a concrete worldview which in turn motivates and stimulates that person's outward character and overall integrity. Authentic leaders lead on a principle of faith which is rooted and based upon their worldview. An integrated life means that a leader lives from the inside out, where personal values and beliefs drive and motivate that person to outwardly serve where best suited (Fryling, 2010; Rodin, 2010).

Most leaders benefit through honest self-awareness, discovering through a balanced and reflective process how they may have or will contribute to each situation (Raelin, 2002; Rodin, 2010). However, if a leader is perceived as being defensive or negative when receiving other thoughts or information from others, or fails to fully and adequately reflection upon them, then that same leader may misinterpret the information, fail to balance his or her thought process, and damage the ability to build trust with others. Since lay leaders regard pastors as leaders, they must be able to genuinely rely on their pastor, knowing that their pastor is open to input and feedback and is looking out for the best interests of all people involved. "In today's Christian community pastors are responsible for spiritual guidance and development, motivation, restoration, care, correction, protection, unity, and encouragement of parishioners [and] many are also responsible for the organizational development of the church" (Carter, 2009, p. 261). Today's ministry seems to require an "expert-generalist . . . who is skilled at performing an extraordinarily wide range of tasks and activities" (Bloom, 2013, p. 42). Therefore, moral reasoning with balanced processing is a critical piece to authentic leadership, and people in the church would hope that much of it has begun by the time that pastor has left seminary to enter parish ministry. When numerous questions and responsibilities about varied tasks lie before pastoral leaders, it stands to reason that they must be intentionally aware of their competencies and inadequacies not only through reflective self-awareness, but through the concrete feedback of others, so that they may learn how to capably lead organizations and congregations.

Just as the intrapersonal elements concretely shape the inner side of an authentic leader, so the interpersonal elements also sculpt one's outward character and behavior. Authentic leaders wish to be genuinely warm, outwardly exhibiting integrity without hiding their flaws or intentions (Ezell, 1995). These elements also are those most readily observed by supervisors, peers, and followers. The four critical elements of the interpersonal dimension of authentic leadership are psychological capi-

tal, emotional intelligence, trust and transparency (Goleman, 2004; Luthans & Avolio, 2003).

According to Luthans and Avolio (2003), several proactive, positive characteristics form a profile for authentic leaders. First, they are courageous, hopeful, optimistic and resilient. Unlike Freudian psychology, which often focused on negative aspects or behaviors of individuals, positive psychology does the opposite, focusing on what is right and strong with individuals (Luthans & Avolio, 2003, p. 244). According to Clapp-Smith et al. (2009) and Peterson, Walumbwa, Avolio, and Hannah (2012), both psychological capital and trust in and from the leader may mediate and improve the performance of followers.

Additionally, authentic leaders tend to possess higher emotional intelligence. “Emotionally intelligent leaders are self-motivated, have a passion to seek challenges, love to learn, take pride in a job well done, and have the energy to do things better” (Luthans, Luthans, Hodgetts, & Luthans, 2001, p. 12). Klenke (2005) submitted that authentic leaders who exercise emotional intelligence not only figure out and manage their emotions better in certain contexts, but actually facilitate better thinking in and with others (p. 163).

Within the last two decades, research on authentic leadership theory has taken shape and more studies have been and continue to be conducted both domestically and globally (Caza, Bagozzi, Woolley, Levy, & Caza, 2010; Leroy, Palanski, & Simons, 2012; Peterson et al., 2012). The initial discussion about authentic leadership focused on the corporate world (Clapp-Smith et al., 2009; George, 2003). However, the study of authentic leadership has broadened to include many types of organizations. This study specifically focused on the authentic leadership of clergy to identify if there is a relationship between authentic leadership and their ministerial effectiveness in leading of congregations.

To be authentic is not an entirely new concept for pastoral ministry. The New Testament and many church fathers throughout the centuries have a strong tradition of encouraging pastors to personally embody integrity. Pope St. Gregory the Great, who lived from 540 to 604 A.D. and authored one of the most ancient pieces on pastoral theology, stressed the consistent, authentic life of pastors in his *Book of Pastoral Rule*: “It is necessary that the good which is displayed in the life of the pastor should also be propagated by his speech” (Gregory the Great, 1995, p. 1). Further, he also urged that “every preacher should give forth a sound more by his deeds than by his words, and rather by good living imprint footsteps for men to follow than by speaking show them the way to walk

in” (Gregory the Great, 1995, p. 71). Such counsel is echoed not only within clerical circles today, but also in leadership circles for CEOs and managers. George (2003) wrote that “when leaders preach one thing and practice another, commitment is quickly lost and employees become doubly cynical” (p. 75).

Ministerial Effectiveness

This particular study focused on the authentic leadership of clergy and how such authentic leadership may be positively related with ministerial effectiveness. Unlike authentic leadership, ministerial effectiveness has been studied, evaluated and examined for over 50 years by different researchers with different measuring tools in varying denominations (Nauss, 1996). Ezell (1995) indicated that ministerial effectiveness is judged by a number of factors, depending on how quickly pastors and others react to change, how willing they are to face risk, and how willing they are to dream. While Ezell did not use these three points as the sole measurement of effectiveness, the ability to change, risk, or dream are external factors, visible to others.

