

Pepperdine University
Graduate School of Education and Psychology

SIGNIFICANT TRAITS, CHARACTERISTICS, AND QUALITIES OF
HIGH EFFECTIVE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH CLERGY

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

by

Grant John Hagiya

September, 2011

Kent Rhodes, Ed.D. – Dissertation Chairperson

UMI Number: 3468837

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3468837

Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This edition of the work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

This dissertation, written by

Grant John Hagiya

under the guidance of a Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Doctoral Committee:

Kent Rhodes, Ed.D., Chairperson

Vance Caesar, Ph.D.

Cedrick Bridgeforth, Ed.D.

© Copyright by Grant John Hagiya (2011)

All Rights Reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	viii
VITA	ix
ABSTRACT	x
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH	1
Overview	1
The United Methodist Church and Membership Decline	3
Statement of the Problem	5
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Question	6
Significance of the Study.....	7
Limitations of the Study	8
Definitions of Terms	9
Organization of the Study	11
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	13
Overview	13
Personality Traits Theory Model	13
Situational Theory Model	20
Style Approach Theory Model	24
Contingency Theory Model	26
Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory Model	27
Transformational Theory Models	30
Servant Leadership Model	34
Women and Leadership	41
Emotional Intelligence and Leadership	50
Clergy Leadership	52
Unconditional Positive Regard	68
Beyond Current Leadership Paradigms	70
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	75
Nature of the Study	75
Hypotheses	75

	Page
Research Questions	76
Analysis Unit, Population, Sample and Sampling Technique	76
Characteristics Studied and their Definitions	78
Data Collection Plan	83
Instrumentation	87
Measuring Emotional Intelligence	87
Measuring Leadership Characteristics	89
Data Analysis	91
Analytical Techniques	92
 CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS	 96
Quantitative Findings	96
The BarOn Assessment Measuring Emotional Intelligence	96
The Leadership Practices Inventory Measuring Transformational Leadership	 98
The Size and Health of the Local Church Appointment	100
Personal Self Assessment of Leadership and Ministry Effectiveness	101
Qualitative Findings	102
Question 1	105
Question 2	108
Question 3	118
Question 4	126
Question 5	134
Question 6	136
Question 7	143
Question 8	152
Question 9	154
Question 10	160
Question 11	169
Summary of the Qualitative Findings	180
 CHAPTER 5: RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS... ..	 181
The BarOn Assessment and Emotional Intelligence	181
The Leadership Practices Inventory on Transformational Leadership	183
Summary of the Qualitative Analysis	185
Overall Conclusions	191
Specific Research Concerns	192
Recommendations to the United Methodist Church	193
Future Research Options and Recommendations	195

	Page
REFERENCES	199
APPENDIX A: Demographics of Ministers Survey	209
APPENDIX B: Analysis of Ministers Survey	210
APPENDIX C: Invitation to Participate in Research	216
APPENDIX D: Invitation to Participate in In-Depth Interview	217
APPENDIX E: Demographic Survey	218
APPENDIX F: Informed Consent Form 1	219
APPENDIX G: Informed Consent Form 2	221
APPENDIX H: IRB Approval Letter	223

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Statistics from the California-Pacific Annual Conference	3
Table 2. Robert Quinn's Eight Polarities and Eight Creative States	17
Table 3. DeShon and Quinn Study of Clergy Knowledge, Skills, Ability and Personal.....	66
Table 4. High Effective vs. Low Effective Clergy on the BarOn Scale of Emotional Intelligence.....	97
Table 5. High Effective vs. Low Effective Clergy on the Leadership Practices Inventory	99
Table 6. High Effective vs. Low Effective Clergy on Church Size and Vitality	100
Table 7. High Effective vs. Low Effective Clergy on their Personal Leadership and Ministry Effectiveness	101
Table 8. Small Membership Churches in the United Methodist Church.....	113

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The African proverb that “it takes a village to raise a child,” is never so true in other contexts, and especially as one endeavors to write a doctoral dissertation. The completion of the research and writing of this dissertation could not have been done without a whole “village” of supporters.

I need to acknowledge my own family, who gave me the time and support to complete this study.

I need to thank my dissertation committee, who guided and steered me to completion, as well as the Professors and staff of Pepperdine University, who teach and lead with inspiration and knowledge. My dissertation Chairperson, Dr. Ken Rhodes, and Committee members, Dr. Vance Caesar and Dr. Cedrick Bridgeforth provided such supportive and wise advice throughout the entire process.

I need to thank the United Methodist Church, who gave me intervals of time to do the research and writing.

Finally, I need to humbly thank all of the United Methodist Church clergy who agreed to participate, and without which this study would not have been possible.

VITA

CHURCH PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2008-Present	United Methodist Church Bishop, Seattle and Alaska Areas
2008-2008	Executive Director of the Center for Leadership Excellence, Cal-Pac Annual Conference & the Claremont School of Theology
2005-2008	Dean of the Cabinet, Los Angeles District, California-Pacific Annual Conference
2000-2008	District Superintendent, Los Angeles District, California-Pacific Annual Conference
1993-2000	Senior Minister, Centenary United Methodist Church, Los Angeles
1985-1993	Senior Minister, North Gardena United Methodist Church
1978-1985	Senior Minister, Berkeley United Methodist Church

EDUCATION

2009-Present	Doctoral Candidate, Pepperdine University, Organizational Leadership
2007-Present	Ed.D. Student, Pepperdine University, Organizational Leadership
1978-1982	Ph.D. Student, Graduate Theological Union Area IV Religion & Society (Major Concentration: Theological Ethics, Minor Concentration: Sociology of Religion)
1977	D.Min., School of Theology at Claremont Dissertation: The Japanese American Christian Church: "It's Past, Present and Future"
1977	M.Div., School of Theology at Claremont
1976	M.A. in Religion, School of Theology at Claremont Graduating Paper Requirement: "The Theology of Violence in Latin American Liberation Theology"
1974	B.A. San Jose State University – Major: Psychology, Minor: Asian American Studies and Speech Communications

SEMINARY WORK EXPERIENCE

1997-present	Adjunct Faculty Member, Claremont School of Theology
1995-1998	Director, Licensing School, School of Theology, Claremont. Instructor in the Course of Study
1990-1994	Director, Course of Study, School of Theology, Claremont Adjunct Faculty, School of Theology, Claremont
1990-1993	Director of Urban Ministries and Assistant Professor of Religion and Society, School of Theology, Claremont
1990-1991	Interim Director, Field Education, School of Theology, Claremont
1987-1989	Director, Licensing School, School of Theology, Claremont

ABSTRACT

This dissertation attempts to identify the key traits, characteristics, and qualities of high effective United Methodist Church clergy. The experimental study employed a mixed methods design, with a quantitative component that compared high effective and low effective clergy on the dimensions of their Emotional Intelligence using the BarOn Assessment, leadership qualities using the Leadership Practices Inventory, church size and vitality, and finally, self identification as to leadership abilities and ministry effectiveness. It also included a qualitative component in the form of in-depth interviews with high effective United Methodist Church clergy on their leadership traits, characteristics, and qualities.

The dissertation's quantitative findings include a significant correlation at the .05 level on the Emotional Intelligence of highly effective UMC clergy as compared to low effective UMC clergy. On the Leadership Practices Inventory between highly effective and low effective clergy, the conclusions are mixed and inconclusive. The study did find a significant difference at the .05 level between highly effective UMC clergy as compared to low effective UMC clergy on both the size and vitality of the churches that they serve and the self-ranking of their personal leadership and ministry effectiveness.

The qualitative research identified 11 key traits, characteristics and qualities that highly effective clergy demonstrate, and a 12th factor that demonstrates situation and context making a difference in one's leadership, but highlighting the ability of these leaders to adapt and change.

The dissertation concludes with some major recommendations of the findings to the United Methodist Church and other mainline denominations, as well as suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction of the Research

Overview

This dissertation attempts to find significant traits, characteristics and qualities of successful United Methodist Church local church ministers who have a proven track record of being able to increase membership and programs in the churches where they serve. In the last 20 years of ministry, this researcher has observed those ministers who are able to grow the church where they are assigned, regardless of the size, health, or condition of the church when they first arrived. In other words, some ministers seem to have the ability to grow churches no matter what the condition of the church, and others clearly do not. This study will ask the question of “why.”

Like many organizations that face the challenge of organizational change, the mainline Protestant churches have experienced an external environment shift that has greatly affected membership and commitment (as cited in the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, 2008; Schaller, 2005).

The United Methodist Church has inherited the way to do programs for the church from the 1950-60's when it was popular to attend a local parish in one's immediate neighborhood. Back then, denominations could build or acquire a place of worship in a demographically rich area, open its doors and people would come. In our present time, the norm is not to attend a local church on Sunday morning, so the old strategy of local and weekly church attendance just does not work anymore. Church growth experts, Frost and Hirsh (2003) name this phenomenon: the “attractional church” versus the “missional church” (p. 18). The “attractional church” represents the old paradigm where the church

would attract visitors and newcomers into its doors, and the general U.S. population would be seeking to attend a church. The new paradigm involves the “missional church,” whose task is to go outside its doors to a missional field to engage and witness to its message.

To put this in a more formal research mode, there exists the dynamic of a paradigm shift in how organized religion is perceived and valued (Mead, 1991). Basically, society has moved from a Christendom era where the local church is the accepted norm and supported by members of a local community or neighborhood, to a post modern age that does not see value in the Christian church and actually shuns organized religion. The statistics are very telling when it is pointed out that between 60% and 70% of Generation Xers have never attended a church, not even for a funeral or wedding (Southern & Norton, 2001).

A recent Lilly endowed project from the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life reports that approximately one-quarter of American adults (28%) have left the faith in which they were raised in favor of another religion, or no religion at all (as cited in the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, 2008).

This same survey reports that the number of people who say they are unaffiliated with any particular faith today is one out of every six Americans (16.1%). This figure is more than double the number who say they were not affiliated with any particular religion as children, indicating a growing rejection of organized religious faith. If you take the age group 18-29 years, who say that they are not affiliated with any particular religion, the number rises to one out of every four Americans.

The United Methodist Church and Membership Decline

The United Methodist Church (UMC) is a world-wide denomination that is the second largest Protestant denomination in the United States. The UMC has a hierarchy of connecting bodies, and the annual conference represents a geographically located collection of local churches and clergy. The California-Pacific Annual Conference (Cal-Pac AC), which will be the object of this study, encompasses the Southern California region and includes all the islands of Hawaii, and also Guam and Saipan. The Cal-Pac AC is comprised of approximately 390 churches and 82,000 members.

The UMC has not escaped the huge environmental shift in church attendance. The entire denomination lost 80,000 members in 2004 alone, and the church loses approximately 15,000 members each week (T. Butcher, personal communication, September 29, 2008).

To use the benchmark of the years, 1968 compared to 2003. During this period the overall population growth in Los Angeles went from 5 million people in 1968 to over 15 million in 2003. Unfortunately, the United Methodist Church in this region continued to decline in hard numbers. Here are the important statistics:

Table 1

Statistics from the California-Pacific Annual Conference

	1968	2003
Congregations	461	390
Members	267,164	93,099
Average Worship Attendance	246	141
Ratio of Clergy to Members	1 to 503	1 to 209

A more telling description is the fact that Bishop Gerald Kennedy, the icon of membership growth in Episcopal leadership, hoped to have 100 local churches with 1,000

members or more by the time he retired. When he did retire in 1972, he had almost reached his goal with 98 churches with 1,000 members or more. In the 39 years since his retirement, the annual conference has declined in large membership churches so that they now have only 5 churches with 1,000 members or more.

Jim Collins (2001) begins his understanding of a cultural of discipline with the admonition: “Confront the Brutal Facts Yet Never Lose Faith” (p. 86). The United Methodist Church has consistently failed to “Confront the Brutal Facts.” Of course, the UMC shares this overall decline with all mainline Protestant denominations, but as the second largest Protestant denomination in the United States, the United Methodist Church has been especially susceptible to this dilemma.

The sad reality is that these statistics are fairly common for many other United Methodist annual conferences. They are also the norm for many of the mainline Protestant denominations. This is indicative of the United States Census statistics that show that there exists not one county in the entire United States that has a greater church population in it now than it did 10 years ago (T. Butcher, personal communication, September 29, 2008).

Still, among the overall decline, there are some UMC clergy who continue to grow their churches in both worship attendance and membership, and carry on vital ministries to their congregations and communities. It is critical for denominational leaders to understand why this is so, and to isolate qualities and characteristics that might be teachable to other ministers, and especially seminarians who are in training to become ministers.

Statement of the Problem

Why do some UMC ministers seem to have the ability to increase worship attendance, membership, and vitality when assigned to a local church and others do not? Since the United Methodist Church requires a minimum standard of education and training (a Master of Divinity degree from an approved seminary) of all ordained clergy, it somewhat mitigates the educational variable in this difference. In addition, all UMC clergy must go through a rigorous process in order to become candidates, and go through a comprehensive examination in order to receive ordination. Here again, there is a minimum standard of competency and examination in a probationary period. Since all candidates must go through a standardized process in order to become ordained, an additional variable of minimum competency is also removed. In spite of these standards of ordination in the United Methodist Church, there still exists an inescapable difference between those UMC ministers who can tangibly grow a local church in membership and activity, and those who cannot.

Purpose of the Study

This study attempts to isolate some key traits, qualities, and characteristics of highly successful UMC ministers in terms of growth of their churches. It addresses a major problem facing mainline denominational churches: membership decline and the closing of local churches. If the study identifies key traits and qualities of successful ministers, this will have a number of key implications to the United Methodist Church, and other denominations.

First, this will enable the church to be more effective in identifying and recruiting potential ministers with similar traits and characteristics. The polity of the UMC is that

every local church should be a recruiting ground for potential new ministers. The Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church (2004), states that the Committee on Pastor-Parish Relations (e.g. the Personnel Committee of the local church) shall: “enlist, interview, evaluate, review, and recommend annually to the charge conference lay preachers and persons for candidacy for ordained ministry” (p. 175). At every level of the church it would help to know what type of ministerial leader the church needs.

Second, this would greatly improve the church’s training of new ministers at the seminary level. If there were some key traits or characteristics we could isolate as attributed to highly effective ministers, the seminary could design specific courses to enhance or improve such qualities.

Third, if denominational judicatories knew specifically what makes for highly effective ministers, they could retool and improve those existing clergy who are less than effective, and even those who show potential for effectiveness but have not yet turned that corner in their ministry.

In summation, answering the question of what makes for a highly effective minister would enable the denomination to create and implement a leadership process that would have impact on recruitment, training and continuing education for its clergy.

Research Question

The research question of this dissertation is: What traits, qualities, or characteristics, if any, do highly effective and successful United Methodist Church ministers exhibit specifically in regard to growth of their churches when compared to less effective United Methodist Church ministers?

Significance of the Study

In North America and Europe, the mainline Protestant Church continues to decline in both membership and number of churches (Schaller, 2004). This is largely the result of a cultural ethos shift in American and European organized religion. The present U.S. context is a time and culture where people are not seeking out organized religion on a massive scale. As generations get farther and farther away from exposure to and comfort level within the mainline church, the natural attrition rate of the church's loyal followers will lead to membership loss. Schaller (2004) stated that in 1972 the United Methodist church reported a total of 12,543,000 members, of which the majority of these were members in the United States (12,067,000). The remaining 476,000 or 3.8 percent were members of churches called the "Central Conferences," or those in other countries outside the U.S. In 2001, these same statistics showed that the UMC had 9,591,000 members in America and 2,466,000, or 20 percent of the total in the Central Conferences (the huge growth in Africa and Asia). Since that time the numbers in the U.S. have continued to decline whereas the numbers in Africa and Asia have risen dramatically. Virtually all of the other mainline Protestant denominations are experiencing this same membership decline in the U.S., so clearly the religious cultural shift is impacting all of the mainline churches.

As can be expected the United Methodist Church, as an organization, is reacting to this decline by reorganization, retooling, and reshaping. It is fitting into the classical business paradigm of a market shift that equates into declining profits for a corporation, and in turn that corporation undergoes a massive reorganization and change process in order to adapt and survive in a changing business pattern.

The United Methodist Church is in the midst of that very change process, and leadership is on the front burner of its focus. If this study is successful in providing insight into what makes for an effective local church minister, it could enable the denomination to retool its leadership development and selection process, train existing ministers to be more effective, and lay the groundwork for a future generation to be productive in our present national cultural climate.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of this study is that it is confined to United Methodist ordained ministers who are appointed in the California-Pacific Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church. Although the United Methodist Church is the second largest Protestant denomination in the United States, there are some differences in polity and practice from other mainline Protestant denominations (e.g. Episcopal, Presbyterian, Lutheran, etc.).

Another limitation would be the regional nature of this study, namely, the Southwestern part of the United States and Southern California and Hawaii in particular. There exist tremendous regional cultural differences for the United Methodist Church in terms of geography. For example, the UMC in the mid-East and southeast of the United States is markedly more conservative both theologically and socially than the West. The West is also the smallest numerically in terms of membership and churches as compared to the Mid-East and Southeast of our country.

One final limitation would be that all of the congregations in the study can be classified as homogenous in that they are all English speaking, and although there are

ethnic congregations in the study, they are uniformly of the same ethnic group and not multicultural.

Definition of Terms

Trait theory: Webster's New World Dictionary (1994) defines "trait" as a "distinguishing quality or characteristic" (p. 1508). Consequently, "characteristic" is defined as "the indication of a quality that is peculiar to, and helps identify something or someone" (p. 239). Obviously, there is a circularity of the definitions, and they can be used interchangeably.

A more precise definition comes from the leadership literature where trait theory is one of the oldest and most researched theories. Northouse (2007) describes it this way:

Of interest to scholars throughout the 20th century, the trait approach was one of the first systematic attempts to study leadership. In the early 20th century, leadership traits were studied to determine what made certain people great leaders. The theories that were developed were called "great man" theories because they focused on identifying the innate qualities and characteristics possessed by great social, political, and military leaders (e.g. Mohandas Gandhi, Abraham Lincoln, and Napoleon). It was believed that people were born with these traits, and only the "great" people possessed them. During this time, research concentrated on determining the specific traits that clearly differentiated leaders from followers. (p. 15)

Trait theory has ebbed and flowed in terms of popularity and acceptance, and as of late it has seen resurgence in popularity (Bass, 1990; Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

Ministers: will be defined as Commissioned or Ordained Elders in the United Methodist Church. Commissioned or Ordained refers to the two steps in the current UMC ordination process. One first goes through the process of candidacy, where all of the psychological testing and exploratory examinations take place. One must then go through an exhaustive set of examinations and interviews in order to receive the probationary status of Commissioned Elder. Upon completion of the Master of Divinity degree from an approved seminary (a three year professional degree), and a minimum of two full years under supervised appointment in the United Methodist Church (usually serving a local United Methodist Church), the person is then eligible to apply for ordination as a Full Member of the Annual Conference and Ordained Elder. Upon receiving Elders Orders, United Methodist ministers are tenured for life in the structure of the church.