Ministerial effectiveness is defined by a person’s integrity or internal character, the motivations and inclinations of the pastoral leader’s heart and mind. Some scholars evaluate outward functions, and some evaluate psychological states and traits. Nauss (1996) added that pastoral effectiveness, determined by job analysis or function, may be judged by such outward actions as preaching, teaching, leading worship, or administrating meetings. However, he also noted that there are internal factors which may affect a minister’s effectiveness as well. Butler and Herman (1999) indicated that one of the key challenges in any study of pastoral leadership is how to distinguish highly effective leaders from those who are less effective so that existing seminary curricula may be designed to enhance leadership skills. Their study, as well as Barnett’s (2003), Eaton’s (2002), and Scuderi’s (2010), incorporated the input and feedback of both congregants and clergy for their Ministerial Effectiveness Inventory (MEI) work. While ministerial effectiveness, specifically utilizing the MEI, has been directly compared to pastoral mentoring (Belcher, 2002), ministerial competency (Barnett, 2003), and personality factors (Eaton, 2002), it has not yet been correlated or compared with authentic leadership. According to Jones and Armstrong (2006), “we believe that you cannot adequately address pastoral leadership apart from congregations and their day-to-day lives, hopes and fears, joys and griefs” (p. 24). Usually, such feedback includes self-rat-

ings as well as other ratings from subordinates. “By completing self-ratings, individuals become aware of their behaviors desired by the organization and could presumably set goals accordingly” (Atwater, Waldman, & Cartier, 2000, p. 276).

Scholars have debated whether pastors, congregants, or both are the best judges of ministerial effectiveness. When Carter (2009) evaluated transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness in clergy, she noted that ministerial spirituality, revealed through a pastor’s personality and behavior, appears to be an important element in evaluating pastoral leader effectiveness. She also evaluated clergy utilizing both self and other ratings, but each filled out different instruments. Belcher (2002) utilized only self-ratings of senior pastors and not those of laity when utilizing the MEI. Even though Butler and Herman (1999) and others utilized mostly laity to evaluate clergy, the clergy also evaluated themselves. Majovski (1982) referred to the “halo effect” when laity tend to rate their clergy more highly than the way clergy score themselves. This same effect was evident in Butler and Herman’s (1999) and Barnett’s (2003) studies, but not within this current study. In Majovski’s (1982) study, the pivotal base for the Butler and Herman’s (1999) study, the same instrument was first initiated, and pastors, superintendents, and laity were asked for input. Generally, the Nazarene and the Southern Baptist clergy who were studied rated themselves lower in MEI categories than their laity did. The Lutheran clergy in this study, however, rated themselves slightly higher in the MEI than their laity did. Yet when the total ALQ scores were also compared between the laity and clergy, the “halo effect” was evident in this study.

Regardless of who evaluates ministerial effectiveness, the pastor or the laity, a central factor to identify is that effective leaders always work in tandem relationships with followers. “What characterizes effective leaders is a sense of what works for them with others,” say Goffee and Jones (2006). “They know and show enough of themselves to win over their followers” (p. 32). This is why authentic leadership is so insightful for leaders; their ability to be effective with followers increases when a large quotient of self-awareness is employed. Goffee and Jones make the following observation:

What we observe in effective leaders is primarily a matter of self-awareness. As they interact with others leaders are better equipped to learn how they are seen by others and how they can actively shape others’ perceptions in the formation of their identity. (p. 32)

Based on research about authentic leadership, this study hypothesized that there would be a positive correlation between pastors with a

high degree of authentic leadership and their effectiveness as a minister. This study's purpose was to further research on authentic leadership theory by focusing on the significance of collaborative relationships clergy share with their lay leaders, identifying the extent of the relationship between ministerial effectiveness and authentic leadership. If a positive correlation exists between clergy authentic leadership and ministerial effectiveness, then this type of study is fruitful for reflection by pastoral and seminary leaders and may be an incentive for further research. If clergy strengthen and cultivate authentic leadership, this may be a critical and effectual step toward fostering valuable, genuine and meaningful leadership with staff, a church council, and congregants.

Method

This study examined whether ministerial effectiveness is related to the authentic leadership of pastors. Data was collected using an online survey consisting of the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) and the Ministerial Effectiveness Inventory (MEI). Participants were clergy and lay members of the Indiana District of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (LC-MS).

Participants

This study focused on pastoral leaders in the Indiana District of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (LC-MS). One hundred and fifty-seven full time parish pastors who had served at least three years in their current parish were invited to participate in this study. Each pastor was also asked to invite the chair of their congregation's board of elders and two other lay leaders of their choosing to complete the survey. Data from both experienced clergy and lay leaders who regularly observe and work with them was foundational for this study. Fifty-eight pastors and 164 lay leaders completed the survey. Fifty of the 164 lay leaders were chairs of their congregation's boards of elders. All 58 pastors are males and 144 (88%) of the lay leaders are male. It is important to note that the LC-MS limits ordination of pastors and election of chair of the board of elders to males.

Measures

We used two main instruments in this study: The Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) and the Ministerial Effectiveness Inventory (MEI). The ALQ, developed by Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, and Peterson (2008), examines four areas of leadership: self-

awareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing, and relational transparency. The measure consists of 16 items each scaled along a five-point Likert Scale (0 = “Not at all” to 4 = “Frequently, if not always”). Self-awareness is defined as the degree to which the leader is “aware of his or her strengths, limitations, and how others see him or her and how the leader impacts others.” Internalized moral perspective is defined as the degree to which the leader “set[s] a high standard for moral and ethical conduct.” Balanced processing is the degree to which the leader “solicits sufficient opinions and viewpoints prior to making important decisions.” Finally, relational transparency is the degree to which the leader “reinforce[s] a level of openness with others that provides them with an opportunity to be forthcoming with their ideas, challenges and opinions” (Mind Garden, Inc., n.d.). Walumbwa et al. (2008) provided evidence for the validity of the ALQ using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. They report internal consistency reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha) ranging from 0.76 for internalized moral perspective to 0.91 for self-awareness. In their studies, Beyer (2010), Northouse (2010), and Rego, Vitoria, Magalhaes, Ribeiro and Pina e Cunha (2013) concluded that the ALQ is a reliable, well-respected instrument and is used frequently by scholars researching authentic leadership.

Majovski (1982) developed the Ministerial Effectiveness Inventory (MEI) largely from the works of Aleshire (1980) and Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke (1980). The entire MEI includes 59 questions and each item is scaled along a six-point Likert Scale (from 0 = Never to 5 = Always). Only 24 of the 59 items specifically measure eight characteristics of ministerial effectiveness. Majovski makes it clear in her research that 24 of the items in the assessment are designed to measure ministerial effectiveness. The additional 35 items were specific to her research with United Methodist Church pastors (Trotter, 1980). Therefore, our statistical analysis focused only on the results of the 24 items that are descriptors of the eight main characteristics of effective ministry. The eight MEI elements of ministerial effectiveness are (1) having an open, affirming style; (2) caring for people under stress; (3) evidencing congregational leadership; (4) being a theologian in life and thought; (5) undertaking ministry from a personal commitment of faith; (6) developing fellowship and worship; (7) having denominational awareness; and (8) not having disqualifying personal and behavioral characteristics. Validity and reliability of the MEI are documented in Schuller et al. (1980), Majovski (1982), Butler and Herman (1999), Eaton (2002), and Scuderi (2010).

Procedure

Each instrument, the ALQ and the MEI, was formatted electronically on the Internet through Mind Garden, which was contracted to collect the data from each pastor and lay leader. A letter from the District President of the Indiana District LC-MS was sent to all pastors, encouraging their participation in this study, and an email was sent to a population of 157 pastors in the Indiana District of the LC-MS who had served their current congregation in full-time parish ministry for no less than three years. Each pastor completed a self-rating on both the ALQ and the MEI. Beyond completing these instruments, each pastor was asked to provide Mind Garden with names and e-mail addresses of three targeted lay leaders within his congregation: the chair of the board of elders and two other elected congregational officers. These lay leaders were then sent an email, asking and inviting them to participate in the study on behalf of their pastor. The lay leaders were instructed to complete both the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) and the Ministerial Effectiveness Inventory (MEI) to rate their knowledge of and experience with their pastor. They were informed that two other lay raters from their congregation were also selected to provide ratings about their pastor.

Results

The purpose of this study was to examine if pastoral effectiveness is related to authentic leadership. Scale means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients are reported in Table 1. Correlation coefficients among leadership variables are moderate at 0.66 between *moral/ethical conduct* and *balanced processing* and high at 0.79 between *self-awareness* and *balanced processing*.

Correlation coefficients among effectiveness variables are also moderate at 0.43 between *congregational leadership* and *denominational awareness and collegiality*, and 0.71 between *open and affirming style* and *congregational leadership*. Correlation between leadership and effectiveness variables range from a low of 0.31 (between *balanced processing* and *denominational awareness and collegiality*) to a moderate of 0.69 (between *self-awareness* and *open and affirming style*). The correlation between total ALQ score and total MEI score is 0.52, suggesting that about 25% of the variance in ministerial effectiveness may be explained by authentic leadership characteristics. It is apparent from Table 1 that pastoral effectiveness may be related to authentic leadership characteristics.

To examine further the nature of the relationship between effective-

Table 1

Scale mean, standard deviation and Zero-order correlation.