Highly effective and successful: The operational definition of highly effective and successful will be used in reference to those United Methodist ministers who have sustained numeric worship attendance growth at a 10% or higher level at their primary worship services, in their local churches in three out of five years of their ministry, or longer. An additional level of definition will be those who have been deemed highly effective and successful by their immediate supervisor, the District Superintendent.

Lower effective: Conversely, lower effective United Methodist ministers will be those who have seen no growth or whose congregations have declined at a 10% level or higher in their worship attendance at their primary worship services in their local

churches in the last three out of five years of their ministry, or longer. Again, their immediate supervisor, the District Superintendent, will confirm the definition of lower effective.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into 5 chapters. Chapter 1 includes the generic introduction of the research project, and all of the background information necessary to explain its content. It also includes the statement of the problem, purpose of the study and research questions. The first chapter rounds out the laying out of the problem by including the significance, limitations and organization of the study, and defining the key terms of the research questions.

Chapter 2 summarizes the findings of the literature review on leadership, trait theory, transformational leadership, and the measurement assessments, which include emotional intelligence and leadership styles. It concludes with a summary of the literature review findings.

Chapter 3 lays out the research design and methodology. Included in this chapter are the nature of the study, the study's objectives including the hypothesis under investigation and the research questions. The chapter looks at the analysis unit, population and sample, describes and defines the characteristics to be studied, and explains the data collection plan. The chapter concludes by looking at the specific assessment instruments (including validity and reliability), and the analytical techniques employed. A final summary of the research design and methodology is included.

Chapter 4 discusses the quantitative and qualitative findings of the study. The quantitative findings focus on the results of the analysis of the dependent variables in the

form of the two assessment tools (the Leadership Practices Inventory and the BarOn Emotional Intelligence test). The size and vitality of the churches served by highly effective versus low effective clergy, and the self-ranking of the two groups in terms of personal leadership and ministry effectiveness are also examined. These findings are stated in order to assess the independent variable of high or low effectiveness of the clergy in the study.

The qualitative findings focus on the traits, qualities and characteristics of the highly effective UMC clergy group. The objective of this chapter is the rich and thick descriptions of in-depth interviews with highly effective clergy. The conclusions of a thematic analysis and key leadership traits are highlighted and discussed in this chapter.

Chapter 5 summarizes the research project by drawing overall conclusions from the research findings. Also included are the important recommendations to the UMC denomination about leadership, leadership development, analysis, and evaluation. Finally, the chapter suggests future research options and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Overview

This literature review covers the major theories of leadership. The dissertation focuses on many of the theories in a foundational way, but concentrates on a few specific theories as they apply to clergy leadership. Most notably, trait theory, servant leadership, transformational leadership, and emotional intelligence are the theories explored in-depth.

Personality Traits Theory Model

Certainly, one of the oldest systematic studies of leadership revolves around the model of personality trait theory. The earliest psychological study of leaders, attributed to Terman (1904) focused on the personality traits or qualities of individual leaders and was originally dubbed the “great man” approach and was the foundation for leadership studies (as cited in Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002). Personality traits theory reached its height of popularity between the 1940s and 1960s, and is still used to describe and define how these leaders became effective by utilizing their innate abilities (Judge et al., 2002). “Traits are considered to be patterns of individual attributes, such as skills, values, needs, and behaviors, which are relatively stable in the sense that they tend to repeat over time” (Strang, 2004, p. 431). The most common traits associated with this leadership style are: intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability (Northouse, 2007). Such abilities were characterized by attributes that set them apart from their organizational counterparts or peers exploring educational levels, physical

health, social standing and upbringing, communication capacity, cognitive stealth, masculinity, decision-making aptitude, and what is now known as emotional intelligence.

Although the personality trait theory has been through much iteration over the past hundred years, the process has been a concerted effort to better define leadership and has taken into account a bevy of possible attributes. The traits model has developed into what is now known as, The Big Five theory (Judge et al., 2002). Robbins (2005) lists the major factors attempt to capture or identify a leader's personality traits according to how leaders rate on the following scales:

Extraversion (introversion), agreeableness (antagonistic), conscientiousness (unreliability and disorganization), emotional stability (self-confidence/insecurity, calm/nervous, and level of anxiety), and openness (comfort with new and creative endeavors). (pp. 35-36)

Many studies have been conducted to either support or refute the traits model. What research does support is that traits correlate to an individual's ability to be perceived as an emergent leader. However, such personality traits are not the complete picture, or the only indicators of an individual's success as a leader (Lord, de Vader, & Alliger, 1986).

Even amid the controversy of trait theory in the field, there is little argument that great leaders do possess certain qualities and traits that accentuate their success. In his research on enduring greatness, Jim Collins (2001), has isolated a matrix of traits in his own theory of Level 5 Hierarchy of Leadership

By closely viewing this hierarchy of traits, the same list of common traits that many previous researchers have compiled can be paralleled. Level 1 necessitates

intelligence, level 2 requires self-confidence, level 3 entails determination, and level 4 involves integrity and sociability. “Level 5 leaders are a study in duality: modest and willful, shy and fearless. To grasp this concept, consider Abraham Lincoln, who never let his ego get in the way of his ambition to create an enduring great nation” (Collins, 2001, p. 140).

Collins (2001) is clear in his own mind that Level 5 leadership is one of the keys to an organization’s enduring greatness. Two main traits emerge from those who attain Level 5 leadership: Humility and a fierce determination and commitment to the organization itself, not for personal gain or recognition.

Since Collins’ (2001) model of leadership is cumulative, each level building on the foundation of the previous level, the end product of a Level 5 leader is one who has mastered the hierarchy itself. The end product of a Level 5 leader looks remarkably similar to a transformational leader (which will be covered later in this literature review). That Collins did not wish to label the Level 5 leader with this description begs the question of the real difference between a Transformational Leader and a Level 5 Leader. In reality, they look very similar on paper.

A rather novel evolution of trait theory is provided by Quinn (2004) in his book *Building the Bridge As You Walk On It*. Quinn’s main thesis is that in true leadership, we move from the comfort of the (Normal State of Leadership), to the (Fundamental State of Leadership). Quinn posits four quadrants in his theory of leadership:

1. In the Normal State one is Self Focused (Ego driven and mainly concerned with putting one’s own interest first),
2. Internally Closed (Wishing to stay in one’s comfort zone),

3. Externally Directed (Defining oneself based on how other's see you),
4. Comfort Centered (Living in a reactive state of problem solving).

In the Fundamental State of Leadership one moves past these comfort levels to being:

1. Other Focused (Moving beyond my own ego to putting the welfare of others or the common good first),
2. Externally Open (Pushing oneself outside one's comfort zone to a higher level of learning, growth and vision),
3. Internally Directed (Constantly evaluating oneself and removing the gap between my deepest values and how one acts),
4. Purpose Centered (Constantly clarifying one's core purpose and living one's life consistent with such core values; Quinn, 2004).

Quinn (2004) outlines four levels of working with leadership traits. The first level is the "Static View" (p. 85), and it highlights the basics of trait theory in identifying desired traits or characteristics of a leader. The second level is the "Polar View," that identifies opposite leadership traits such as "mindful; reflective" vs. "active; energetic" (pp. 86-87). The third level is the "Competing Values View," that "contains the thirty-two leadership traits organized into eight polarities and places each polarity next to a similar or overlapping polarity" (p. 87). At this level, a Jungian "shadow side" emerges, as when a leader overemphasizes some positive trait so that the trait has the potential to turn into a negative. Quinn gives the following example: "A concerned leader who practices too much concern becomes a lax leader. An overly assertive leader becomes an overbearing leader, etc." (p. 87).

Quinn's (2004) final level, and where the "Fundamental State of Leadership" emerges is the "Integrated View." At this level, positive traits expand to "co create and sustain each other" (p. 89). Thus, Quinn integrates positive oppositions to create a set of eight concepts in describing leadership (Table 2):

Table 2

Robert Quinn's Eight Polarities and Eight Creative States

Eight Polarities	Eight Creative States
Spontaneous; expressive/self-disciplined; responsible	Responsible freedom
Compassionate; concerned/assertive; bold	Tough love
Mindful; reflective/active; energetic	Reflective action
Principled; integrated/engaged; involved	Authentic engagement
Realistic; questioning/optimistic; constructive	Appreciative inquiry
Grounded; factual/visionary; hopeful	Grounded vision
Confident; secure/adaptive; flexible	Adaptive confidence
Independent; strong/humble; open	Detached interdependence

Thus for Quinn (2004), two positive trait polarities are identified, and if the leader can demonstrate both of these traits there will emerge an integrated state of a higher level of leadership. An example by Quinn is "Someone who exhibits 'tough love,' for example, will be both assertive/bold and compassionate/concerned" (p. 89).

One very provocative example of Quinn's (2004) polarities is "detached interdependence." In this state, the leader is both "humble and open" as well as

“independent and strong” (p. 163). The shadow side of these polarities is seen when the leader takes humble and hope too far, and this leads to the potential to be dependent and weak. On the other hand, if one is too independent and strong, it has the potential for the leader to become arrogant and closed. The synthesis of these polarities produces a leader who is “humble and strong” (p. 163). Quinn (2004) quotes the philosopher Peter Koestenbaum in reflecting upon this state:

It’s the existential paradox of holding yourself 100% responsible for the fate of your organization, on the one hand, and assuming absolutely no responsibility for the choices made by other people, on the other hand. (p. 161)

In the real world of organizational life, this state seems to offer sage advice. If the leader is totally committed and accountable for the outcome of his or her organization, and yet at the same time realizes that he or she cannot control the choices of individual employees, there is a realistic sense of leadership involved. One can give one’s all for the organization, and yet at the same time realistically put that commitment in perspective that as a leader one does not have absolute control over everyone. It has the potential for producing a leader with “realistic optimism,” and tempers any false expectations.

In summary, in expanding upon trait theory, Quinn (2004) provides a more sophisticated and comprehensive theory of leadership that has real world applicability. Of course, trait theory does not escape the criticism of the research field when it comes to the reality of its usefulness. Opponents of the trait approach theory of leadership argue that personality cannot explain leadership (Anderson, 2005). “Traits of leaders cannot explain organizational effectiveness. Management and leadership in formal organizations are not about possessing special traits. It is about acting” (Anderson, 2005, p. 1078).

Some contemporary research suggests that personality has no bearing on emergence in leadership. Even though Stodgill (as cited in Anderson, 2005) is quoted as claiming that leaders who have certain traits are not necessarily equipped for any leadership position, but that there are indicators that traits do work with other factors in leadership positions, Anderson (2005) still believes that it is a weak correlation to effective leadership. Furthermore, Gibb (1969) concluded in his research “there is no scientific basis for a relationship between traits and leading positions” (as cited in Anderson, 2005, p. 1085). Yet, Gibb does mention that personality traits cannot be excluded from leadership positions (Anderson, 2005). Most telling, trait theory does not have a strong and systemic training component that enables one to hone the specific traits needed for success.

Even amid the controversies, trait theory does help us look at enduring qualities that do impact leadership. It enables people to work from their strengths (the Gallup Poll Strengthsfinders research), describes qualities for people to work on in their leadership quest, and is supported by a century of research. It is clear that the trait approach is alive and well, and will continue to be a factor in effective leadership research. As Northouse (2007) chronicles its history, trait theory “began with an emphasis on identifying the qualities of great persons; next, it shifted to include the impact of situations on leadership; and most currently, it has shifted back to reemphasize the critical role of traits in effective leadership” (p. 16).

Situational Theory Model

Situational leadership is one of the more popular and pragmatic models used in the organizational world today. In its simplest form, the leader adapts his or her leadership style to match the situation that he or she faces. Depending upon the unique situation that one encounters, the leader must adapt and change his or her leadership reaction based on what would be most effective given that uniqueness. As Yeakey (2002) comments: “To develop subordinates to become effective leaders and operate as cohesive teams, leaders must be adaptable in their own leadership styles to move toward participative leadership” (p. 81).

The situational theory model first originated with the research of Hersey, Blanchard and Hambleton in the 1960s (as cited in Gumpert & Hambleton, 1979). This theory explores how managers engage their environment through two relationship factors: task behavior or relationship behavior. As found in Gumpert and Hambleton (1979), the manager who engages by task, tends to dictate to their subordinates their requirements of goals and accomplishments. In the alternative, the manager that engages his team through relationship behavior makes a commitment to the employees’ success through supporting and listening to their subordinates.

The ability of a leader to employ differing styles may relate to changing situations within the job and psychological maturity, defined as the ability and motivation of employees in the organization (Graeff, 1983). As the developmental capacity of the followers mature, the ability and motivation of the employees increases, thus allowing leaders to employ a higher task-oriented approach over the relationship style (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Graeff (1983) challenges Hersey and Blanchard by picking apart their maturity component and definitions by positing that motivation and ability offer too many options. Given the appropriate situation and company, the situational relationship and behavior model does not retain its impact. The affects are a lowering of all components in the relationship model rather than having a larger affect on one particular aspect. Due to the nature of the situational method, the leader's approach has more to do with their ability to adapt to their employees abilities and responses rather than correlating to the leader's effectiveness or influence over the employees (Graeff, 1983).

The most contemporary advocate of the situational model of leadership is Goleman (2000), who unveiled his thinking in a Harvard Business Review article entitled *Leadership that gets Results*. Goleman begins his article by pointing out the lack of quantitative research that isolates precise leadership behaviors that lead to positive results, and then points to a Hay/McBer research model that drew upon a random sample of 3,871 executives from a database of more than 20,000 executives worldwide.

The Hay/McBer study isolated six distinct leadership styles (springing from different components of emotional intelligence) that appear to have a direct link to the performance of a company, division and team. These six include:

1. Coercive style
2. Authoritative style
3. Affiliative style
4. Democratic style
5. Pacesetting style
6. Coaching style (Goleman, 2000).

A quick description of the different styles highlights the coercive style (Goleman later changed the name to commanding), as top down, and demanding immediate compliance. It is a disciplinary style that is hierarchical and commanding. It tends to get short-term immediate results, but because of its negativity, turns workers off and has short-term motivational effects. The coercive style does have some success in times of crisis or immediate turnaround situations.

The authoritative style (a somewhat misleading name), wishes to mobilize people toward a vision, and instead of demanding of them, attempts to invite others to join in a positive direction or vision. The emphasis is placed on a communal or organizational goal, rather than individual achievement, and naturally works best in a change management situation, or when a clear direction is called for.

The affiliative style is the most relational of the six, and attempts to create harmony and build emotional bonds between people. It is a people first style that takes personal interest in workers and is genuinely concerned with their welfare. Obviously, the style centers on relationship building and communication. It is a strong style when there has been a breakdown in trust and honesty, to build team harmony and strengthen morale.

The democratic style is perfectly named in that it attempts to build consensus through direct participation. It is a collaborative style that asks workers for their opinions and attempt to get buy in by as large a segment of the organization as possible. This style tends to build morale, participation and empowerment, and in general, has a positive outcome for most organizations. It works best when the leader or organization is uncertain about what to do or where to go next in the near future.

The pacesetting style is a high accountability model that sets a very high bar and asks everyone to aspire to such a bar. It is a high achiever's model that asks/demands the very best effort and work from its employees, and sets measurements to assess if one is achieving such goals. People who use this style tend to lead by example, and must model the high performance that they are asking of others. Ironically, over time, it tends to harm morale and motivation rather than improve it. Often, employees feel overwhelmed with the demands and over their lack of ability to ever achieve increasingly high demands. This style works best with a high performing, self-motivated and high self esteem individual or team.

Finally, the coaching style is what the name implies: a developmental approach that is most concerned with building leadership for the future. Like good coaching it centers on the individual, and attempts to develop that individual to the best of his or her own abilities. Good coaching helps individuals improve on their strengths and address their weaknesses, sets self goals and directions, and enables them to be held accountable for what they have established as objectives. It is a positive approach to long-term leadership development, but it is the least used style due to most organizations' need for immediate results and the pressures of a competitive environment to produce. This style works best when employees are motivated to improve their skills and performance, and when the organization has the luxury of time and resources to develop future leaders.

The most helpful recommendation from Goleman (2000) is his observation that the most effective leaders use more than one style, or better yet, all six depending upon the specific situation that one faces. His analogy is an important one, and that is to think of the styles as:

An array of clubs in a golf pro's bag. Over the course of a game, the pro picks and chooses clubs based on the demands of the shot. Sometimes he has to ponder his selection, but usually it is automatic. The pro senses the challenge ahead, swiftly pulls out the right tool, and elegantly puts it to work. That's how high-impact leaders operate, too. (p. 80)

Style Approach Theory Model

The behavior of leaders is the focus of most Style theories of leadership. In contrast with trait theory that focuses on characteristics, style theory focuses on two major behaviors: task behavior and relationship behavior. Thus, task behavior centers on leaders who enable others to fulfill accomplishments and objectives. In contrast, relationship behavior focuses on leaders who are committed to building strong interpersonal relationships, and enabling others to feel comfortable with themselves, co-workers, and work situations. As Northouse (2007) explains: "The central purpose of the style approach is to explain how leaders combine these two kinds of behaviors to influence subordinates in their efforts to reach a goal" (p. 69).

At first glance, the style approach seems to mirror the previous situational leadership theory. Like the Hersey and Blanchard's situational approach, the style approach authored by Blake and Mouton (1982) evaluates how individuals lead and interact with a group of employees. Both seem to evaluate employee/relationship and production/task behaviors. However, key differences define the Style model.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) suggest that their work is influenced by the *observed* behaviors a leader exhibits in relation to their team members. Blake and Mouton (1982) are famous for the creation of the Managerial Grid, which describes

attitudes or predispositions toward production and employees, plus supports a high concern for people and their results (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982, pp. 50-51).

The grid depicts five leadership styles:

- 1.1 Impoverished Managers measure low concern for production and people.
- 1.9 Country Club Managers measure high concern for people and low concern for production.
- 9.1 Task Managers measure high concern for production and low concern for people.
- 5.5 Middle of the Road Managers measure medium concern for production and medium concern for people.
- 9.9 Team Managers measure high concern for production and high concern for people (Blake and Mouton, 1964).