Scales	Mean	SD	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Transparency	3.40	.53	.71	.69	.69	.89	.61	.52	.65	.59	.54	.47	.41	.53	.37
2. Self-awareness	3.16	.73		.67	.79	.92	.69	.56	.65	.65	.50	.61	.35	.49	.51
3. Moral and Ethical	3.68	.47			.66	.83	.60	.47	.57	.61	.56	.48	.36	.55	.47
4. Balanced Processing	3.18	.70				.89	.64	.53	.65	.63	.45	.58	.31	.42	.51
5. ALQ Total	3.36	.53					.72	.59	.72	.70	.58	.61	.41	.58	.52
6. Open/Affirming Style	4.26	.74						.64	.71	.69	.56	.65	.46	.53	.56
7. Car. for Pers. Und. Stress	4.10	.79							.63	.62	.52	.58	.47	.49	.55
8. Cong. Leadership	3.70	.93								.65	.60	.64	.43	.46	.56
9. Theo. in Life and Thought	4.35	.62									.69	.68	.52	.49	.57
10. Pers. Comm. to Faith	4.53	.53										.56	.51	.50	.36
11. Dev. Fellowship. & Wors.	4.15	.77											.46	.46	.60
12. Denom. Aware. & Colleg.	4.52	.62												.52	.21
13. Disqual. Beh. Charac.	4.56	.61													.16
14. MEI Total	3.39	.31													

*All coefficients are significant at the 0.05 level.

ness and leadership variables, we conducted a series of standard regression analyses. The results of these analyses are reported in Table 2, which shows that each effectiveness variable can be significantly ($p < 0.001$) explained by the set of leadership variables accounting from a low of 18% of the variance in *denominational awareness* to a high of 53% of the variance in *open and affirming style*. *Self-awareness* ($\beta = 0.37$) appears to be the most important leadership variable to explain the pastors' *open and affirming style*, which alone, may account for 47% ($r = 0.69$) of its variance.

Caring for persons under stress can be explained mainly by self-awareness ($\beta = 0.26$) and transparency ($\beta = 0.18$). Congregational leadership can be explained mainly by transparency ($\beta = 0.29$), self-awareness ($\beta = 0.22$), and balanced processing ($\beta = 0.23$). Theologian in life and thought can be explained mainly by self-awareness ($\beta = 0.28$), moral and ethical conduct ($\beta = 0.23$), and balanced processing ($\beta = 0.17$). Moral and ethical conduct ($\beta = 0.33$) and transparency ($\beta = 0.26$) are significant leadership variables to explain undertaking ministry from a personal commitment to faith, while self-awareness ($\beta = 0.37$) and balanced processing ($\beta = 0.25$) are important and significant leadership

Table 2
Regression analysis results

Ministerial Effectiveness Indicators												
Leadership Quality	Open			Caring			CongLead			TheoLife		
	b	SE	β	b	SE	β	b	SE	β	b	SE	β
Constant	1.03	0.29		1.34	0.36		-0.42	0.37		1.52	0.25	
Transparency	0.17	0.10	0.12	0.26	0.13	0.18*	0.51	0.13	0.29***	0.14	0.09	0.12
Self-awareness	0.38	0.09	0.37***	0.28	0.11	0.26	0.27	0.11	0.22*	0.23	0.07	0.28***
Moral/Ethical	0.25	0.11	0.16*	0.11	0.14	0.06	0.15	0.14	0.08	0.31	0.10	0.23**
Balanced Processing	0.16	0.09	0.15	0.19	0.11	0.17	0.30	0.11	0.23**	0.15	0.07	0.17*
R ²	0.53			0.35			0.52			0.50		
F	60.13			29.50			58.71			54.26		
p	≤0.001			≤0.001			≤0.001			≤0.001		
<p>*p≤0.05, **p≤0.01, ***p≤0.001 Open—Open and affirming style; Caring—Caring for persons under stress; CongLead—Congregational leadership; TheoLife—theologian in life and thought.</p>												

Leadership Quality	ComMin			DevFell			DenAware			DisChar		
	b	SE	β	b	SE	β	b	SE	β	b	SE	β
Constant	2.11	0.24		1.68	0.34		2.64	0.32		1.85	0.28	
Transparency	0.26	0.09	0.26	-0.03	0.12	-0.02*	0.34	0.12	0.29***	0.28	0.10	0.24
Self-awareness	0.10	0.07	0.14***	0.39	0.10	0.37	0.10	0.09	0.11*	0.12	0.08	0.15***
Moral/Ethical	0.37	0.09	0.33*	0.13	0.13	0.08	0.16	0.12	0.12	0.41	0.11	0.31**
Balanced Processing	-0.05	0.07	-0.06	0.27	0.10	0.25	-0.05	0.10	-0.06**	-0.04	0.08	-0.05*
R ²	0.37			0.40			0.18			0.35		
F	31.51			36.06			3.94			29.12		
p	≤0.001			≤0.001			≤0.001			≤0.001		
<p>*p≤0.05, **p≤0.01, ***p≤0.001 ComMin—Undertaking ministry from a personal commitment to faith; DevFell—Development of fellowship and worship; DenAware—denominational awareness and collegiality; DisChar—disqualifying personal and behavioral characteristics.</p>												

variables to explain development of fellowship and worship.

Transparency ($\beta = 0.29$) is the only significant leadership variable related to denominational awareness and collegiality. Disqualifying personal and behavioral characteristics are largely accounted for by transparency ($\beta = 0.24$) and moral and ethical conduct ($\beta = 0.31$).

Findings from the regression analyses are summarized in Table 3. Overall, it appears that ministerial effectiveness is significantly related to pastor authentic leadership behaviors. *Self-awareness* appears to be

an important leadership characteristic for five of the eight effectiveness variables. *Transparency* is also significantly related to five of the effectiveness variables. Finally, *moral/ethical conduct* is significantly related to three of the eight effectiveness variables. These findings seem to suggest that ministerial effectiveness may not be defined by any one leadership characteristic, but rather a combination of inter-related authentic leadership behaviors.

Discussion and Conclusion

The present theory of authentic leadership strongly suggests that the intrapersonal and interpersonal dimensions mutually shape individual leaders, the atmosphere in which they work with followers, and how followers respond to their leadership. (It is acknowledged that extraneous variables, such as the uniqueness of congregational lay leaders, each

Table 3
Findings summary

Authentic Leadership	Ministerial Effectiveness*							
	<i>Open</i>	<i>Caring</i>	<i>CongLead</i>	<i>TheoLife</i>	<i>ComMin</i>	<i>DevFell</i>	<i>DenAware</i>	<i>DisChar</i>
<i>Transparency</i>		x	x		x		x	x
<i>Self-awareness</i>	x	x	x	x		x		
<i>Moral/ethical conduct</i>				x	x			x
<i>Balanced processing</i>			x	x		x		
*Open—Open and affirming style; Caring—Caring for persons under stress; CongLead—Congregational leadership; TheoLife—Theologian in life and thought; ComMin—Undertaking ministry from a personal commitment to faith; DevFell— Development of fellowship and worship; DenAware—Denominational awareness and collegiality; DisChar—Disqualifying personal and behavioral characteristics								

pastor, the size of the church or geographical context, may have affected these results.) If laity, as followers, sense high integrity, credibility, transparency, and trust within their pastors as leaders, they may be more willing to invest, risk, and follow their pastors (Clapp-Smith et al., 2009). This is the “positive collective identification” which Luthans and Avolio (2003) allude to, the “team potency” which Rego et al. (2013) suggest, and the “pastoral flourishing” which Bloom (2013) indicates. When leaders and followers enthusiastically and trustingly gather around one organization’s cause or mission, exciting ministry opportunities abound. When lay leaders exchange trust and transparency with their pastor,

they gravitate toward his leadership and are capable of honestly deliberating and processing decisions (Klenke, 2007). This concurs with Chan et al. (2005), who stated that “when leaders are perceived as authentic, their leadership interventions are more favorably received and the resultant impact is multiplied. . . . They . . . engender trust and allow followers to easily and confidently infer authenticity from their actions” (p. 25).

This study’s focus on the collaborative relationships which clergy share with their lay leaders is somewhat similar to other authentic leadership findings in other vocational fields. Rego et al. (2013) very recently discovered that team potency and collective efficacy of a group are strongly contributed to by authentic leadership. “Authentic leaders nurture team virtuousness, thus leading teams to develop greater affective commitment and, in this way, team potency” (p. 75). Wong, Laschinger, and Cummings (2010) also learned in the realm of nursing and health-care that the way nurses worked varied according to the quality of the authentic relationships they shared with their nursing managers. When nurses had stronger relationships with authentic managing nurses, the performance of following nurses was enhanced. Although none of Briand’s (2009) findings in the world of business utilizing the ALQ were significant, she did find that leader awareness correlated somewhat with an employee’s sense of relatedness and that awareness did relate with controlled motivation. This research on pastoral leadership concurs with earlier research that indicates that a shared leadership model is vital (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009; Klenke, 2007). The way in which pastors transparently relate to and build trust with their lay leaders is crucial to whether or not lay leaders will return such trust to pastors, honestly share with them, and invest themselves in the future mission of a congregation.

These findings provide a platform for a more thorough elaboration and examination of the subject of authentic leadership and ministerial effectiveness. While ministerial effectiveness has been defined in broad ways, this particular study endeavored to utilize the best existing instrument for evaluating a pastor as a person in behavior, life, thought, and action (Butler & Herman, 1999; Nauss, 1996). To be an authentic pastor depends upon not only one’s ability to theologically navigate texts and reflect upon them, but also on the unpretentious behavior and a candid outward demeanor which an individual pastor demonstrates and exchanges with laity. The relationship between authentic leadership and ministerial effectiveness confirmed by this study should encourage pastors to examine how they may improve their authentic leadership.

It would appear that when lay leaders perceive their pastors to be truly authentic leaders, they also recognize them to be effective ministers. Since these perceptions are based on the observation of pastors' behavior, it is reasonable to assume that pastors who are authentic leaders are actually more effective.