Blake and Mouton (1982) purport, “This approach also culminates in descriptions of behavior, but the variables of the Managerial Grid are *attitudinal* and *conceptual*, with *behavior* descriptions derived from and connected with the thinking that lies behind action” (p. 22-23). They imply that by knowing the thoughts behind a leaders’ behavior, the Managerial Grid is a “more comprehensive statement of leadership theory” and “one [of the] most effective style” approaches (Blake and Mouton, 1982, p. 23).

Alternative, Hersey and Blanchard (1982) do not suggest that one theory is better than the other, but rather that the situational approach allows more flexibility for leaders to respond to their team members and respond with multiple options when confronted with many different situations.

Bass (1990), sums up the model well when he comments that the situational leadership model is one of the most utilized tools in leadership development for organizations.

Contingency Theory Model

Contingency theory builds upon the research in the situation and style models, and an indirect way, deflects the question of whether a person can change her or his leadership style to match a particular situation (Situational theory). Rather, contingency theory attempts to match the leader's natural style to a particular work role or task. Instead of the leader adapting to a situation, the leader is placed in a role or task that calls for that leader's particular style. As Mezner and Johnson (2005), comment: "A firm's strategy and structure must fit each other if performance is to be enhanced" (p. 121).

The contingency model stemmed from the situational approach to better define how leaders can find appropriate situations to fulfill an organizations need(s) thereby studying organizational issues and how best to fit traits of leaders to those needs through understanding power relationships (Fiedler, 1972). Contingency theory asks the question, "If situational and style approaches have no direct correlation to performance then how do we increase performance?" (Fiedler, 1972, p. 463).

Fiedler investigated groups of individuals with the same training and differing training and found no direct impact on performance outcomes. This left Fiedler (1972) to ask, "what factor(s) increase performance?" Fiedler's rhetorical answer: "The contingency model postulates that group performance depends on the match between situational favorableness, the leader's control and influence and leadership motivation" (p. 453).

Fiedler's (1972) then designed an appropriate test to find the best matching variables, which he called the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) concept.

The LPC builds upon the situational and style attributes by describing leaders as either task or goal oriented or relationship motivated. However, Fiedler (1972) added the additional variable of *position of power* to describe a leader's influence over subordinates to "reward and punish, hire and fire" (p. 455). On the LPC, high scores are relationship-motivated leaders and low scores are task-motivated leaders. According to Northouse (2007) by measuring a leader's LPC score and the variables, it can be predicted if a leader is going to be effective in a particular situation. Task-oriented leaders do well in highly favorable conditions such as in smooth running organizations and increase the performance of chaotic organizations (Fiedler, 1972).

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory Model

A simple and pragmatic definition of leadership is expressed in having followers. Such a definition is simplistic to the point of bordering on being unhelpful, but there is no doubt that leadership involves the dynamic of a relationship between leader and follower. This is exactly the subject of the leader-member exchange (LMX) theory: an emphasis on the relationship between a leader and follower, with the aim of improving task performance and job enrichment.

LMX theory has evolved over the last 50 years, and it has incorporated the evaluation of relationships among and between groups, and specifically between the group leader and members of the team (followers). Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) point out that LMX theory looks at both leader and follower roles and studies the working relationship between the two to understand the interrelation, perspectives, and behaviors

of the members. This differentiation can be utilized to take into consideration the numerous leadership theories to recognize when differing models may be most effective given differing situations.

Much like sociological studies of in-groups and out-groups in culture, LMX theory correlates a high quality relationship between leaders and followers who are part of in-group, and a low quality relationship to those who are part of an out-group. In this regard, high levels of information exchange, mutual support, informal influence, trust, and greater negotiating latitude and input in decision influence represent a high-quality LMX relationship (Somech & Wenderow, 2006).

In particular, leaders often have a special relationship with an inner circle of trusted lieutenants, assistants and advisors, to whom they give high levels of responsibility, decision influence, and access to resources. This in-group pays for their position. They work harder, are more committed to task objectives, and share more administrative duties. They are also expected to be fully committed and loyal to their leader. The out-group, on the other hand, is given low levels of choice or influence (Syque Consultants, 2002).

Therefore, a high-quality LMX relationship exists between a leader and follower who is part of the in-group whereas low-quality LMX relationships involve followers who are part of the out-group. Furthermore, high levels of information exchange, mutual support, informal influence, trust, and greater negotiating latitude and input in decision influence represent a high-quality LMX relationship (Somech & Wenderow, 2006).

LMX theory proposes a process of relationship development between the leader and followers. In this process, three sequential stages are moved through: (a) stranger,

(b) acquaintance, and (c) partner which all rely on transformational type social exchanges (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

In the first stage, or stranger level, individual self-interest is highest, as there has yet to be developed a commitment to the group or organization itself. If the leader can cultivate a transformational process, the leader will assess the follower's abilities to perform tasks, and expand roles and responsibilities in mutual trust. "Greater responsibilities, discretion, and benefits are given as the follower meets these successively expanded role responsibilities" (Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005, p. 423).

In the second, or acquaintance stage, social bonds and friendships increase, and there is a growing sense of commitment to one another and the work group itself. In this stage, there are increased social exchanges among members and they begin to share greater information and resources on both a personal and work related level (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). In the last and most committed stage, partnerships develop naturally from the bonds and loyalty that followers have toward the leader and each other.

In high-quality LMX relationships, loyalty and contributions from followers in work-related forms promote great task performance. An example of such a contribution is working longer hours to meet project deadlines. This performance, in turn, rewards workers with special privileges that lead to career-enhancing opportunities. "... [T]ask performance is a form of currency in the social exchange between leader and follower, and a means of fulfilling obligations for reciprocity" (Wang et al., 2005, p. 422).

A mature partnership in the LMX relationship transforms when there is a shift in

the followers' motivation from a desire to satisfy the immediate self-interest via quid-pro-quo exchanges to a desire to satisfy longer term and broader collective interests of the work unit (Wang et al., 2005).

Transformational Theory Models

It is always helpful to describe a concept by first looking at its opposite, and in the case of transformation theory, one must look at its opposite in transactional theory. The earliest origin of transformational leadership comes from James MacGregor Burns and his 1978 book entitled *Leadership*. Mostly a historical examination of how leaders shape the course of history by transforming followers, Burns captured the imagination of quite a few in the field of leadership.

Bernard M. Bass was one of the first to develop the ideas of transformational and transactional leadership from Burns (as cited in Spinelli, 2006). Bass (1985) compares the transformational theory models to that of the transactional theory model, which can be equated with the phrase, "give for get." Stemming from its very title, a "transaction" between the leader and follower utilizes methods whereby followers are rewarded for good effort, performance, and action. Transactional theory can describe a process or ethos that is operative by an organization, and everyone understands that it is the basis for the operating norm. Thus, the management only gets involved when employees are off track. Bass posits the managers are seen to be less involved or more passive and this behavior is assumed by the subordinates to not care about the work environment. Kest (2006) posits that subordinates will respond to the leader based upon rewards and punishments with a clear chain of command. There is thus, a common goal held by both the leader and the followers, otherwise known as a contingent reward. Leaders and the

followers can then combine energy to achieve their commonly defined goal. Hood (2003) states that transactional leadership is based on legitimate power or authority within the organization.

Transformational leadership has emerged as the clear preference in later and current iterations of the transactional-transformational theories. Transformational leadership is more closely aligned with the modern values of empowerment, self-determination and self-development. According to Bass and Avolio (1994), transformational leadership has four components; charismatic role modeling, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation.

Bass's (1985) model of the charismatic leader explores the ability of a leader to be aware of their subordinate's needs. Leaders work within their teams challenging and motivating their employees to strive for the greater good and a larger picture beyond self-interest.

Northouse (2007) outlines some of the key aspects of transformational leadership as emotions, values, ethics, standards and long-term goals, and includes assessing followers' motives, satisfying their needs, and treating them as full human beings. One of the key aspects of transformational leadership is the development of the followers as they are inspired by their leader to move in an ethical and value driven direction. The leader consistently inquires about the follower's needs for emotional capacity in order to meet those needs and influence the employees through problem-solving tactics (Bass, 1985).

Bass's (1985) model can be summarized by, "Transformational leaders inspire, energize, and intellectually stimulate their employees" (p. 19). This involvement by a

leader gives a structure to and example for employees. How the leader treats their subordinates is only one dimension of Bass' studies. Bass (1997) discusses the personal nature of the transformational leader as having characteristics or attributes such as displaying a conviction, demonstrating commitment, and having a value structure and strong personal ethics.

Reiterating Bass and Avolio (1995), Northouse (2007) repeats that transformational leadership has been broken down into four factors, charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration . Leaders who have a specific vision and a high ethical standard that followers subscribe to and wish to emulate would be described as demonstrating charisma. Charismatic leaders have strong convictions, high self-confidence and a deep sense to dominate and influence others (Mannarelli, 2006).

The second factor, "inspirational motivation" occurs when a leader builds a team through communication and inspiration of a shared vision. "What is necessary for leaders, whether regarded as charismatic or transformational, is that they have a compelling vision and that they find a way to communicate it" (Mannarelli, 2006, p. 47).

The third factor "intellectual stimulation" is manifest when a leader demonstrates supportive behavior in challenging followers by innovation and problem solving. As stated by Masood, Dani, Burns and Backhouse (2006), transformational leaders raise the consciousness of the followers with ideals, morals and values while not subscribing to negative emotions such as fear or greed.

The final factor the leader uses is "individualized consideration," and this is characterized by the development of followers in coaching or mentoring them to reach

individual fulfillment. To quote Beugre, Acar and Braun (2006): “In addition to providing inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation, transformational leaders provide individualized consideration to followers, showing respect and dignity and serving as mentors” (p. 55).

A popularized version of transformational leadership is found in Kouzes and Posner’s (2003) leadership model, *The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership*. They posit five practices that leaders do to get extraordinary things done in organizations: (a) Model the Way, (b) Inspire a Shared Vision, (c) Challenge the Process, (d) Enables Others to Act, and (e) Encourage the Heart.

Kouzes and Posner (2003) see the first act of “Modeling the Way” as the embodiment of integrity and credibility. As they describe this act: “leaders must stand for something, believe in something, and care about something” (p. 13). However, their actions must be consistent with their ideals and words. Leaders “set the example by aligning their personal actions with shared values” (Kouzes and Posner, 2003, p. 13).

Their second act is “Inspire a Shared Vision,” and this stresses the need for a greater vision for the whole, as well as the communication and commitment of followers to the larger vision. As Kouzes and Posner (2003) state: “leaders enlist others in their dreams by appealing to shared aspirations. They breathe life into ideal and unique images of the future and get people to see how their own dreams can be realized through a common vision” (p. 13).

The third suggestion is to “Challenge the Process.” This incorporates the leader’s task of change. In their own words: “The status quo is unacceptable to them. Leaders search for opportunities by seeking innovative ways to change, grow and improve.

Leaders also experiment and take risks by constantly generating small wins and learning from mistakes” (Kouzes and Posner, 2003, p. 14).

Collaboration is the object of the fourth practice, and this is entitled “Enable Others to Act.” In this practice, leaders enable others to work toward higher communal goals and strive for the greater good. Trust, mutual respect and cooperation are at the heart of this process. Leaders strive to empower others both personally and collectively to reach a higher purpose.

Finally, the last practice is to “Encourage the Heart.” Here, Kouzes and Posner (2003) recognize that continuous improvement is draining and difficult, and there will be frustration, exhaustion, and burnout. Leaders must respond by encouragement, appreciation, and inspiration to carry on. “Genuine acts of caring uplift spirits and strengthen courage” (Kouzes and Posner, 2003, p. 14). It is the task of all transforming leaders to speak to the heart, and uplift followers by offering hope for the future.

Kouzes and Posner (2003) have developed a standard leadership inventory (Leadership Practices Inventory, or LPI) to assess the five practices outlined above. A full description of the LPI is included in Chapter 3.

Servant Leadership Model

The servant leadership model has greatly influenced Christian churches in America since its development in the late 1970’s. Robert Greenleaf (1982) was the chief architect and spokesperson for the model, and wrote and lectured extensively on the virtues of servant leadership throughout his adult life.

There is a natural affinity between the tenets of servant leadership and the Biblical ethos of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. Many of the synoptic gospels recount Jesus

modeling servant leadership and speaking of being a servant (Matt. 20: 26ff; Matt. 25: 31ff; Mark 9: 35ff; John 13).

Ironically, Greenleaf (1982) would not accept that his idea of servant leadership came from the New Testament notion of “Whoever wishes to be great among you must be your servant...” (Matthew 20: 26, p. 1472), but rather drew much of the ethos of servant leadership from the more Eastern religious story of Herman Hess’ “Journey to the East.”

Fundamentally, the servant leader serves one’s subordinates by making them the priority and enabling the followers to achieve high standards and greatness (Wilson, 1998). The approach takes into account the larger community in the work environment, and posits by demonstrating a servant’s heart, the whole community will be uplifted to a higher sphere.

Spears (1995) characterized the servant leader field by ten traits: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building a community (as cited in Wilson, 1998).

Greenleaf himself was not a theologian by training, but in fact was a secular AT&T employee and executive who crossed over in his writings from the business field to the nonprofit and religious world. Greenleaf (1982) had a fairly holistic understanding of leadership as that of lifelong journey, in addition to a set of traits or qualities:

The premise here is that *to lead is to go out ahead and show the way when the way may be unclear, difficult, or dangerous* – it is not just walking at the head of the parade – and that one who leads effectively is likely to be stronger, more self-

assured, and more resourceful than most because leading so often involves venturing and taking risks.... Few, if any, who have these qualities of strength, assurance, and resourcefulness, are equally effective as leaders in all situations. Therefore, even the ablest leaders will do well to be aware that there are times and places in which they should follow. And one who seems deficient in one or more of these qualities may, on some occasion, rise to save the day. (p. 7)

What differentiates the religious leader for Greenleaf (1982) is a concern beyond oneself to the larger whole of humanity and the world? In this sense, Greenleaf sees the religious leader as exhibiting the values of compassion: civilizing influence, growth, and seeking to serve rather than destroy.

Greenleaf demonstrates his lack of any formal academic theological training in this rather amorphous description of religious, as there is no formal quality of a relationship with a greater ultimate being or reality. In this description, a secular humanist could qualify as a religious servant leader.

“Alienation” for Greenleaf (1982) is the great threat. He sees alienation as designating “Those who have little caring of their fellow humans, who are not motivated to serve people as individuals or as institutions, and who, though able, do not carry some constructive, society-supportive role, or who miss realizing their potential by much too wide a margin” (p. 11).

Equally imprecise is Greenleaf’s (1982) definition of “religious leadership:”

Together, as *religious leadership*, these two words are used here to describe actions taken to heal, to build immunity from, two serious maladies: (1) widespread alienation in all sectors of the population, and (2) the inability or

unwillingness to serve on the part of far too many of the institutions, large and small, that make up our complex society. (p. 11)

Thus the true test of efficacy for the religious leader is “does it cause the things to happen among people, directly or indirectly, that heal and immunize from maladies like these two?” (Greenleaf, 1982, pp. 11-12).

Somewhat more helpful is Greenleaf’s (1982) three qualities of the religious leader: “Prophet, Seeker and Leader” (p. 12). The Prophet is the one who clarifies vision and provides a check on reality. The Seeker is one “who has not yet found it” (p. 12), but continues to live with openness and questions. Finally, the leader is one who persists with determination and has the courage to take risks and venture into the unknown.

All of these qualities have theological and biblical foundations that Greenleaf fails to identify and thus, weakens his understanding of the difference between a secular and religious servant leader. For example, the biblical prophet was always sent and represented God, and thus had a direct relationship with an ultimate reality, rather than merely providing just any human based vision and penetrating insight.

To sharpen one’s understanding of the generic servant leader, Greenleaf (1982) posits that one first desires to serve and then to lead, and that the outcome of this servant leadership is always the betterment and self-development of those being served. To quote Greenleaf (1982) here:

The definition involves the world *serve*. In my first essay, *The Servant as Leader* I suggested that the servant-leader is servant first. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve *first*. Then conscious choice brings one

to aspire to lead. Such a person is sharply different from one who is *leader* first, perhaps because of a need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions. The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant; first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The test I like best, though difficult to administer, is: do those served grow as persons; do they, *while being served*, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged person in society; will she or he benefit, or at least, not be further deprived? No one will knowingly be hurt, directly, or indirectly. (p. 15)

Not fully understanding Greenleaf's (1982) stance, the United Methodist Church and other Christian denominations adopted his principles without depth of clarity. Thus, written into our UMC Book of Discipline (2004) as an expectation of all members: "for those persons to lead the church effectively, they must embody the teachings of Jesus in servant ministries and servant leadership" (p. 91).

Indeed, the UMC Book of Discipline (2004) dedicates a special heading and paragraph just to servant leadership, and calls upon both lay and clergy to exemplify such behavior:

Within the United Methodist Church, there are those called to servant leadership, lay and ordained. Such callings are evidenced by special gifts, evidence of God's grace, and promise of usefulness. God's call to servant leadership is inward as it comes to the individual and outward through the discernment and validation of the Church. The privilege of servant leadership in the Church is the call to share in the preparation of congregations and the whole Church for the mission of God

in the world. The obligation of servant leadership is the forming of Christian disciples in the covenant community of the congregation. This involves discerning and nurturing the spiritual relationship with God that is the privilege of all servant ministers. (p. 92-93)

Ordained ministers are called and set apart from the laity, but the burden of servant leadership for the role of clergy is especially pointed. The UMC Book of Discipline (2004) explains:

Ordained ministers are called by God to a lifetime of servant leadership in specialized ministries among the people of God...The ordained ministry is defined by its faithful commitment to servant leadership following the example of Jesus Christ, by its passion for the hallowing of life, and by its concern to link all local ministries with the widest boundaries of the Christian community. (p. 93)

What the UMC failed to recognize is that Greenleaf was adamantly opposed to the democratization of servant leadership, the rationale of which whole groups could not adequately carry out the tenants of servant leadership effectively (P. Amerson, personal communication, September 13, 2009).