The ALQ may be a useful tool for more study of clergy in the parish today. The ALQ may be one way to encourage more thorough self-reflection, not only from a pastor's own perspective, but also through the eyes of others. Pastors and their laity may easily complete the instrument for the purpose of mutual discussion and growth. If honest 360° feedbacks are welcomed and initiated by pastors in parishes where trust has been garnered, then pastors may grow in their self-awareness, obtaining a more accurate understanding of who they are and how they are perceived by the laity and others. Further, if seminaries would consider utilizing such leadership tools as the ALQ, seminarians might be able to more accurately assess and reflect upon the quality of their personal relationships with other people prior to entering the ministry. Additionally, if early exchanges of feedback were initiated with seminarians while they attended college and seminary through input and assessment from faculty, peers, and laity, it might strengthen their authentic leadership. Introduction to early exchanges of feedback during college and seminary years proves beneficial to pastors, encouraging them to seek similar feedback when they assume their leadership positions in the parish. If authentic leadership is developmental for individuals, as Northouse (2010) suggested, then authentic leadership can be expanded and increased within individual leaders who are already in the ministry as well as in those training and preparing for ministry.

When and if pastors fail at building effective, credible, transparent, and trusting social relationships with the laity, a congregation's mission motivation and the mutual trust they share with a pastor may suffer. This study concentrated on the relationship between a pastor's authentic leadership and one's ministerial effectiveness in leading others. Pastors in this study rated themselves higher on ministerial effectiveness (as measured by the MEI), generally scoring themselves slightly higher than the lay leaders, probably because they are more confident in their ministry functions, knowing that they have outwardly exercised pastoral ministry successfully for quite some time. This confidence in their ministerial skills is something most pastors acquire from their seminary training and instruction and is reinforced during their years in the ministry. However, the authentic leadership skills, as measured by their scores

on the ALQ, were slightly lower for the pastors than the scores of lay leaders. This may indicate that such leadership skills were not always thoughtfully considered or conscientiously pondered by pastors to be as essential as those skills regarding ministerial effectiveness. It may also indicate the lack of emphasis on leadership development pastors receive in seminary or experience through subsequent professional development.

Stewart (2009) indicated that most current pastors in today's parish settings must spend substantially more time properly handling administrative and relational matters in the parish than they first expected. However, a traditional seminary curriculum, which focuses more on oral presentation and preaching, pastoral care, and Scripture without a working understanding of leadership behavior, may hamper retention in ministry and cause burnout if and when pastoral expectations are unrealized. A renewed need for authentic leadership is suggested by this research as a critical component of pastoral leadership and as a response to the gap between expectations and reality.

This study had some limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the research was conducted within only one geographic district of one Christian denomination and church body: the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (LC-MS). Therefore, all inferences to total general population may only apply to the Midwest District pastors of the LC-MS, because that was the population from which the pastors and lay leaders that participated in the study were obtained. How well authentic leadership may be perceived or utilized in other church bodies or other parts the United States, such as the East or West Coast, has yet to be evaluated. Other researchers are encouraged to explore whether these results are influenced by geographic or denominational factors by studying pastors in other geographical parts of the United States and in other denominations.

This study also examined only male clergy because of the ordination standards of the LC-MS, while many other denominations ordain both male and female clergy. Many leadership studies compare male and female leaders or study populations that include both female and male leaders; unfortunately, the ordination standards of the this study's population made such comparisons impossible. However, Caza et al. (2010) indicate within their study, evaluating the comparability ALQ and the Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ), that there are definitely some gender differences to consider when male and female respondents rate their leaders, male or female. Even the number of lay leaders responding to the pastor assessment was restricted by the standards the LC-MS (which limits the role of elders to only males). It would be useful

to understand whether gender impacts a pastor's authentic leadership and ministerial effectiveness. Furthermore, additional research is needed to discover if female lay leaders perceive pastors differently than the way male leaders do.

It should be clearly understood that this study only measures the perceptions of church leaders about authentic leadership and ministerial effectiveness and should not be projected to apply to all lay leaders or laity in the churches. It was objectively predetermined that only lay leaders would be asked to complete the ALQ and MEI for their pastor. The instructions also asked the pastor to use the chairman of the board of elders as one of the lay leaders that should complete the instruments. The decision to designate the chairman as one of the raters was primarily determined because the board of elders in each LC-MS congregation usually shares the closest working relationship with a pastor. The other two lay leaders, who were also elected officers of the congregation, were selected by the pastor to fill out the MEI and ALQ. It is possible that lay leaders are often more committed to the church than the average parishioner and their views may not represent perceptions of authentic leadership and ministerial effectiveness held by the entire congregation. Researchers could significantly expand knowledge about the relationship between authentic leadership and ministerial effectiveness by studying the perceptions of all laity rather than just leaders.

A particularly interesting aspect of this study, which differs in some ways and yet parallels the findings within other studies, was the analysis of the pastors' self-rating (Barnett, 2003; Butler & Herman, 1999). While the ministerial effectiveness self-rating of pastors was significantly higher than the rating of their laity, differing from previous studies, the authentic leadership self-rating of pastors was considerably lower than the ratings of lay leaders, producing a "halo effect" on the side of authentic leadership. Research on common method variance would suggest that the results should have produced the opposite results with the ALQ, with pastors rating themselves higher (Chang et al., 2010; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). The theological or worldview implications of this result are intriguing. It is possible that the Christian virtue of humility within pastors affects responses to some items in the ALQ. A qualitative study to further examine why pastors rated themselves lower in authentic leadership yet higher in ministerial effectiveness would be beneficial. In addition, future research on other denominations, particularly with those which ordain female pastors, could prove enlightening.

Church bodies, congregations, and seminaries depend upon secure, stable, and visionary pastoral leaders to guide them through the complexities of today's world. They rely on clergy not only to have sufficient theological and theoretical knowledge but also to have capable personal skills, aptitude, and desire to meaningfully and lovingly engage with people. According to Harbaugh (1984), Scazzero (2003), Steinke (2006), and Bloom (2013), many factors inhibit pastoral leadership from becoming a reality, including increased stress, increased social isolation, emotional instability, and the inability to negotiate relationship boundaries. Congregations often assume that all clergy positively influence people, handle power struggles, and are ably equipped and well-seasoned to work with, value, and love people. However, even though pastors have been immersed in theological training and possess strong faith, beliefs, and values, they may not be automatically prepared to nourish and strengthen numerous social contact experiences with people and lead other lay leaders. Further, more crucial to the point, some pastors do not have experience leading an organization or lay leaders who expect pastors to guide them with a shared model of leadership. For such capacity, a new role of responsibility requires time, training, and education to grow in this vocation. Therefore, today's clergy are required to be cognitively sharp, emotionally able, socially engaged, and fully equipped to lead people. This study contributed toward that process, strengthening the understanding of authentic leadership of clergy, as well as their overall ministerial effectiveness.

References

- Aleshire, D. O. (1980). Eleven major areas of ministry. In D. S. Schuller, M. P. Strommen, & M. L. Brekke (Eds.), *Ministry in America: A report and analysis, based on an in-depth study of 47 denominations in the United States and Canada, with interpretation by 18 experts* (pp. 23-53). San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Atwater, L. E., Waldman, D. A., & Cartier, P. (2000). An upward feedback field experiment: Supervisor's cynicism, reactions and commitment to subordinates. *Personnel Psychology*, 53(2), 275- 297. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb00202.x
- Avolio, B., & Gardner, W. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315-338. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F. L., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 801-823. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.09.003

- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60(1), 421-429. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621
- Barnett, D. C. (2003). *A comparative analysis of critical competencies of the assessment of ministerial effectiveness* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3102040)
- Belcher, G. D. (2002). *The relationship of mentoring to ministerial effectiveness among pastors of the Southern Baptist Convention* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3048643)
- Beyer, P. D. (2010). *Authentic leadership in-extremis: A study of combat leadership* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3398746)
- Bloom, M. (2013). Flourishing in ministry: Emerging research insights on the well-being of pastors. The Flourishing in Ministry Project, Mendoza College of Business, University of Notre Dame.
- Briand, M. (2009). *The relationship between authentic leadership, psychological need satisfaction and motivation* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. MR63334)
- Butler, D. M., & Herman, R. D. (1999). Effective ministerial leadership. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 9(3), 229-239. doi:10.1002/nml.9302
- Carter, J. C. (2009). Transformational leadership and pastoral leadership effectiveness. *Pastoral Psychology*, 58(3), 261-271. doi:10.1007/s11089-008-0182-6
- Caza, A., Bagozzi, R. P., Woolley, L., Levy, L., & Caza, B. B. (2010). Psychological capital and authentic leadership: Measurement, gender, and cultural extension. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 2(1), 53-70. doi:10.1108/17574321011028972
- Chan, A., Hannah, S. T., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Veritable authentic leadership: Emergence, functioning and impacts. In W. L. Gardner, B. J. Avolio & F. O. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and development* (Vol. 3, pp. 3-41). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
- Chang, S., Van Witteloostuijn, A., & Eden, L. (2010). From the editors: Common method variance in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(2), 178-184.
- Clapp-Smith, R., Vogelgesang, G. R., & Avey, J. B. (2009). Authentic leadership and positive psychological capital. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15(3), 227. doi:10.1177/1548051808326596
- Eaton, K. J. (2002). *A study of the relationship between 16 PF personality factors and ministerial effectiveness in a sample of Anglican clergy* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. MQ72148)
- Erickson, J. E. (1995). The importance of authenticity for self and society. *Symbolic Interaction*, 18(2), 121-144. doi:10.1525/si.1995.18.2.121
- Eriksen, M. (2009). Authentic leadership: Practical reflexivity, self-awareness, and self-authorship. *Journal of Management Education*, 33(6), 747. doi:10.1177/1052562909339307
- Ezell, R. (1995). *Strengthening the pastor's soul: Developing personal authenticity for pastoral effectiveness*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel.