Greenleaf (1982) addressed this very issue in his own words:

Twelve years ago when I wrote the first essay on *Servant as Leader* I discovered that I had given that piece a catchy title. I am grateful that the title gave the piece some circulation, but I am also aware of the danger servant leadership could become a gimmick. The top person of some ailing institution might try to insert servant leadership as a procedure, as a general management idea, as a means whereby the institution might do better. Such a move might have a short-lived

aspirin effect, but when the effect wears off, it might leave the institution more ailing than it was before and another gimmick would need to be sought. The surer way for the idea to have a long-term effect *is for the top person to become a servant leader*. What that person *is* and *does* then speaks louder than what is said. It might be better if nothing is said, just *be* it. This, in time, might transform the institution. (p. 34-35)

Prophetically, Greenleaf's caution here has been a self-fulfilling prophecy for the United Methodist Church. Much like Schein's (2006), "Espoused beliefs and values," (p. 26) the church has paid lip service to the value while not exemplifying it in actual practice.

It is a fact that most organizations attempt to maintain a homeostasis by reinforcing structures, elevating leaders, and maintaining stability through the status quo. The organized church does not escape this process. It has been this author's experience as a Bishop in the UMC and the expressed role as the Spiritual and Temporal leader of the church, that quite contrary to the expectation for the highest office in the church to live out servant leadership, quite the opposite is the case. Bishops are generally treated with a deference of not servant, but king or queen. Bishops are given the best service, rooms, and means of transportation. Often, when visiting local churches as the Bishop this author's attempt to exercise the role of servant by serving people, cleaning up, or physically helping out is usually met with resistance from the laity by saying "you shouldn't be doing that." Following Greenleaf's intention, this author resists giving in and tries to model that servant behavior as a way to send a visual message to the clergy

and laity. However, the resistance to servant leadership in the actual practices of the church should be noted and prophetically challenged on a regular basis.

Women and Leadership

The research on women in leadership is ever expanding in depth and insight as researchers turn to this important field of study. Although there is mild controversy as to whether clear and quantifiable differences exist between the genders, what is clear from the research is that sex discrimination is a tangible reality for women in the work force (Porter, 2002; Catalyst, 2009b). The often-quoted Glass Ceiling is far from myth, but has been demonstrated by a great deal of research. According to Catalyst (2009a), women represent close to half of the labor force and 40% of managerial position while earning the majority of university degrees, but hold less than 17% (16.9%) of corporate officer positions; only a little more than 11% (11.4%) of senior leadership line roles; and led only 6% of Financial Post 500 companies.

The *2008 Catalyst Census of Women Board of Directors & Corporate Officers and Top Earners of the Fortune 500*, report that “women’s advancement in corporate leadership continues to stagnate, with virtually no growth seen in women’s share of top positions” (Catalyst, 2009a, p. 1). The specific statistics confirm this conclusion:

- Women held 15.2% of board director positions, compared to 14.8% in 2007.
- Women of color held 3.2% of all board director positions.
- Women held 15.7% of corporate officer positions, compared to 15.4% in 2007.
- Women held 6.2% of top earner positions, compared to 6.7% in 2007.

- Little change occurred in the number of companies having zero, one, two, or three or more women corporate officers. (p. 1)

Irene H. Lang (as cited in Catalyst, 2009a), President and CEO of Catalyst believes that the small increase in women in Sr. leadership is unacceptable:

No change in a year of change is unacceptable—for business, for investors, for policy makers, and for the public which looks to business leadership for innovative solutions and accountability. Smart organizations will seize this opportunity to create credible, 21st century leadership that looks like the future, and bring women, including women of color, front and center into their leadership—on boards and in senior management. (p. 1)

There are now three and four generations of women executives that have proven their leadership abilities and skill sets in Fortune 500 companies, and women have reached Senior Executive and Chief Executive Officer positions for decades.

Unfortunately there still exists in some quarters a bias that women are inferior to men in Sr. leadership positions. Porter (2002) quotes the chairperson of the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission who states that it is the glass ceiling that negatively effects the advancement of women into the upper echelons of management, and this could have serious effects on the entire U.S. economy, as we will be unable to compete with continuously diversifying marketplaces in the near future.

Even more devastating is the havoc the glass ceiling plays in the personal and professional lives of women. In an important study on mid-level women leaders who must deal with the constraints of the glass ceiling, (Clark, Caffarella, and Ingram ,1999) conducted in-depth interviews with 23 mid-level women

managers and administrators. The study focused on three areas: career path; the intersection of professional and personal lives; and the impact of gender.

In terms of career path, the study pointed out the assumption that most women follow a nonlinear career path due to the need to bear and raise children and tend to the needs of a family. The study however, found this to be not true in general of the women interviewed. They tended to have a direct or linear career path, but needed to be single or greatly supported by their spouse and family in order to achieve this goal (Clark et al., 1999).

The biggest single obstacle in terms of career path was of course, gender discrimination. As one woman described her experience:

What really kind of precipitated my leaving the job ... is that I came in and hit the road running and did well. In my last review I had before I left there, I remember my boss saying, "It's too bad you're a woman because otherwise you'd be ready to move up in the organization now." ... My husband had been ready to move already and that was the kind of straw that broke the camel's back. (Clark et al., 1999, ¶13)

In terms of the intersection and balancing of their personal and professional careers, most of the women had difficulty with this critical balancing act. As one college administrator described:

It's hard to separate personal and professional life, it really is, and especially when you live in a small community and the people that you are friends with are a part of where you work.... I think if anything suffers, it's your personal life. As a woman you have to sometimes do more to prove yourself and so you find yourself

putting in more hours and doing more things than maybe you would as a man.

(Clark et al., 1999, ¶ 20)

Many of women spoke of the sacrifice of either one or the other in terms of career and personal life. Either their career life would prosper or their personal life would suffer, or the reverse. To highlight this dilemma one a senior account executive shared:

You cannot be successful in consulting unless you work thousands of hours.... It's very hard to have a personal life.... I read an article talking about the myth of quality time. There is an event and either you're there or you're not there, and if the event is a board meeting and you're at your child's school play, you missed the board meeting. Stephen was in the physics show his senior year, and I was on a flight on the way back from Chicago that night, hoping to get there in time for the show. We got stalled on the runway; I missed the whole thing.... I'm still sorry I missed it because ... it will never come again. I think it's a very lop-sided life.

(Clark et al., 1999, ¶ 25)

One of the most striking findings of the study had to do with the last area of the research, namely that of gender. There was a distinct absence of gender awareness with most women in the study. Whereas, most of them had faced gender discrimination, they did not tend to blame that upon the lack of advancement in their careers. In other words, they did not generalize that beyond their own personal experiences and point to a systemic pattern of prejudice and discrimination that affects all women everywhere in the work place. There was also a more negative reaction to the term feminist in general, with few wanting to press for large systemic change in their organization. The few women who did identify with the feminist agenda believed that a concerted effort needed to make

to change the present system. The researchers believe part of the answer to this lack of gender awareness was due to the survival strategy that women have to subject themselves to in order to make it in a male dominated world. In other words, these women knew that they had to play the game, and part of that game was to survive in a male work environment (Clark et al., 1999).

The research is far from conclusive, but it seems that women do possess different leadership tendencies than men. Carr-Ruffino (1997) cites a pattern of typical women leaders (identified by Rosener and Helgesen): “They include a gentler use of power and a greater interest in empowering others, a more democratic approach with greater sharing and participation, more information and communication in general, more focus on long-range results, and a greater concern and interest in the individuals they lead” (p. 10).

Research also seems to support the fact that on average, women are more relational and empathetic (Gillian, 1982). In her pioneering work, Harvard Professor Carol Gillian (1982) discussed the important gender differences in grade school children. In their free time at school, girls place more emphasis on relationships, whereas boys tend to focus on the rules and the structures of the games they play. This emphasis on relationships seems to continue throughout the life of women, whereas it is never as important to men.

In a provocative study of the effects of motherhood on leadership, Grzelakowski (2005) notes that it strengthens and deepens the character of good women. Her research finds that motherhood strengthens women in five ways:

1. Selflessness
2. Confidence

3. Humility
4. Groundedness
5. Honesty.

Taking the first example of selflessness, Grzelakowski (2005) believes that motherhood tends to bring out the natural selflessness in people. In the role of mother, women make natural sacrifices for their children, and they do this willingly and joyfully. Grzelakowski (2005) quotes Cynthia Augustine of the New York Times:

My children have made me a much more complete and involved person.

Devoting yourself to others makes you a deeper, better person. The give and take is huge. So it does not need to be in the center of it. To a great extent, it feels good to give and be helpful. (p. 167)

Likewise with the four other qualities, the role of motherhood enhances these traits by exposing mothers to new experiences that they would not have had if they did not have children.

The feminist agenda has existed for many years, while leadership studies on women have only arisen in recent years. And although it has produced a lasting impact in the social, political and religious fields of study it is a relatively new focus in the area of leadership and management. Chinn cites (2004), the Society for the Psychology of Women made this theme of Feminist Leadership their Presidential Initiative for study. A brief description of the Initiative is as follows:

Thus, this initiative began with the question: How do feminist women lead?

In asking this question, several questions were raised. Is leadership different for men? Are there feminist principles in leadership? Can leaders be feminist

women? The initiative was intended to understand and define feminist leadership. (Chin, 2004, p. 2)

In a study by the Society for the Psychology of Women (2003, as cited in Chin, 2004), many of the classical leadership theories (Trait, Skills, Process, etc.) were examined in terms of how they apply to women and leadership. The study's conclusion was simple: Women lead differently than men. Overall, they are more relational and collaborative in leadership style. Although not stated, but implied, the study saw women as equally qualified, if not more so in some areas, as compared to men's leadership.

A number of studies have focused on the transformational nature of women's leadership styles. The Emerald Group Publishing (2008) points out that transformational leaders act as facilitators and role models to other team members and are more likely to use innovative problem-solving approaches. In addition, transformational leaders tend to adopt mentoring roles with their followers, "encouraging self-development and increased responsibility within the organization" (Emerald Group, 2008, p. 1).

The Emerald Group's (2008) conclusion is unequivocal: Women are more likely than men to have a transformational leadership style, and in both business and politics, the world is being denied such leadership that can bring about a greater change for the good of all.

Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) in a study comparing women and men's leadership styles on the transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire scales, found that female leaders exceeded male leaders on many of the transformational leadership ratings. In contrast, men exceeded women on the major laissez-faire subscales (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001, p. 794).

Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) conclude their study with the fact that the way women lead (with a more transformational style) should enhance the overall effectiveness of corporations and organizations. However, women leaders are often put at a power disadvantage when it comes to their male partners and leaders, and since women are more often in entry positions in organizations, it leads to a greater sense of marginality.

Eagly, A. H. (2003), conducted a meta-analysis of 39 different studies in a variety of organizations in the United States and abroad, and concluded that women's approach to leadership may be more effective than men's. The study looks at the difference between transformational and transactional leadership, and determines that a positive correlation exists between leadership effectiveness and transformational leadership. The study draws the following conclusion about women and transformational leadership:

Women were moderately but significantly more likely to provide transformational leadership, a difference that appeared in 36 of 44 comparisons. They were less remote, consulted more, mentored more, paid more attention to detail, and were more likely to encourage new ideas. Men and women were about equal as transactional leaders, and men were more likely to adopt the laissez-faire style. (Eagly, 2003, pp. 569-571)

In pointing out how the context of leadership changes with different professions and types of jobs, the study highlights: These differences existed even when men and women had the same job description, so it was not just that (as some have said) women act differently because they are in less powerful positions. But the difference between the

sexes was greater in educational institutions, sports and health care than in business. These fields may have provided more opportunities for exercising transformational leadership. (Eagly, 2003)

It seems appropriate to end on this note of transformation. It appears that the principles of transformational leadership appeal to women leaders in general, and if women are to attain equal status in the work place, the system itself must be transformed.

Emotional Intelligence and Leadership

One of the most promising areas of new research in leadership comes from the field of emotional intelligence (EQ). Leadership theories provide part of the picture of the complexity of leadership, and emotional intelligence provides another piece of the puzzle of what makes for effective leaders. Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso (2000) define emotional intelligence as, “[t]he ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others” (p, 396). The foundation of emotional intelligence is in the building of formal and informal relationships.

There are four areas of emotional intelligence: One is self-recognition, which is comprised of emotional self-awareness, accurate self-assessment and self-confidence. Second, self-regulation is made up of six attributes: emotional self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, achievement drive and initiative. The third trait is other-recognition, which includes three characteristics: empathy, service-oriented, and organizational awareness. The last is other-regulation that builds relationships through developing others, influence, communication, conflict management,

catalyzing change, visionary leadership, building bonds, and teamwork and collaboration (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001).

These categories have gone through later iterations and refinement, but the basic grounding of the theory of emotional intelligence has remained the same. Bradberry and Greaves (2009) provide one of the most succinct summaries of emotional intelligence for the popular audience. They outline two primary competencies: *Personal Competence and Social Competence*, and four EQ skills: *Self-Awareness*, *Self-Management* (which falls under *Personal Competence*), *Social Awareness and Relationship Management* (which falls under *Social Competence*). .

Bradberry and Greaves (2009) cite telling statistics on the impact of EQ on personal and work related success:

- EQ is the foundation for a host of critical skills—it impacts most everything you say and do each day. EQ is so critical to success that it accounts for 58 percent of performance in all types of jobs.
- It is the single biggest predictor of performance in the workplace and the strongest driver of leadership and personal excellence.
- Of all the people we've studied at work, we have found that 90 percent of high performers are also high in EQ. On the flip side, just 20 percent of low performers are high in EQ.
- People with high EQs make more money—an average of \$29,000 more per year than people with low EQs. The link between EQ and earnings is so direct that every point increase in EQ adds \$1,300 to an annual salary. (pp. 20-22)

What seems crystal clear from the research is that EQ does have an influence on leadership success, and in the field of pastoral ministry, EQ may play a stronger role due to high level of personal interaction and intimacy in the ministry.

Clergy Leadership

In church circles, research and writing on clergy leadership has not been on the front burner of most scholars and teachers at seminaries and universities. The classical areas of seminary research and study have been in the areas of theology, biblical studies, church history and ethics. The practical theological disciplines are also the focus of research and writing: preaching and worship, pastoral care and counseling, Christian education and teaching, and Christian spirituality. It has only been relatively recently that most seminaries now include a required course in church administration and leadership.

An example of the lesser importance of clergy leadership is the fact that at the Claremont School of Theology, all of the above mentioned disciplines have two required courses (introductory level and advanced level) for a Master of Divinity degree (the basic ordination degree), whereas there is only one course required in church administration and leadership.

The majority of scholarly writing on clergy leadership has been filtered through a theological lens, and has not incorporated the secular advances and research on leadership. The perfect example of this is William Willimon's (2002) book *Pastor: The Theology and Practice of Ordained Ministry*. Willimon outlines the basic function of ordination and current images of the pastor, and then proceeds to write a chapter on each of the classic areas of the clergy role: Pastor as Priest, Preacher, Counselor, Teacher,

Evangelist, and Prophet. One of the later chapters includes “Pastor as leader,” but this has a strong theological focus. Willimon does highlight transformation leadership as a paradigm, but this is a brief foray into secular leadership theory considering the entire book.

Leadership in the Wesleyan Spirit by Lovett H. Weems, Jr. (1999) references a few contemporary secular leadership writers and concepts, but mostly writes from the perspective of the founder of Methodism, John Wesley, and how Wesley’s ideas can be applied to the present day. Again, theology and denominational influence is the main subject of this book.

Writing from an academic seminary perspective, Jones and Armstrong (2006), in their well-written book, *Resurrecting Excellence*, provide a theological and ecclesial perspective on clergy leadership. Sponsored by a major U.S. grant, the Pulpit and Pew Project is designed to study American Protestant clergy. The Pulpit and Pew Project teamed with the Duke Divinity School to sponsor the writing of *Resurrecting Excellence*. The book’s main chapter on leadership links it directly with life long learning, and the emphasis is clearly on the “learned clergy” model for the church. Later in the chapter on leadership, the authors talk about “The Art of Improvisational Leadership,” through the book on Christian Ethics by Samuel Wells. Well’s main point is that clergy should cultivate basic habits and dispositions through rehearsal. This is a very close concept to what Max DuPree (1992) advocates for in his book, *Leadership Jazz*. Again, it demonstrates that theological writers are not familiar with the secular leadership literature.

One of the few books that weave secular leadership theory into a theological and biblical framework comes from Parks and Birch (2004), in their book *Ducking Spears, Dancing Madly*. The main premise of their book is to see clergy leadership in light of the Hebrew Bible's I and II Samuel, but there is a generous supply of contemporary secular leadership authors and models throughout the text. This is one of the few religious works that attempts to incorporate secular leadership theory into church leadership.

The strongest research in the crossover of church and organizational leadership comes from Gil Rendle (2010), in his book *Journey in the Wildness*. Rendle moves with ease between the two worlds of the church and secular systems theory and organizational development. In this research, Rendle provides a template for denominational analysis and the future of the church.

In a Doctor of Ministry degree dissertation, Johnson (2005), finds that emotional intelligence is at the core of clergy leadership. The author concludes that clergy who lead effectively demonstrate a fundamental growth in their awareness of their own emotions and others around them.

In a Ph.D. degree dissertation, Kanne (2005) examined the relationships between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership of 30 senior pastors who participated in the study. The author found a link between EQ and one subscale of transformational leadership: individualized consideration. When coaching was added to the leadership training, two additional subscales of transformational leadership were linked to EQ.

Palser (2005) in a Ph.D. dissertation examined the relationship between clergy burnout and emotional intelligence. Although the author did not find a significant

difference between the two main concepts, in a bivariate analysis, two significant correlations were discovered between emotional exhaustion and a sense of personal achievement, and facilitating emotional thought and understanding emotions.

In the most directly correlating study to this present one, DeShon and Quinn (2007) from Michigan State University conducted a job analysis study of United Methodist local church pastors. The study performed a job analysis of local church pastors to determine the major tasks that make up their role and what knowledge, skill, abilities and personal characteristics contribute to effective performance of those tasks.

Using a qualitative study design, DeShon and Quinn (2007), conducted interviews with 4 focus groups of between four and six clergy who were ranked by their direct supervisors as “high performing” pastors. The secondary criteria of the selection of pastors were to consider a wide range of demographic characteristics which included gender, ethnicity, as well as diverse ministry settings (urban, suburban, rural, large, small churches, etc.).

The results of the pastors interviewed demonstrated a convergence on their definition of effectiveness. Four separate components were identified:

1. Calling: Effective pastors possess a profound inner sense of being “called by” and “called to”: called by God and called to ministry that is involves a deep trust in God. This calling and trust become evident in a willingness to act boldly – and take risks – as part of that called ministry.
2. Leadership: Effective pastors have the ability to cast a vision and mobilize and empower people to work toward it. Effective pastors influence people in ways that will help them achieve their goals.