- Fryling, R. A. (2010). *The leadership ellipse: Shaping how we lead by who we are*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- George, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goffee, R., & Jones, G. (2006). Getting personal on the topic of leadership: Authentic self-expression works for those at the top. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 14(4), 32-34. doi:10.1108/09670730610666382
- Goleman, D. (2004). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, 82(1), 82-91. Retrieved from <http://hbr.org/>
- Gregory the Great. (1995). The book of pastoral rule and selected epistles (J. Barmby, Trans.). In P. Schaff & H. Wallace (Eds.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene fathers: Series II, Vol. XII. Leo the Great, Gregory the Great* (pp.1-72). Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Harbaugh, G. L. (1984). *Pastor as person: Maintaining personal integrity in the choices and challenge of ministry*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg.
- Harter, S. (2002). Authenticity. In C.R. Snyder & S. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 382-394). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Hughes, L. W. (2005). Developing transparent relationships through humor in the authentic leader-follower relationship. In W. L. Gardner, B. J. Avolio & F. O. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and development* (Vol. 3, pp. 83-106). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
- Ilies, R., Morgeson, F., & Nahrgang, J. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaimonic well-being: Understanding leader-follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 373-394. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.002
- Jones, L. G., & Armstrong, K. R. (2006). *Resurrecting excellence: Shaping faithful Christian ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Klenke, K. (2005). The internal theatre of the authentic leader: Integrating cognitive, affective, conative and spiritual facets of authentic leadership. In W. Gardner, B. Avolio & F. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and development* (Vol. 3, pp. 155-182). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
- Klenke, K. (2007). Authentic leadership: A self, leader, and spiritual identity perspective. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(1), 68-97. Retrieved from www.regent.edu/ijls
- Leroy, H., Palanski, M. E., & Simons, T. (2012). Authentic leadership and behavioral integrity as drivers of follower commitment and performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(3), 255-264. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1036-1
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. (2003). Authentic leadership development. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 241-258). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Luthans, F., Luthans, K., Hodgetts, R., & Luthans, B. (2001). Positive approach to leadership (PAL) implications for today's organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 8(2), 3-20. doi:10.1177/107179190100800201
- Majovski, L. F. (1982). *The role of psychological assessment in ministerial selection* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8223416)

- Mind Garden, Inc. (n.d.). *Authentic leadership questionnaire for researchers*. Retrieved from <http://mindgarden.com/products/alq.htm#sample>
- Nauss, A. (1996). Assessing ministerial effectiveness: A review of measures and their use. In J. M. Greer, D. O. Moberg & M. L. Lynn (Eds.), *Research in the social scientific study of religion* (Vol. 7, pp. 221- 251). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Peterson, S. J., Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., & Hannah, S. T. (2012). The relationship between leadership and job performance: The mediating role of follower positivity in extreme contexts. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(3), 502-516. doi:10.1016/j.lequa.2011.12.004
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Raelin, J. A. (2002). "I don't have time to think!" versus the art of reflective practice. *Reflections*, 4(1), 66-79. doi:10.1162/152417302320467571
- Rego, A., Vitoria, A., Magalhaes, A., Ribeiro, N., & Pina e Cunha, M. (2013). Are authentic leaders associated with more virtuous, committed and potent teams? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 61-79. doi:10.1016/j.lequa.2012.08.002
- Rodin, R. S. (2010). *The steward leader: Transforming people, organizations and communities*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Scazzero, P. (2003). *The emotionally healthy church: A strategy for discipleship that actually changes lives*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Schuller, D. S., Strommen, M. P., & Brekke, M. L. (Eds.). (1980). *Ministry in America: A report and analysis, based on an in-depth study of 47 denominations in the United States and Canada, with interpretation by 18 experts*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Scuderi, N. F. (2010). *Servant leadership and transformational leadership in church organizations* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3413541)
- Steinke, P. L. (2006). *Congregational leadership in anxious times: Being calm and courageous no matter what*. Herndon, VA: The Alban Institute.
- Stewart, K. (2009). Keeping your pastor: An emerging challenge. *Journal for the Liberal Arts and Sciences*, 13(3), 112-127. Retrieved from www.oak.edu/academics/school-arts-sciences-jlas.php
- Terry, R. W. (1993). *Authentic leadership: Courage in action*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Trotter, F. T. (1980). The United Methodist Church. In D. S. Schuller, M. P. Strommen, & M. L. Brekke (Eds.), *Ministry in America: A report and analysis, based on an in depth study of 47 denominations in the United States and Canada, with interpretation by 18 experts* (pp. 445-456). San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

- Walumbwa, F., Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Wernsing, T., & Peterson, S. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34(1), 89-126. doi:10.1177/0149206307308913
- Wong, C. A., Laschinger, H. K., & Cummings, G. G. (2010). Authentic leadership and nurses' voice behaviour and perceptions of care quality. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 18(8), 889-900. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2834.2010.01113.x

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.