3. Transforming Lives: Effective pastors are able to transform lives. People with transformed lives experience spirituality as part of their identity; that is, they incorporate spirituality into their everyday lives. People with transformed lives experience God in their lives every day of the week – not just on Sundays. Transforming lives involves seeing people grow in their love of God and develop a deeper relationship with God. People with transformed lives also have a genuine desire for spiritual growth.
4. Helping Others: Effective pastors help people discover and utilize their gifts for the good of their communities. They help people grow personally as well as spiritually. They help people become better, more spiritual people who make better decisions and have stronger, healthier relationships with God and others. (DeShon & Quinn, 2007, pp. 8-9)

The next major part of the study attempted to isolate the tasks performed by local church pastors that contributed to effective performance. DeShon and Quinn (2007) describe this process as attempting to identify “a set of competences that describe an effective pastor” (p. 9). Through the interviews, the researchers were able to isolate 13 task clusters, but were unable to conclude what the relative importance of each task to effectiveness is. The following is a list of the 13 tasks, and this is followed with a brief definition of each task cluster and behavioral examples of each one:

Effective Performance Task Clusters:

1. Administration – Performing activities that support the efficient functioning of the organization:
 - Accounting

- Bookkeeping
- Budgeting
- Financial forecasting
- Facilities maintenance
- Formal interactions with external organizations (e.g., United Methodist Church, local, state, and national government)
- Purchasing and maintaining equipment
- Ordering supplies
- Recording, storing, or maintaining information in written or electronic form
- Risk Management (e.g., insurance and investments)

2. Care-giving – Performing activities that serve the spiritual, mental, or physical needs of congregants or community members:

- Relationship counseling
- Grief counseling
- Addiction counseling
- Crisis intervention
- Hospital or home visitation
- Arranging care systems for individuals with physical limitations or poor health
- Provide assistance during emergencies or crises

- Assists victims of neglect or injustice
- Ministers to the sick, dying, and bereaved

3. Communication – Performing activities that transmit information to others in a comprehensible form :

- Interpreting events for congregants
- Disseminating information to relevant parties
- Share information about religious issues by writing articles, giving speeches, or teaching
- Provide information to superintendents, supervisors, other local pastors, church staff, congregants, local government, and community members by telephone, in written form, e-mail, or in person
- Obtain information from relevant sources to support decisions
- Relates God's activity to everyday life and happenings

4. Evangelism – Performing activities that bring individuals into a personal relationship with Christ:

- Develop and implement methods for increasing congregation size
- Fundraising to support local, national, or international missions
- Developing websites to reach more people with an evangelical message
- Incorporating video, contemporary music, and interactivity into worship experiences to better connect with younger individuals
- Develop methods for increasing congregation membership

- Leads people in the process of reaching out to the unchurched in the community
 - Urges people to share their faith with others
5. Facility Construction – Performing activities to renovate existing or build new church structures:
- Leading or participating in architectural design processes
 - Meeting with local government representatives to obtain necessary permits
 - Raise funds to support congregation activities and facilities
 - Scheduling planning and progress review meetings
 - Construction
6. Fellowship - Leading or participating in activities that support the sharing of common interests, desires, and motivations among Christians:
- Fosters fellowship at church gatherings
 - Coffee hours
 - Fellowship dinners
 - Prayer chains
 - Men's breakfasts
 - Youth groups
 - Church picnics
 - Sacred music concerts
7. Management – Performing activities that mobilize and coordinate staff and congregants to achieve organizational goals:

- Negotiation
- Conflict Management
- Scheduling events, programs, and activities for self and others
- Staffing by matching tasks and jobs with congregant strengths
- Identify and develop lay leaders
- Motivating a voluntary workforce
- Cheerleading subordinate activities
- Planning methods to accomplish organizational goals
- Organizing and coordinating efforts to achieve organizational goals
- Getting members of a group to work together to accomplish tasks
- Quality control
- Resource allocation
- Leading or participating in project teams to accomplish specific goals and church functions
- Developing and communicating long-term church goals (i.e., visioning)
- Developing and building teams
- Organizing, planning, and prioritizing work
- Analyze information to choose the best solution
- Problem solves and idea development for new activities, projects, and programs
- Works with congregational boards and committee

8. Other-Development – Performing activities to teach, train, or mentor individuals and groups to improve their knowledge and skills:

- Teach Bible study classes
- Teach discipleship
- Train senior staff
- Teach a world religions course at a local prison
- Teach spiritual disciplines (i.e., prayer, Bible study, worship, fasting, conversation with other Christians)
- Develop church leadership through disciple-building and staff training
- Plan and lead religious education programs for congregants
- Instruct individuals who seek to become members of the United Methodist Church
- Mentor aspiring and less experienced lay and ordained pastors in both formal and informal capacities
- Mentor a youth director in the candidacy process
- Mentor Associate pastors
- Trains lay leaders
- Helps youth identify goals and gifts
- Talks with individuals about their spiritual development
- Counsels with people facing major life decisions (e.g., marriage and career)
- “Give the job away” by empowering, equipping, and encouraging

others (congregants, fellow pastors, and community members) to

- Serving as a spiritual model

9. Preaching and Public Worship – Performing activities to support and lead public worship services and convey spiritual and moral messages through public speaking:

- Prepare and deliver sermons
- Prepare and deliver public speeches
- Read and listen to examples of good sermons
- Plan and conduct public worship services
- Communicate religious lessons
- Incorporate current events into the communicated message
- Develop alternative worship approaches (technologies)
- Lead prayer

10. Relationship Building – Performing activities that create, maintain, and strengthen personal and professional relationships with congregants, community members, United Methodist Church members, and members of other denominations:

- Individual or small group meetings with congregants
- Hosting dinners
- Leading prayer at community events
- Participating in community events
- Organize and engage in interfaith, community, civic, educational, and recreational activities

- Develop constructive and cooperative working relationships with others
- Speaks to community and civic groups
- Participates in social activities to develop and strengthen relationships
- Participates in community projects and organizations
- Interact with the community through social actions
- Learn the history and culture of the local church
- Work with clergy and laity of other faiths, religions, denominations, or sects

11. Rituals and Sacraments – Leading or participating in ceremonies such as baptism, communion, funerals, and weddings:

- Administer religious rites or ordinances
- Prepare people for participation in religious ceremonies

12. Self-Development – Activities designed to improve spiritual, mental, and physical development that contribute to the delivery of more effective ministry:

- Studying religious books and documents
- Studying administration and management books and documents
- Practicing spiritual disciplines
- Physical fitness
- Maintaining balance between time for self, family, and congregants

- Maintains a disciplined life of prayer and personal devotion
- Cultivates home and personal life
- Participating in support groups such as covenant groups and prayer circles
- Skill updating
- Keeping up-to-date with technological advances (e.g., computers, Internet, PDAs)
- Setting and maintaining personal boundaries
- Developing personal support systems (e.g., covenant groups and prayer teams)
- Participation in conference and continuing education programs

13. United Methodist Connectional Service – Performing activities that contribute to the goals of the United Methodist Church that extend beyond the scope of the local church:

- Travel
- Writing reports
- Participating in planning and governance committees within the United Methodist Church organization (e.g., annual conference planning and Boards of Ordained Ministry)
- Attending Annual Conference meetings
- Committee work
- Participation in expert panels and focus groups

- Apportionments and stewardship. (DeShon & Quynn, 2007, 10-16)

DeShon and Quinn (2007) concluded that the pastor's work activities are: highly varied, taxing, fast-paced, unrelenting and often fragmented. This requires that the pastor be able to rapidly switch between highly diverse roles such as mentor, preacher, counselor, spiritual leader, and prophet. . . . In addition, pastors must demonstrate the ability to multitask and engage in polychronic behavior.

The final stage of the research focused on four categories that contributed to the effective performance of the previous identified tasks. These four included:

1. Knowledge – An organized set of principles and facts applying in general domains:

Administration and Management – knowledge of business and management principles involved in strategic planning, resource allocation, human resources modeling, leadership technique, production methods, and coordination of people and resources.

2. Skills – developed capacities that facilitate learning or the more rapid acquisition of knowledge:

Social perceptiveness – being aware of others' reactions and understanding why they react as they do.

3. Abilities – enduring attributes of the individual that influence performance:

Oral expression – the ability to communicate information and ideas in speaking so others will understand.

4. Personal characteristics – personality variables, interests, and experiences. Openness – Openness to experience involves active imagination, aesthetic sensitivity, attentiveness to inner feelings, preference for variety, and intellectual curiosity.

This was followed by a complete listing of characteristics under the major sub-headings of knowledge, skills, abilities and personal characteristics found in Table 3.

Table 3

DeShon and Quinn Study of Clergy Knowledge, Skills, Ability and Personal Characteristics

Knowledge	Personal Characteristics	Abilities	Skills
Administration	Achievement Orientation	Adaptability	Active Learning
Calling to Ministry	Attention to Detail	Attentional Focus	Active Listening
Clerical	Authenticity	Calling to Ministry	Calling to Ministry
Community Demographics	Autonomy	Creativity	Conflict Management
Community History	Balance	Idea Fluency	Decision Making
Counseling Principles	Calling to Ministry	Inductive Reasoning	Discernment
Local Church History	Cooperation	Intelligence	Exegetical Skills
Management Principles	Dependability	Memorization	Goal-setting and Feedback
Psychology	Empathy	Oral Comprehension	Motivating Others
Sociology	Initiative	Trust in God	Multitasking
Theology and Scripture	Integrity	Teaching	Negotiation
Training Principles	Leadership	Teamwork	Oral Communication
United Methodist Church Doctrine	Learning orientation	Time Management	Problem Solving
	Openness	Written Communication	Public Speaking
	Passion		Social Perceptiveness
	Patience		Spiritual Disciplines
	Persistence		
	Risk-Taking		
	Self-Awareness		
	Self-Control		
	Social Orientation		
	Stress Tolerance		

One interesting conclusion from DeShon and Quinn (2007) is their surprise at the great variation of tasks involved in ministry, and the speed with which pastors must switch between these tasks. As researchers who have not had a great deal of experience working with the church and clergy, this is a helpful insight. For most pastors with a great deal of experience, these ministry tasks and the need to change rapidly between them are simply a given and a natural part of the role and job of being a minister.

DeShon and Quinn's (2007) observations are therefore insightful for those who have who been in the ministry for some length of time:

Finally, the breadth of tasks performed by local church pastors coupled with the rapid switching between task clusters and roles that appears prevalent in this position is unique. I have never encountered such a face-paced job with such varied and impactful responsibilities. It would be extremely informative to perform a study using structured observation methods to extend the findings of Kuhne and Donaldson (1995). Are multitasking skill and polychronic orientation critical to effective performance in this position or is it possible for individuals with lower levels of these skills and orientations to structure work in such a way to perform effectively despite the demands of the job? (p. 20)

The limitations of this study are readily apparent. First, the sample size is much too small (20 UMC pastors), geographically limited (only 3 U.S. states), and lacking in ethnic diversity (70% of respondents were Caucasian) to represent the vast diversity of the United Methodist Church. The second concern was the small amount of actual interview time (there were 4 groups of between 4-6 clergy conducted over 2-4 hours only). If one takes an average interview time of 3 hours for 4 groups that comes out to

only 12 hours total, and if one divides 12 hours by 20 clergy that comes out to only 36 minutes per clergy member. Finally, without a ranking of the 13 task clusters and the 64 knowledge, skills, abilities and personal characteristics as to which rank the highest in terms of the effectiveness of those clergy who possess them, the study fails to draw any ultimate conclusions on what makes for an effective pastor. However, the study is helpful in providing some general pointers as to clergy effectiveness, and it is the most current of available research on clergy qualities and traits.

Unconditional Positive Regard

One final trait that is relevant to this study is the rather elusive concept of love or caring. One of the Greek derivatives of the word love is “agape.” Theologically, agape is most closely descriptive of God, or a love that has no conditions or strings attached to it in the form of expectations of return. Agape means that you love unconditionally, without expectation that the love will be returned in any form. If a person exemplifies agape in their personal life, then trust is the natural by-product in all of their personal relationships. As ordained United Methodist ministers, to live by this ideal of agape is a goal to be achieved. The founder of Methodism, John Wesley believed that all Christians should be on a pathway leading to an end state that he called “Perfection,” or “Entire Sanctification.” In this final state, we love God with all our heart, mind, soul and strength, and your neighbor as yourself. It is a state where the self is eclipsed by the love of God and neighbor. Obviously, it is a moment-by-moment state of being, as the self is so reflexive for us as human beings, it is impossible to lose the self for an indefinite amount of time.

As a pre-Enlightenment thinker, Wesley also believed that the human condition was

one of “utter depravity” (Cobb, 1995; Maddox, 1994). So the human paradox is that humans cannot help but to sin, and yet the ideal is to live this agape love. The theological solution is that we must rely on the absolute grace of God in order to overcome our sinful nature and work toward the goal of perfection.

To quantify this trait of agape love is challenging to say the least. In a formal research mode, the best description comes from the late psychologist, Carl Rogers (as cited in Clinebell, 1966), who described the concept as “unconditional positive regard.” To quote Rogers:

Actually it is only the experience of a relationship in which he is loved (something very close, I believe, to the theologians’ agape) that the individual can begin to feel a dawning respect for, acceptance of, and finally, even a fondness for himself. It is as he can thus begin to sense himself as lovable and worthwhile, in spite of his mistakes, that he can begin to feel love and tenderness for others. (as cited in Clinebell, p. 295)

In the therapeutic literature, unconditional positive regard is the closest professional term to agape love. Clinebell (1966), describes it as a constellation of “warmth, liking, caring, acceptance, interest and respect” for the other (p. 295). In a therapeutic setting the counselor serves as a companion and guide, and strives to establish a compassionate human relationship with the patient.

Obviously, those UMC ministers who demonstrate unconditional positive regard in their personal relationships are going to be trusted, affirmed and more successful than those who are not. Unconditional positive regard is clearly a verb, and it can be demonstrated as an action in personal relationships. In this regard, UMC clergy have the

ability to prove this in interpersonal relationships with parishioners over time in a local church. As laity trusts clergy over time, this adds to their overall effectiveness and ability to grow and improve churches.

There may exist a subjective dimension to unconditional positive regard in the form of some leaders having the ability to gain instant rapport with those they encounter.

Mother Teresa, the Dali Lama, and to a certain extent, Billy Graham have been reported to have had this quality. However, it would be difficult to isolate their source credibility, or reputation from this perception of their unconditional positive regard for others.

Needless to say, it is one dimension of UMC clergy effectiveness that is worth examining.

Beyond Current Leadership Paradigms

One final sobering reflection comes from Edgar Schein in a journal article entitled, *Leadership Competencies: A Provocative New Look*. In this short article, Schein (2006), questions the current “obsession” (p. 255) with leadership competencies.

Schein (2006) relates his experience in one organization in which the HR people requested senior management to reduce a list of over 100 competencies identified by a particular leadership consulting firm to 10 usable concepts that could be worked with in the organization. Schein explained that it was difficult to reduce the number in a coherent way with the many overlaps and relationships between the list of 100. Schein comments as they left the meeting, one participant asked, “Am I nuts or is this all ‘smoke and mirrors?’” (p. 256).

Reflecting on this comment, Schein (2006) writes:

I don’t believe the desire to identify leadership competencies is smoke and mirrors.

I think it is an honest attempt from a psychological point of view to make sense of what it is that leaders do and must be good at. The problem that I see is that it is too psychological. Most of us admit that leadership is a *relational* concept and is very *contextual*, but we do not take the insight to its logical conclusion, namely that it is not always about the leader but about the culture and environment in which the leader operates. Yet leaders are individual human beings, so we need some way of characterizing what we would like them to be like and what we think they should be good at. How do we bring these two points of view together? I believe we have missed something in the exclusive focus on psychology. We have missed the cultural breadth and depth of what creates leaders in the first place, and we have overlooked the reality that what leaders do that is unique is to manage culture.

(p. 256)

Schein (2006) is onto a very important observation in the field of leadership, and that is, the almost exclusive usage of psychology to define and refine the role of the leader. It is not that psychology should have a role in the leadership field, but so much more can be gleaned from a more interdisciplinary approach, and the broadening of the qualities and definitions of leadership beyond the psychological paradigms.

As if almost on cue, Schein (2006) then goes on to propose three broad and provocative competencies for leaders. An effective leader should:

- Think like an *anthropologist*.
- Have the skills of a *family therapist*.
- Cultivate and trust *artistic* instincts.

Because so much of his work revolves around culture, it is a natural suggestion for

him to advocate thinking like an anthropologist. Of course, the first realization of thinking like an anthropologist is realizing how much culture has created us and legitimizes us in our role and work. From that base, we would then begin to realize the many cultural variations that exist among different countries and companies, and even amid divisions and sub-groups of the same organizations and corporations.

Schein's (2006) second suggestion of thinking like a family therapist is a very familiar one to the church culture and literature. Much research has been done on family systems, and their applicability to the church's culture and organization (Bowen, 1978; Friedman, 1985; Steinke, 2006).

Schein (2006) rightly points out that role networks and identity is as important, if not more important in system change than interpersonal influence. For example, we have long learned from family system therapy that all of the attention and help usually centers on the one family member who is "acting out" the most. However, that role of "acting out" must be seen in the larger context of the entire family, where each member also contributes their own role identity to the person who is acting out. This is called the "identified patient," and to focus therapy on only that person is to miss how the other family members contribute to that person's problems and role. The only final solution is to bring the entire family in for analysis and therapy, and thus, see how each role contributes to the dysfunction or health of the family unit. Many churches and organizations model this family unit context, and the person who "acts out" inappropriately is singled out, but must be examined in light of the role relationships of those around this person.

Schein's (2006) second point is that the system's health must be examined in a

deeper way than just the economic wellbeing of the organization. A truly positive change in a system only comes with deep learning and a commitment to a process of learning that has a constant feedback loop.

Finally, Schein (2006) points to what family systems therapy has practiced for decades: that all families must find ways to deal with anxiety, and identify the many defensive mechanisms that families create to deflect such anxiety and return to a state of homeostasis. As Schein (2006) notes, a good family systems counselor looks for the parts of the system that are least stuck, and tries to flesh out the positive change that can be leveraged by each of the individual members of the family.

What Schein doesn't say here is that a good family therapist will be able to see the larger family dysfunction, and attempt to address the parent's illness, rather than focus on the one member as the "identified patient."

Schein's (2006) final suggestion is probably his most creative and provocative: Cultivating and trusting artistic instincts. Schein notes that one of the main roles of the artist in society "is to stimulate us conceptually and emotionally" (p. 260). Artists do this by demonstrating visibly what we know intuitively in the core of our being. But it is not just the "technique" of an artist that the leader learns and demonstrates leadership from. Rather, it is to develop the "artistic intuition" that precedes any specific demonstrative skill level. Thus, "the leader must see more deeply and grasp intuitively what may not be obvious or provable" (Schein, 2006, p. 261).

How does the leader develop such an intuition? Schein (2006) believes it is more than just a technical skill developed, but rather that leaders become more "reflective and open to learning" (p. 261). This thirst for learning leads naturally to his final

recommendation, that to keep the creative fires burning inside, artists must “expose themselves to many kinds of experiences and stimuli (p. 262).

Thus Schein (2006) suggests that leaders seek a well rounded life of culture and the arts. Leaders need to have a life outside of their own organizations to gain a better internal perspective both personally and organizationally. They need to travel and move in the external world on a regular basis to maintain a balance that would enhance their work in their own organization.

CHAPTER 3

Research Design and Methodology

Nature of the Study

The research method of this study is descriptive in nature. The study has a correlation design in which one measure the variables between two groups of United Methodist ministers, designated as high effective and low effective. High effective UMC ministers are those who have a proven tract record of increasing worship attendance at their primary local church appointment by 10% or more in their local churches in three out of five years of their ministry, or longer. An additional level of definition is those who have been deemed “highly effective and successful” by their immediate supervisor, the District Superintendent. On the other hand, “lower effective” United Methodist ministers are those who have seen no growth or decline at a 10% level or higher in their worship attendance at their primary worship services in their local churches in the last three out of five years of their ministry, or longer. Again, their immediate supervisor, the District Superintendent, has confirmed the definition of “lower effective”. As Heiman (2002) points out: “Correlation studies are often especially useful for meeting the goal of predicting behaviors” (p. 96). This is exactly what is being attempted to establish, as the study tries to isolate what qualities and characteristics two distinct groups of clergy have that make them either effective or non-effective.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study is that there are significant traits, qualities or characteristics that highly effective and successful local church UMC ministers possess when compared to their lower effective counterparts. Among those traits of highly

effective UMC ministers will be higher levels of emotional intelligence and transformational leadership abilities.

Research Questions

Specific research questions that this study will include are:

1. Do highly effective UMC ministers exhibit greater emotional intelligence and transformational leadership qualities as compared to lower effective UMC ministers?
2. What specific traits or qualities do highly effective UMC ministers possess?
3. What leadership styles and methods (if any) do highly effective UMC ministers employ?
4. What ministerial practices or disciplines (if any) do highly effective UMC ministers employ?

Analysis Unit, Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

The analysis unit of this study is ordained UMC ministers, and more specifically those who have a proven tract record of increasing worship attendance at their primary local church appointment.

The general population of this study includes fully ordained and active (not retired) Elders of the California-Pacific Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church. Since implicit in the definition of highly and lower effective is a five year window of service, the study will be limited to those UMC clergy who were ordained Elders before 2004.

The population sample has designated those UMC clergy who have met the criteria of having been designated by their District Superintendent as being “Highly

Effective,” and shown a 10% increase or higher in worship attendance at their local churches for three out five years, or longer of service.

Conversely, the population sample has designated those UMC clergy who have met the criteria of having been designed “Lower Effective” UMC ministers by their District Superintendent, and who have seen no growth or worship attendance decline at a 10% level or higher in their local churches in the last three out of five years of their ministry, or longer.

In 2007, the appointed Cabinet of the California-Pacific Annual Conference ranked all active clergy on a scale of 1-5, with “1” designated “ineffective” and “5” designated as “highly effective.” This archived data was used to determine a pool of both “highly effective” and “lower effective” United Methodist clergy, as ranked by the District Superintendents.

This process was followed by an analysis of each clergy person’s local church statistics in worship attendance. From the archived records, determination were made as whether clergy achieved a 10% growth or loss or no growth in worship attendance while serving in 3 out of 5 years, or longer of their service records. From this selection process, a total of 18 high effective clergy and 19 low effective clergy were identified.

All UMC clergy who met the criteria of “highly effective” and “lower effective” ministers were sent demographic and leadership questionnaires and asked to take part in a “study on clergy leadership.”

Characteristics Studied and their Definitions

One of the key leadership characteristics to be studied is Emotional Intelligence. A relatively new research area, Emotional Intelligence or EQ is in fact a constellation of qualities and practices rather than a single dominant trait.

Goldman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) outline the fundamentals of emotional intelligence in the following way:

Personal Competence: These capabilities determine how we manage ourselves.

Self-Awareness:

- Emotional self-awareness: Reading one's own emotions and recognizing their impact, using "gut sense" to guide decisions.
- Accurate self-assessment: Knowing one's strengths and limits.
- Self-confidence: A sound sense of one's self-worth and capabilities.

Self-Management:

- Emotional self-control: Keeping disruptive emotions and impulses under control.
- Transparency: Displaying honesty and integrity, trustworthiness.
- Adaptability: Flexibility in adapting to changing situations or overcoming obstacles.
- Achievement: The drive to improve performance to meet inner standards of excellence.
- Initiative: Readiness to act and seize opportunities.
- Optimism: Seeing the upside in events.

Social Competence: These capabilities determine how we manage relationships.

Social Awareness:

- Empathy: Sensing others' emotions, understanding their perspective, and taking active interest in their concerns.
- Organizational awareness: Reading the currents, decision networks, and politics at the organizational level.
- Service: Recognizing and meeting follower, client, or customer needs.

Relationship Management:

- Inspirational leadership: Guiding and motivating with a compelling vision.
- Influence: Wielding a range of tactics for persuasion.
- Developing others: Bolstering others' abilities through feedback and guidance.
- Change catalyst: Initiating, managing, and leading in a new direction.
- Conflict management: Resolving disagreements.
- Building bonds: Cultivating and maintaining a web of relationships.
- Teamwork and collaboration: Cooperation and team building. (p. 39)

The two major components of EQ are personal competence or mastery, and social competence or mastery. When you add these complimentary competences together, and

add layers of leadership characteristics under these competences, there is a comprehensive set of leadership traits involved. Since ministry involves working with people at their best and worst, and also involves working with a complex organizational structure in the form of the church, EQ is especially significant in the assessment and development of ordained ministers.

Specifically, the “relationship management” qualities could be written specifically for ministers. The central focus of ministry is to provide “inspirational leadership,” as clergy inspire followers through a compelling vision of the Gospel message that moves them to greater compassion and love for others. The Christian agenda is to develop and change individuals from selfishness to sharing, from self-love to love of God and others. The church attempts to create a new community of faith wherever it exists, and the goal is to foster a community that cares for each other and those around it. The purpose of a Christian community is to build deep bonds between the members, but if it confines its care to only its own community it falls short of what the Christian ethos really is. In this sense, many local churches become social or country clubs that only take care of its own members, and the witness of the Bible prophetically forbids such a short-sided understanding of the church. The church exists in and for the world. The church exists to transform the world from violence to nonviolence, from greed and selfishness to sharing and caring, and from destructiveness and death to birth and new life. In this sense, ministers must be “change catalysts” who attempt to change individual lives and whole communities for the better. Any change also brings tension and conflict, so ministers must be skilled in conflict resolution and management. The job of ministry is

to be agents of peace and reconciliation, and much of what ministers do is help people to work through their difficulties and conflicts.

Finally, Christian ministry is the ultimate in terms of teamwork and cooperation. The mission statement of the United Methodist Church is “to make disciples of Jesus Christ for the transformation of the world.” UMC Ministers are to create a community of believers wherever they are sent, and the purpose of that community is to transform people and structures for the better.

Some additional qualities and skills sets would seem important to effective ministry. In a recent pilot study of highly effective ministers (see Appendix A and B), they rated interpersonal relationships (Social awareness and Relationship management in Emotional Intelligence) as the “Extremely Important” to the success of their ministry (86%).

Next in the ranking of “Extremely Important” was “Personal leadership” in a generic sense (76%). Tied with leadership was Personal spirituality” (76%). Ranked far below on the 2nd tier category of “Somewhat Important” was church growth skills and knowledge (48%).

The pilot survey did not spell out specific definitions to these characteristics, and it would be helpful to do some pilot interviews with those surveyed in order to cross reference their definitions of these topics.

One glaring omission from this survey was communications skills and preaching. It would seem that the ability to communicate orally and in writing would be extremely important in effectiveness as a minister. As a Reformation denomination, preaching and worship still stands at the center of the United Methodist spiritual practices, and it would

help to assess how important preaching and communication is to the self-perceived success of ministers.

Beyond the scope of this project would be the perception of the laity in what makes for an effective minister. This would be akin to asking the consumers to rate the effectiveness of a service provider. This certainly will be included in the additional research areas for the future.

To bring more precision and focus to the question of clergy leadership, the study will look at Transformational Leadership as a paradigm. James M. Burns (1978) was one of the original authors of the concept of transformation leadership. He contrasted “transformational” as opposed to “transactional.” Transactional leadership involves an exchange of some kind between parties. The exchange could be economic, political or psychological in nature. The simple example would be a leader exchanges protection of the follower in exchange for loyalty to the leader. There is a quid-pro-quo exchange going on, in which leader and follower have mutually inclusive objectives to be achieved, and a fair exchange between both parties is brokered.

In contrast, transformational leadership attempts to better both parties in a mutual relationship of respect and care. If the leader serves the follower in a compassionate and concerned way, the follower is lifted up, but in turn the leader is also elevated in the process of serving. As Burns (1978) puts it:

Transformational leadership occurs when one or more persons *engage* with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality . . . and thus it has a transforming effect on both. (p. 20)

It is thus natural for a Christian minister to have this same understanding of leadership, for this is exactly what a Christian community attempts to foster. It is best expressed in the Pauline description of the early church from 1 Corinthians 12: 26: “If one member suffers, all suffer together with it; if one member is honored, all rejoice together with it” (The Holy Bible, 1989, p. 992).

Thus, a Christian minister who displays the transformational leadership style would best exemplify a leader in the Christian church, and the by-product would be high effectiveness in leadership.

Data Collection Plan

From the established pool of highly effective and lower effective UMC ministers, a complete packet of information asking participants to take part in a study on UMC clergy leadership was sent to each person. Included in the packet was the following:

- A cover letter inviting one to participate in the research project, general instructions, and general IRB protections and limitations.
- A color-coded demographic survey for participants to fill out and determine if they would like to participate in the research.
- A checklist sheet with specific instructions and indications on what needs to be returned.
- An instruction sheet on the taking of the BarOn and LPI assessments.
- A Phase 1 Informed Consent sheet, approved by IRB, and instructions on returning it.
- The Leadership Practices Inventory assessment to be taken and sent back.
- A self-addressed, stamped, return envelop.

The demographic questionnaire was designed to reduce the level of demand characteristics, and it was color coded to distinguish high and low level of effectiveness (e.g. highly effective minister's questionnaires in blue and lower effectiveness minister's questionnaires in green). The demographic survey included:

- A checkbox to indicate one's willingness to participate in the research, and instructions to proceed to fill out the questionnaire.
- A checkbox to indicate that one did not wish to participate at this time, and instructions not to fill out any of the information, but to return the survey in the self-addressed envelop.
- Individual ministry information which included:
 - Number of years in ministry.
 - Highest degree attained.
 - Number of years at current church.
 - Number of churches served full time in one's career.
 - Current age.
 - Ethnicity.
 - Gender.
- Description of one's current appointment which included:
 - Type of community (rural, urban, suburban, or a combination).
 - Strength of the church (strong & vital, maintenance, declining or hospice).
 - Strength of the laity (strong/active, medium, weak, combative).
 - Average age of the laity.
 - Laity ethnicity.

- Average worship attendance.
- 2009 number of Professions of faith (members joined).
- A rating of their personal leadership (extremely effective, effective, average, below average, ineffective).
- A rating of how effective in their current appointment (extremely effective, effective, average, below average, ineffective).

The complete demographic survey can be found in Appendix E.

As a descriptive study, the research will have greater external validity but less internal validity as compared to an experimental study. However, one must be careful to generalize beyond the confines of the United Methodist denomination, and even beyond the geographic area of the far West (California and Hawaii).

In order to meet the challenge of reliability (“the degree to which measurements are consistent and do not contain error”), only proven and tested measurements of leadership will be used (Heiman, 2002, p. 72). Except for the demographic survey, all of the measurements have been standardized and field-tested (with reliability and validity ratings).

Packets were mailed to all eligible pools of clergy on June 15, 2010. The first return mailings came in approximately two weeks from the original mailing date, and continued through the months of July and August, 2010. By the end of August, 2010, 11 high effective participants had returned the information, agreeing to participate in the study, but only four of the low effective participants had returned the information, two of whom agreed to participate, and two who did not want to participate at that time.

After checking with the researcher's dissertation committee, the suggestion was made to contact the low effective pool again for a response. On September 6, 2010, a second mailing of the complete packet was sent to all of the designated low effective pool of clergy who did not respond the first time. A new cover letter was drafted that reminded them of the first mailing, and requesting that possible participants send back the demographic sheet indicating whether they wish to participate or not. The letter included a request that more responses were needed for the researcher's database, and all of the original materials were in the second mailing in case they had misplaced the first set.

In addition, an email notification was sent to those low effective pool participants at the local church in which they were serving asking them to consider participating in the study, and alerting them that a second packet was sent to them.

From this second set of reminders, three low effective designated clergy agreed to participate in the study. One low effective designated person emailed that he would be sending in his information shortly, but no information was forthcoming. Both a return email and phone call to the person, reminding him that it was not too late to send in his information failed to elicit a response.

In addition, two of the high effective designated clergy responded that they had planned to participate, but one because of time constraints could not, and the second responded that he did not discover the original mailing over the summer until October, and wanted to know if the researcher still needed the information. We agreed that he did not have to participate at this point, since the pool of high effective designated clergy was ample.

This does present the problem of an extremely small sample size of low effective designated clergy of only five. Since the original research proposal stated that the quantitative analysis would be conducted on all of those who agreed to respond, the statistical analysis was conducted with this small sample. The small sample size of low effective designated clergy is duly noted in this research, and will be analyzed in the research findings in Chapter 5.

Instrumentation

The participants were given complete instructions on taking the BarOn Assessment which is available online through the Multi-Health Systems (MHS) website, and a hardcopy of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) survey to be mailed back.

Each individual tested was given a user-code in an attempt to maintain confidentiality. The database was put in Microsoft Excel and then imported to NCSS for analysis.

Measuring Emotional Intelligence

The field of emotional intelligence has expanded since the 1990s. Many authors have developed slightly differing survey instruments to measure emotional intelligence in youth, adults and leaders. The BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory (2008) was chosen to evaluate clergy leadership.

The BarOn test assumes that emotional intelligence is multifactorial in nature, and hence, the test consists of a number of subscales to assess the layers of emotional intelligence. The inventory consists of 133 questions with standard Likert scale responses: “1—*Very seldom or not true of me*; 2—*Seldom true of me*; 3—*Sometimes true of me*; 4—*Often true of me*; and 5—*Very often true of me or true of me.*”

As reported by Cox (as cited in Plake & Impara, 1999) in the Supplement to the Thirteenth Mental Measures Yearbook:

Scores are provided for four validity scales, five composite scales, 15 subscales, and a total quotient. Scores are reported as standard scores relative to the test taker's age and gender with a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15.

Interpretative guidelines for scores are adequately described within the technical manual. Higher scores are thought to be more indicative of success in coping with environmental demands whereas low scores present problematic coping skills. (p. 10)

The BarOn has a fairly strong North American normative sample of 3,831 individuals (ages 15-60) in the United States and Canada. The sampling represents the diversity of gender, ethnicity, age, educational level and geography.

Cox (as cited in Plake & Impara, 1999) reports that the "internal consistency and test-retest reliability estimates appear to be adequate" (p. 11). The average internal consistency coefficient is .76, and average test-retest coefficients are .85 and .5 for 1- to 4- month time periods (Cox, as cited in Plake & Impara, 1999).

Also adequate are the instruments validity ratings, although Cox (as cited in Plake & Impara, 1999) reports that some of the validation procedures do not include North American samples, and thus might be a liability for use in the U.S.

Overall, the BarOn appears to be a reliable and adequate instrument to assess emotional intelligence. The BarOn provides a comprehensive set of measurements that will enhance this particular study.

Measuring Leadership Characteristics

The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) was chosen because of its long-term viability and usage in the research and applied leadership field. Originally created by James Kouzes and Barry Posner (2003), the LPI has been updated into later editions: the Leadership Practices Inventory Delta (LPI-Delta), and the Leadership Practices Inventory—Individual Contributor (LPI-IC).

The original theoretical framework for the LPI has been kept for all later editions, and this model views effective leadership as a set of behaviors that can be learned and honed through practice.

The LPI measures five sets of behavior:

1. Challenging the Process
2. Inspiring a Shared Vision
3. Enabling Others to Act
4. Modeling the Way
5. Encouraging the Heart (Kouzes and Posner, 2003).

Kouzes and Posner (2003) believe that these five sets of fundamental leadership behaviors are foundational for general leadership, and those who excel in these five areas will demonstrate effective leadership.

The basic LPI and its revisions include a 30 item questionnaire that can be self-administered to both a participant and an evaluator (supervisor, peer or subordinate). The questions focus on descriptive behavioral statements, and are judged on a standard Likert response scale that has increased from a range of 5 options to now 10 in later revisions of the test (e.g. 1 = *Almost Never*, 2 = *Rarely* to 9 = *Very Frequently*, and 10 = *Almost*

Always). The rationale for the increase in numbered responses from 5 to 10 was to create a more sensitive reading of the behavioral responses.

Reliability, as reported from the appendix of the LPI trainer's manual, the internal reliability coefficients for the 5 leadership behaviors are reported as ranging from .68 to .80 for the Self-form and .76 to .88 for the Observers form. Other independent reviewers report reliability estimates from .70 to .85 for the Self-form and .81 to .92 for the Observers form (as cited in Plake & Impara, 2001).

Validity, as reported by Pearson (as cited in Plake & Impara, 2001) in the 14th Mental Measurements Yearbook, "Various validation efforts have resulted in the 30 items loading on the appropriate dimensions and have remained stable" (p. 665). Pearson (as cited in Plake & Impara, 2001) also adds that the LPI has been relatively free from biases on gender and cross-cultural studies over the years.

The LPI has been subject to some criticism through its years of use. Chemers (as cited in Plake and Impara, 2001) views the model as "overly simplistic, with a romanticized and narrowly focused view of leadership" (p. 662). Chemers continues his criticism by pointing out that Kouzes and Posner in their own research used questionable quantifiable interviewing techniques and self-report questionnaires on a very select sample of people. This could produce in Chemer's words, "an overly romanticized image of 'heroic leaders'" (pp. 662-663). Most telling is Chemer's criticism that their model fails to consider the situation and context, and thus tend to be oversimplified and marketable rather than scientific.

Vance Ceasar (personal communication, August 26, 2009) sees both positive and negative elements of the LPI, noting that the test is quick to administer and take, and

many busy executives will not bother with assessments that take over 30 minutes to fill out. However, he cautions that one missing element of the LPI is it does not look at the “inspirational” aspects of the leader, an important element of this particular area of research (V. Caesar, personal communication, August 26, 2009).

Criticisms of the LPI are duly noted, however, there has been much empirical research that demonstrates positive reliability and validity scores through the years of its use. It is by no means the perfect assessment of leadership, but the summation by Enger (as cited in Plake and Impara, 2001) is worth noting:

Overall, Kouzes and Posner have developed a very usable and popular Leadership Practices Inventory that has stood the test of time and continues to hold a prominent place in the market of instruments used primarily for formative evaluation of leaders at various levels of an organization. (p. 664)

Data Analysis

The quantitative data were analyzed in the following formats. Descriptive statistics were calculated for all demographics. Then each of the dependent factors within the multi-scale information for the LPI and Bar-On were analyzed for correlation (both positive and negative) to the independent variables of high effective and low effective clergy groups. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was run between the two groups of high effective and low effective clergy with an $\alpha = 0.05$ on the LPI and the Bar-On scales. An ANOVA was also run comparing the high effective and low effective clergy on the current worship attendance, members received (Professions of Faith), and percentage of appointments paid (the local church's contribution to the general United Methodist Church) at the current church where they serve. Finally an ANOVA was run on

the self-ranking between high effective and low effective clergy on their perceptions of their personal leadership and ministry effectiveness.

Analytical Techniques

As outlined previously, the quantitative analysis was conducted first. After all of the quantitative research was done, the qualitative analytical techniques began.

The qualitative technique conducted in-depth interviews with a selective sample from the initial “highly effective” UMC ministers. The selective sample was invited to participate in the in-depth interviews, and they were scheduled at their current place of ministry if at all possible. Of special importance was to get a balanced and representative sample of the “highly effective” UMC ministers in terms of gender, ethnicity and age.

A series of open-ended questions was designed to elicit the deeper levels of leadership that will enhance the study. A pilot study was conducted to check the reliability of the in-depth interview questions and process. In the pilot study, questions about the questions were solicited in order to check on the conveyed meaning of the designated questions.

The initial interview questions included the following:

- Do you consider yourself a successful local church minister? Why or why not?
- Can you identify some of the most important reasons for success in your own ministry? How specifically have they led to success?
- How would you describe your leadership in the local church?
- What leadership qualities do you possess that has led to your success in the local church?

- How important a factor has been the church itself (congregational make-up, demographics where the church is located, and church history) as a variable in the success/failure of our your ministry?
- Who are your role models or mentors in ministry? What qualities do they have that you wish to emulate or make a part of your own ministry?
- Have you used, or are now using coaches in your ministry. If you have used them, how important a factor have they been in the overall success of your ministry?
- How has the quality of “resiliency” affected your leadership? In other words, have you faced personal and professional setbacks that you have bounced back from and learned from in order to succeed? Can you describe these setbacks?
- If “entrepreneurial” was described as “immediately seizing on opportunities that present themselves to you in your ministry, and avoiding hazards that would set your ministry back.” do you consider yourself an “entrepreneurial” type of person? How important has entrepreneurial practices led to the success of your own ministry?

An in-depth interview pilot study was conducted with one of the high effective clergy members on February 19, 2010. The meeting was set up three weeks beforehand, and a complete explanation of the pilot nature of the interview was discussed and the interviewee agreed to participate. The interview was conducted in the clergyperson’s office, and the IRB Phase 2 consent form was read, and the interviewee signed the consent form, and agreed to have the interview audio taped. All of the initial questions

outlined above were asked. Following the complete interview, each question was discussed to see if the interviewee understood the question, and whether the question solicited what the researcher was looking for. The interviewee reported a consistency in what the researcher was asking on almost all of the questions, the exception being Question 3 and 4:

-How would you describe your leadership in the local church?

-What leadership qualities do you possess that has led to your success in the local church?

The interviewee thought that these two questions were very similar, and was not sure what the researcher was looking for in the questions. It was clarified, that the researcher really was interested in the “style” of leadership in Question 3, and the “qualities” of leadership in Question 4. This made sense to the interviewee, and a request was later submitted to IRB to add the word “style” to Question 3.

The researcher also noted in the pilot interview that the issue of a person’s individual mission does affect one’s corporate leadership of the church’s mission. This was discussed with the interviewee, and an additional question was submitted to IRB to be included in the in-depth interviews: *What is your personal mission/vision in life, and how does that impact the mission/vision for your local church?*

Finally, during the pilot interview, the ending question did not seem like a good conclusion, so after discussing this with the interviewee, a final concluding question was constructed and again submitted to IRB for inclusion: *Is there anything that I did not ask you about from a theoretical or practical framework that has a bearing on your leadership in the local church?*

The in-depth interviews will be enhanced in reliability by the use of multiple sources such as field notes and artifacts. Of particular interest for this study would be books and literature on church growth and evangelism that ministers might have in their offices.

A total of 10 high effective pastors were selected for the in-depth interviews. Every attempt was made in order to get a diverse group (age, sex, ethnicity, and experience). The breakdown of the 10 high effective pastors included:

- 7 males and 3 females
- 7 Anglo, 2 Asian and 1 African American
- 2 were in the age range of 30-40; 3 were in the age range of 40-50, and 5 were in the age range of 50-60.

CHAPTER 4

Research Findings

Quantitative Findings

The quantitative analysis of this research involved a comparison of high effective pastors to low effective pastors on four levels:

- The BarOn Assessment (measuring Emotional Intelligence).
- The Leadership Practices Inventory (measuring Transformational Leadership style).
- The size and health of their current local church appointment (as measured by average worship attendance, Professions of Faith in the past year, and percentage of apportionment paid in the past year).
- Personal assessment of one's leadership and ministry effectiveness.

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was run comparing the two groups of high effective pastors and low effective pastors on these four levels.

The BarOn Assessment Measuring Emotional Intelligence

It is clear that in terms of emotional intelligence, there is a significant difference between high effective and low effective clergy. Table 4 highlights the research findings.

Table 4

High Effective vs. Low Effective Clergy on the BarOn Scale of Emotional Intelligence

BarOn Categories	P-Value	Findings
1. Total Emotional Intelligence Quotient	0.000722*	Significant correlation
2. Intrapersonal	0.000487*	Significant correlation
3. Self-Regard	0.010962*	Significant correlation
4. Emotional Self-Awareness	0.002625*	Significant correlation
5. Assertiveness	0.003076*	Significant correlation
6. Independence	0.001650*	Significant correlation
7. Self-Actualization	0.015718*	Significant correlation
8. Interpersonal	0.005718*	Significant correlation
9. Empathy	0.428241	Not Significant correlation
10. Social Responsibility	0.086385	Not Significant correlation
11. Interpersonal Relationship	0.002033*	Significant correlation
12. Stress Management	0.073510	Not Significant correlation
13. Stress Tolerance	0.000158*	Significant correlation
14. Impulse Control	0.995777	Not Significant correlation
15. Adaptability	0.005222*	Significant correlation
16. Reality Testing	0.076878	Not Significant correlation
17. Flexibility	0.016809*	Significant correlation
18. Problem Solving	0.008510*	Significant correlation
19. General Mood	0.000446*	Significant correlation
20. Optimism	0.000632*	Significant correlation
21. Happiness	0.001586*	Significant correlation

The most important indicator on the BarOn scale is the first one that represents one's total Emotional Intelligence quotient. The current research found that there is a

significant correlation at the .05 level between high effective clergy and their Emotional Intelligence as compared to low effective clergy.

The second most important factor of the BarOn Assessment is the major categories of Emotional Intelligence under which the sub-scales are organized. On 4 out of 5 of the general categories: Interpersonal, Intrapersonal, Adaptability, and General mood there was a significant correlation at the .05 level between high effective and low effective UMC clergy. The only exception of no significant correlation was the general category of Stress Management. As the BarOn assessment identifies specific individual attributes of Emotional Intelligence, there were significant correlations between the two groups on 9 of the sub-scales.

There were 5 sub-scales that showed no correlation between the two groups on Emotional Intelligence. These were “9. Empathy, 10. Social Responsibility, 11. Stress Management, 13. Impulse Control, and 15. Reality Testing.” A deeper analysis of these 5 sub-scales will be provided in Chapter 5.

The Leadership Practices Inventory measuring Transformational Leadership

The quantitative analysis of the Leadership Practices Inventory between the two clergy groups produced a more mixed set of results. Table 3 provides the quantitative results. Unlike the BarOn, the LPI does not have a total score that would reflect a composite result. Although high effective pastors scored numerically higher on all the dimensions, there were only two significant correlations of the five: “3. Challenge the Process and 4. Enable Others to Act.” There was no significant correlation on the other three dimensions of the LPI: “1. Model the Way, 2. Inspire a Shared Vision, and 5. Encourage the Heart.”

Table 5

High Effective vs. Low Effective Clergy on the Leadership Practices Inventory

LPI Categories	P-Value	Findings
1. Model the Way	0.11106	Not significant correlation
2. Inspire a Shared Vision	0.105130	Not significant correlation
3. Challenge the Process	0.030752*	Significant correlation
4. Enable Others to Act	0.010134*	Significant correlation
5. Encourage the Heart	0.0104539	Not significant correlation

Unlike the BarOn, the LPI does not have a total score that would reflect a composite result. Although high effective pastors scored numerically higher on all the dimensions, there were only two significant correlations of the five: “3. Challenge the Process and 4. Enable Others to Act.” There was no significant correlation on the other three dimensions of the LPI: “1. Model the Way, 2. Inspire a Shared Vision, and 5. Encourage the Heart.”

Without one composite score, it would be impossible to determine any definitive results from these findings. A complete analysis of the LPI results will be included in Chapter 5.

The Size and Health of the Local Church Appointment

There is a significant correlation between the size and health of high effective clergy's current appointment as compared to lower effective clergy. Table 4 summarizes the research findings. For example, the average worship attendance of the high effective pastors is 410, as compared to only 60.4 for the low effective pastors. The number of new members that join a church (Professions of Faith) in the previous year is 18.2 for the high effective pastors and only 3 for the low effective ones. There was a significant correlation on these two levels between high effective and low effective clergy.

Table 6

High Effective vs. Low Effective Clergy on Church Size and Vitality

Categories of worship size and vitality	P-Value	Findings
1. Average worship Attendance	0.007318*	Significant Correlation
2. Professions of faith in past year	0.0028968*	Significant Correlation
3. Percent of Apportionments paid in past year	0.195648	Not Significant Correlation

On the last dimension, the percent of financial contributions to the larger denomination (Appointments paid) averages 91.8% for the high effective pastors and only 68.4% for the low effective pastors. Even with this difference, the ANOVA analysis found no correlation between high effective and low effective clergy in terms of percentage of funds paid to the UMC denomination.

In terms of church size there is a significant correlation between high effective pastors as compared to low effective pastors. This difference is verified in terms of worship attendance and new members added.

Personal Self-Assessment of Leadership and Ministry Effectiveness

The last dimension quantitatively analyzed was in terms of the self-ranking of high effective clergy vs. low effective clergy on their assessment of their own 1) personal leadership, and 2) ministry effectiveness. Table 5 concludes the quantitative analysis.

Table 7

High Effective vs. Low Effective Clergy on their Personal Leadership and Ministry Effectiveness

Personal Leadership Assessment	P-Value	Findings
1. Assessment of personal Leadership	0.014493*	Significant correlation
2. Assessment of ministry Effectiveness	0.014493*	Significant correlation

In terms of self-analysis of their own personal leadership, high effective pastors rate themselves on average at 1.6 (on a scale of 1-5, 1 being the highest), as compared to lower effective pastors who rate themselves at 2.6. As these clergy ranked themselves in terms of ministry effectiveness, high effective pastors come in at an average of 1.6 versus low effective pastors who rank themselves at 2.6. Both of these rankings by high effective pastors showed a significant correlation as compared to the self-ranking of low effective clergy.

Qualitative Findings

Of the five traditions of qualitative research Creswell (1998) has outlined, this study is clearly in the phenomenological classification. In this regard, this research is attempting to identify leadership traits or qualities from high effective UMC pastors, which clearly represents a lived phenomenon of such clergy.

From this lived experience, the search is for “central underlying meanings” from both “outward appearance” and “inward consciousness” of the clergy being studied (p. 52). In this research, the data collection type is in-depth interviews with clergy, and the analysis of the phenomenological data looks for commonalities in the themes expressed in the interviews. Although the search is for all possible meanings in the data, the common themes can be singled out to form patterns of thought and action.

It is critically important for any researcher to set aside personal prejudgments about the lived experience. Husserl (as cited in Creswell, 1998) speaks of this suspension of presuppositions as “epoche” (p. 52).

Creswell (1998) outlines the major procedures in using a phenomenological study and to paraphrase his points:

- Of key importance is the background step of the actual experience that people go through at the most elementary level. Epoche is the standard operation procedure, whereby the researcher attempts to limit his/her own experience so as to allow how the participant experiences it.
- From such descriptions, the researcher posits research questions that delve into the meaning of that which is experienced, and focuses on the lived experiences of the participants.

- Data is collected from the participants, and often the medium is interviews between the researcher and participants.
- The *phenomenological data analysis* steps are generally similar for all psychological phenomenologists who discuss the methods. According to Moustakas and Polkinghorn (as cited in Creswell, 1998) all psychological phenomenologists employ a similar series of steps. The original protocols are divided into statements or *horizontalization*. Then, the units are transformed into *clusters of meanings* expressed in psychological and phenomenological concepts. Finally, these transformations are tied together to make a general description of the experiences, the *textual description* of what was experienced and the *structural description* of how it was experienced. Some phenomenologists vary this approach by incorporating personal meaning of the experience (Moustakas, as cited in Creswell, 1998), by using single-subject analysis before intersubject analysis, and by analyzing the role of the context in the process (Giorgi, as cited in Creswell, 1998; pp. 54-55).
- Finally, a report is generated that attempts to describe the essence of the experience of the participants themselves. Often, a central unifying meaning of the experience is sought after. This concept presupposes a theory that many experiences have an underlying structure of meaning. The final conclusions should end with the reader grasping a better internal understanding of that which is being investigated and explored.

As Seidman (1998) has outlined, the interview method involves “the process of selecting constitutive details of experience, reflecting on them, giving them order, and thereby making sense of them” (p. 1).

Furthermore, Seidman (1998) sees the purpose of the interview “is an interest in understanding the experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (p. 3). He goes on to express that “interviewing provides access to the context of people’s behavior and thereby provides a way for researchers to understand the meaning of that behavior” (p. 4).

In the case of this research, the in-depth interviews are attempting to elicit the behavioral traits and qualities of high effective clergy, and to find commonalities in the meaning of such behavior that leads to effectiveness in ministry.

In the section that follows the data analysis of the eleven questions posed to ten highly effective clergy will be presented. The standard protocols of this qualitative analysis involve organization of the statements, or horizontalization, the coding of the statements into clusters of meanings, and finally tying together these meanings into general and common descriptions of the experiences so as to have both textual descriptions of what was experienced and structural experiences of how it was experienced (Creswell, 1998).

Question 1

The first question was really designed to immediately allow participants to enter into the thesis of this research study: *“Do you consider yourself a successful local church minister? Why or why not?”*

Overall, the quality of “humility” was repeated in participant’s answers. Three participants (30%) specifically mentioned having trouble with the word “success.” As one highly effective clergywoman states:

That question has been bugging me because...I find it a very hard question to answer. If you ask me if I am an effective church minister, I can say yes...if you ask me if I am a faithful, yes, but successful? To me that is a word of the world, and I am trying to figure out what does it mean in terms of ministry, and I can think of many examples of where I can actually say yes, but then I can also think of many things that I would also say no...so what are the criteria of success? (P. Farris, personal communication, February 19, 2010).

In the interview, she goes on to give examples where she feels she has been successful, and areas where she has not felt successful, but broaches the issue of humility in a very positive fashion:

So success is kind of elusive. I have so many more dreams and ideas that I haven’t put into place, so I find it a very challenging word (success), to try to get my head around it. And maybe it is a humility...I hope not false humility, but I am very uncomfortable saying “Yes, I am a successful minister.” I am very comfortable saying “I am a faithful minister.” I am comfortable saying

“effective” or “fruitful,” or other kind of words that I think are more gospel words. (P. Farris, personal communication, February 19, 2010).

The quality of humility is pervasive in this group of high effective pastors, as 10 out of 10 (100%) were consciously aware of one form or another of their personal limitations of leadership in their work. This would also be a high correlation factor to the Emotional Intelligence of this group in understanding themselves and their limitations.

As one pastor put it in reflecting on how he might be more successful:

I would think that I am not as highly successful as I would want because I think I suffer from the “pastor bottleneck syndrome,” where in my pastorates it has tended to center too much on me without enough delegation. So I think if I were to delegate more and train more, I think I would have been more successful.

(T. Choi, personal communication, July 11, 2010)

It is extremely difficult to prove that one is truly humble, but the intuitive feeling of humility was certainly present in these interviews with highly effective pastors. 4 of them (40%) specifically mentioned that they did not believe that they were the sole reason for the church’s health and well-being, and on the demographic survey form only 2 (20%) of them saw themselves as “extremely effective” pastors. Eight of them (80%) marked themselves as “moderately effective” on the same survey.

Six of the participants spoke of specific examples of success in their ministry, and this was roughly divided between quantitative elements (numerical growth in membership and attendance, larger amounts of giving, etc), and qualitative examples (individual lives that were transformed, or people hearing the call to ministry). Overall, a greater satisfaction and pride was expressed in the qualitative forms of success, and this

was expressed in what was more important in the long run: not merely numbers, but people whose lives have been changed for the better.

One pastor was able to give a specific example of qualitative success:

So, I would like to be part of a church, if I were a parishioner, that was living out that kind of ethos, so that might be my sense of what being successful is: to help the congregation live beyond itself; to live out of generosity, with compassion for the community, the children and families, of the mission field where it is, and the wider world. (J. Chute, personal communication, Aug. 10, 2010)

Two of the pastors (20%) reported that one of the personal “markers of success” in ministry for them involved their continued sense of “engagement and excitement” in the ministry and church. To quote both of them:

One, that I still feel engaged by what I’m doing, and I still really feel that the hope that I had of what pastoral ministry might be is still alive for me; It’s not like I’m tired of it, and I had the fun of working with congregations that while I was there, were stable and growing. (J. Chute, personal communication, Aug. 10, 2010)

But you know the thing that really came to me as to why I am successful? And I thought, yeah, I am still excited. I mean, I really feel successful after 15 years because I am not bored. I mean, I still feel like there is a lot to do, there’s potential, there’s creativity, there’s new people with new ideas. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

Subjectively, all 10 of the highly effective pastors demonstrated examples of this engagement and excitement in their ministry, although they did not report it specifically.

Finally, three (30%) specifically reported “preaching and/or communication skills” as one of the reasons for their success in ministry. To further enhance the correlation between highly successful pastors and preaching ability, 9 out of 10 (90%) of those interviewed were rated “strong preachers” by their immediate supervisors (District Superintendents).

In summary of the trends of this first question on whether they consider themselves successful in ministry:

- Overall, there is a deep sense of humility that these highly effective pastors possess when it comes to the personal assessment of their own ministry.
- Coupled with their humility, all of them are aware of their own limitations in one form or another, and thus possess a strong sense of self-awareness that is a major component of their Emotional Intelligence.
- They possess a deep sense of engagement and excitement about their ministry.
- Preaching and communication skills ranks extremely high in these high effective pastors.

Question 2

Question 2 is an attempt to find reasons for the success of these pastors, and more specifically to quantify tangible behaviors and attitudes that have led to their success:

“Can you identify some of the most important reasons for success in your own ministry? How specifically have they led to success?”

The overarching leadership behavior elicited from this question was “Empowerment of the congregation—of the lay people of the church itself.” 8 out of 10

(80%) reported this directly in their responses, and the other two participants, although not reporting it specifically, embody this behavior in their ministry description.

This empowerment of others genuinely stems from many of these pastors' love of people, and especially those whom they serve directly. As one pastor put it:

I really do genuinely love the people of the congregation, and again, I don't just mean just members, but the people that our ministry puts us in touch with, whether it's a community person who has a need, illness, hospitalization, Memorial Service, weddings, Baptism, child enrolled in pre-school: I enjoy getting to know people in their lives, and so I don't know because I'm not on the other side of the relationship, but what I hear is that they feel as though I do know them. (J. Chute, personal communication, Aug. 10, 2010)

Another pastor distinguished the internal and external reasons for his success, and speaking of what motivates him internally responded:

I think the internal reason is that I just love it—I love these people; I love doing ministry; I love the creative process, and people like to be around someone who is happy, joyful, loving, connected, and producing something that is meaningful, so they value that; they want to be a part of that. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

One of the key behaviors that reflect the empowerment of the laity comes from the ability of these pastors to assess the gifts and talents of the congregation, and then unleashing these gifts through mentoring and leadership development. Time and time again, these pastors commented that their job and role was to *see* the gifts in others, *name*

and cultivate those gifts, and *unleash* those gifts and people into the ministry of the church and community. Here is how one pastor expressed this ability:

I'm really good at seeing what people's gifts are and then being able to see how those gifts can really allow the church to move ahead in its vision. So like, I mean it's really stupid stuff, but someone will say to me, "Oh yeah, well this is what I do..." in their profession, and automatically my head starts working, "how can I use that in the local church?" So like, the thing that I think one of the stamps that I left here is one of the design aspects of the church, and how that reflects our desire to be excellent, and that came about you know in two different ways, it came about first, with (Parishioner's name), you know in hearing about that she's a designer at Toyota, and then totally oblivious to really how she was connected to the church at that point, but just going to her and saying "You know, I really have a vision for our church newsletter, and it involves someone like you who can really help our newsletter to become a nice readable document that excites people in the church." And she's like: "What are you talking about?" Because at that point she really wasn't that involved in the church, and so the thing that I think that is understated about all of that is while it can sound like I just sort of use them for their gifts, the thing that I have sensed in (Parishioner's name) is that her feeling that her contributions are meaningful has helped her to connect with the church in a way that's different from folks who come out of their faith only. You know, there are people who come here for their faith, and who want to worship God and like the singing and the worship and whatever, but there are folks who are like (Parishioner's name) who are not really connected that way,

but who have felt a sense of connection and meaning to the church because they say: “my gifts can contribute to the organization and its goal and vision.” So you know, it’s weird when you think about our music ministry that was just that same thing of 5-6 guys who were musically gifted who we brought into the circle and said “we want to start a music program.” I feel like that’s one of my strengths: is being able to see how people are gifted and how those gifts can contribute to the organization, and how I can weave them together to help the organization achieve its goals and vision. So that’s also intuitive and it’s really just listening to people. (D. Nakano, personal communication, August 5, 2010)

However, it is clear that these high effective pastors have the relational understanding and ability to be able to bring out the best in other people. In some ways, it is a special skill set that they have acquired through years of ministry. Notice how this one pastor skillfully describes her cultivation of a staff person’s gifts:

And I give people responsibility before they think their ready for it, and I’ve done that with a lot of staff people, some of which are now pasturing churches, and one is our Director of Christian Education, and when I came I said, are you involved in helping to lead worship? “No”...how about Children’s Moments? “Oh no, I could never do that.” So I just kept pushing her and nudging her, and now she’s doing all of that on a regular basis with such ease, and now she’s actually preached; She’s getting her Masters next door at the seminary, and she’s applying to be a Deacon, but it was me pushing her all the time, I mean a little bit beyond her comfort level, but she actually said, “I’m going throw up if I have to do this,” but I would walk the journey with her, but I’d get her there. But I think I’m pretty

good at seeing that in other people and calling it out, and say “Give it a try.” You know...and there were people I asked to preach at Westwood; they never had a preaching class, and I do it at low risk times: “Preach on Ash Wednesday—it’s a good one to start on.” And it’s just awesome to see what people do, you know.

(S. Rhodes-Wickett, personal communication, July 13, 2010)

Thus, it is clear that these high effective pastors display the classical elements of Emotional Intelligence in their work and lives, and that sense of personal and relational understanding serves them very well. As one pastor put it in his self reflection on this very question:

I think one of them would be a willingness to be in constant discernment—discernment is very important: Constantly thinking about evaluating my audience, the congregation, the mission field I’m working in, and to say “what are the ways we can reach these people.” I think a second but equally important aspect is that I think I am constantly self evaluative. To tell you the truth (maybe this is a question that is coming up later), but one of the problems I see with a lot of our pastors is a lack of self awareness, and I think that I may be many things, but I think I am fairly self aware. (T. Choi, personal communication, July 11, 2010)

Among other important reasons for these high effective pastors success at their local churches: four (40%) specifically report team building and the ability to work with multiple staff people successfully. This is a unique skill set that many pastors have not mastered, and if they are to be successful at larger churches, the one mandatory skill set is to be competent in staff management and development. In a church system such as the United Methodist Church, where the majority of our local churches have small

worshipping attendance, this skill level of working with a multiple staff simply does not exist. The exact number of churches in the United Methodist Church with small worship attendance figures is very telling:

Table 8

Small Membership Churches in the United Methodist Church

Worship Attendance	No. of Churches	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
50 or less	17,321	48.5%	48.5%
50-100	8,722	24.4%	72.9%
100-200	1,991	5.6%	88.5%

Even with a worship attendance of 200, it is highly unlikely that the local church would have the necessary resources to hire a multiple staff. At this size, there might be part time staff members, but probably no full time staff to manage and oversee.

Thus, the vast majority of United Methodist Church clergy do not have multiple staff experience and skill sets. The exception is when they come into ministry as a second career and have had staff management skills in the secular world. Certainly, our younger clergy candidates do not have this type of secular experience, and they have little opportunity to hone in the skills of staff management since they are more likely to be appointed to the small membership churches at the beginning of their careers.

So it would seem an absolute prerequisite for a large church pastor to have the experience and ability to handle multiple staff situations. Still, it is a challenge for pastors, since the United Methodist Church system does not have a training ground for those skills to be practiced. Even these experienced highly effective pastors struggle with personnel issues. At least two of those interviewed expressed the difficulty of “firing” or

having to let go of staff members. Both of them conceded that they probably err on the side of waiting too long out of compassion and optimism with hired staff. As one pastor reports:

I think it is a growing edge for me, even at that, I probably over-trust, and I probably still need to do a better on the front end with people coming on board to help them think through intentionally the sort of operating ethos that really is here. By that, I mean things like, staff in our parking lot out in the main parking lot area, do not park in the spots nearest to the church—they park in the spots farthest from the church because we assume that parents taking kids to school get the best spots. Like, who are we here for? If we're here for us, then we should have those spots. There's no clergy spot on this campus. Every once in awhile, and it's probably happened 3 times—we've hired somebody who really had a different idea, and I didn't see that at the beginning, and in fact, in one case, I was persuaded that that was the opposite of the case, and so I let it go longer than I think I should have before I made a change, because I thought how is this not happening—how is this not working? And so you have the choice, do you want to put in the time on the front end, or do you want to put in the time at the back end, and I probably under-do the front end. Fortunately, I have not had too many of those changes, but I've made 3 of them, and none of them was fun. (J. Chute, personal communication, August 10, 2010)

Three participants (30%) specifically report preaching and communication skills as directly related to their success in ministry. As already mentioned, overall, this group of highly effective pastors is considered strong preachers and communicators.

Three participants (30%) also report the quality of never being satisfied, and of always growing. Assessing this as a personal quality correlating with her success, one pastor puts it this way:

I think of personal qualities: of discipline...of high expectations of myself...Strong work ethic...A creative mind...always lots of ideas: we can do this, we can do that—never at a loss for possibilities of what more can we do...Never really satisfied with what is. (P. Farris, personal communication, February 19, 2010)

Some of the other qualities raised by the interview group included: Seeing opportunities, seeing the big picture, caring and compassion, not afraid of making mistakes, diplomacy, and honesty.

One of the participants reported specifically, and a few others implied it in examples, the ability to network and create partnerships outside the local church. This seems to be a very important component of clergy leadership as we move into a post-religious world. In a video interview with General James Dubik, Retired Four Star General of the U.S. Army, who is currently consulting with the Roman Catholic Church, he cited this as one of the key leadership qualities necessary in his work in the military, and now with his consulting work with the Roman Catholic Church. One example he used was the assignment to expand the military base in Honolulu, Hawaii, and the fact that he had to constantly meet with public groups, some very resistant to any military presence. He accomplished this task, but he remarked it was only possible by creating partnerships and contacts in all forms of outreach: civic, domestic, political, educational, religious, and economic (J. Dubik, personal communication, June 29, 2010).

In our post-religious American society, this partnering becomes increasingly important. Whereas in the past, the church could remain insular and still have people seeking out a local church to attend, in our present age, the church must reach out to its surrounding neighborhood and mission field if it is to survive. Partnering and networking becomes increasingly central to the mission and outreach of the church, and clergy must be able to provide this type of leadership.

As one pastor responds to the question of the reason for success:

The second one is reaching partners--creating partnerships. Creating partnerships around the church community be it political partnership or business partnerships and civil partnerships. I'm always looking for organizations and individuals who are outside of the church to partner with, and that's been fruitful through the years. (K. Walden, personal communication, July 16, 2010)

One final quality that at least two of the participants reported specifically, and that is the ability to understand systems, and to work in the development of a healthy system for the church. One highly effective respondent uses the metaphor of a healthy human body vis-à-vis the local church. A human body that is operating at optimum health is constantly replicating good cells, and rejecting and even destroying unhealthy cells. By extension, so it is also true of a healthy organization: if the systems of the church in our case are healthy, they will be constantly creating healthy cells and rejecting unhealthy ones. As he summarizes:

Instead, it's like the power to allow, and so usually my answer from the time I came here was, "Sure, why not? And if it doesn't work we won't do it, or if it becomes a problem, we see it's not healthy for..." And that's the other thing, to

me what's helped is we have to be a healthy system, and in this system the leadership and the staff, you're either going to be healthy and in right relationship, or you're going to self-select out, or we're going to move you, because everyone says "this is not healthy, and it's got to stop. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

In summary of this question of identifying the most important reasons for their success:

- The most common reason cited by these highly effective pastors is "Empowerment of the laity."
- One of the most common strategies in this empowerment cited by these clergy is the ability to *see* the gifts in others, *name and cultivate* those gifts, and *unleash* those gifts and people into the ministry of the church and community.
- In this ability to empower the laity, this group of clergy possesses the necessary Emotional Intelligence to excel in this endeavor.
- One of the key skill sets, especially for large church pastors is the ability to do team building and to work with multiple staff configurations.
- Other relevant reasons include preaching and communication skills, a passion for the work of ministry, and the quality of never being satisfied and the desire to always be growing in their own ministry.

Question 3

Question 3 was added after the initial pilot interview to see if there was any correlation between one's personal mission statement and the mission and direction of the

local church where they serve. Because it was added after the pilot interview, only nine participants gave answers to the question instead of the original number of 10. The question posed was: *“What is your personal mission/vision in life, and how does that impact the mission/vision for your local church?”*

Question 3 elicited a very strong correlation between these pastors’ personal mission and the effect that has on the mission of the church where they serve. Nine out of nine (100%) believed that their personal mission directly effected their church mission. Two of the nine did not put their personal mission statement in a specific formula of words, but spoke of their personal mission in terms of a vision or experience that they had in life. Here are the other specific personal mission statements:

- “To continue to grow and lead others to grow in Christ.”
- “To have balance and excellence in my life so that I can properly attend to my family, and to my career (the ministry of the church), and myself.”
- “To live fully all the time, and to give 110% in everything I do.”
- “To learn and grow as much as I can in life.”
- “To reach out and bring in those people who are on the margins.”
- “To create Kingdom soil”
- “Restore the church.”

The other two pastors did not have specific mission statements in words, but expressed it indirectly. One of those pastors talked about her previous mission was to “make the church happy,” but she realized through the years that was a false direction, and now her mission is to reach out into the mission field and to bring those people to a relevant faith (C. Coots, personal communication, August 5, 2010).

Another pastor reported his mission in the form of a life experience:

I'm not sure I've ever articulated a personal vision for my life—I think I probably glimpsed it. I was 16 on the first summer of the Sierra Service Project, and was probably in my mind an agnostic at the time. You know, I liked youth group, but the intellectual side of me was not persuaded by the whole God thing, and there we were working hard during the day, in my case, adding a room onto a house, and it was significant physical labor. And the people who were coordinating this and making it happen were (mentions specific names), some other people from our church in Escondido, and they were really it. I saw them doing something that mattered; I saw them helping us do something that mattered, and they, in a non obnoxious way, used religious language and symbols in a way that made you realize that there was sort of foundation for them—it wasn't like a decoration, and I think that contrasted for me significantly, what I saw as a lot of religious language with among my peers. And I thought, maybe this really could be something: to be involved with life in the way of service, outreach and compassion, and in a non-paternalistic/maternalistic way that honored the integrity of other people's lives and invited us into community. And, I saw that--that was what excited me. (J. Chute, personal communication, August 10, 2010)

All of the participants interviewed were able to link their personal vision to the vision and mission of the local church where they serve. One example of this is how the pastor quoted above saw the direct link of his vision experience to the life of his current church:

And, there probably is some undercurrent of relationship between that and what I hope to be helping to nurture here. To be in a place that let's people share their gifts differently—share their different gifts differently, but where we model a kind of respect and care for each other. If we can't practice that among us, why would we think anyone else in the universe would be interested in who we are and the message that we say we proclaim? (J. Chute, personal communication, August 10, 2010)

Another good example of a pastor who is able to give a concrete example of the link between her personal vision of “reaching out to people who are on the margins,” and how this is directly manifest in her church work:

Yeah, I think it varies from location to location—who were at the margins at any given community? So, it's not that's its any one, and I think that's what so profound about God's call: it's wasn't go bring in the greasers and the dopeheads, it was people who feel on the margins—that they don't feel acceptable to the church, because I didn't feel that way. There was a sense in which “Do you get this?--Now you help this happen.” So, it's been a lot of things—it's been youth, it's been young people...it's been young parents, it's been people of color...it's been people with different ideas...it's been concepts: you know trying to enlarge people's concepts around immigration, and at Santa Clarity, that's when the AIDS epidemic starting to come out, and so people—you might remember back in the early 80's, you know were afraid if they touched a door handle that a person with AIDS touched, that they would get it. So, (name of husband) and I were working really hard to try to bring people in and have discussion, and to say...to try to

make those biblical discussion with outcasts and so forth. And so it's not easy—they didn't want to...so that comes to mind. (S. Rhodes-Wickett, personal communication, July 13, 2010)

A few of pastors reported how their vision has evolved over time and ministry experience. In this regard, continued growth both personally and professionally contributed to the shaping of one's vision over time. As one pastor entertainingly expressed it:

Yeah, well, when you're younger, your vision is for yourself—what am I called to do?—what am I suppose to do? What is my life going to be? The more that I became a part of the Body of Christ, and realized that it wasn't about me. It kind of evolved as I begin in ministry. I remember at Pomona, I made one of my first pastoral calls, and it was to an I.C.U. unit, and it was to (parishioner's name) and she was 92, and I had a degree in counseling; I could do Rogerian active listening you know. So, I was going into that room—my first hospital ICU room, to listen and to reflect, and I walked in and I was 26, and she was on a respirator, and she couldn't talk, I couldn't listen, and I went “Oh crap, what do I do?” And she opened her eyes, and she saw me, and she said “Ohhh...” and she started patting my hand. Here's this woman on a respirator, and she sees this scared little pastor, and she starts patting me, and in that moment it was a Holy Spirit presence, and I realized I was just there to remind her of God's presence. I was just there to get out of my anxiety and let God's grace work between us, and that taught me, when I try to remember when I preach and relate to people, I'm trying to get out of the way and let the Spirit come through. So, I evolved that through my understanding

through ministry, and especially when I came here (current church) and begin to try to bring large groups of people into relationship with God. You can't be in the way. So, it's not being the seed; it's about me creating the soil—that was the transition that I experienced. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

One of the pronounced characteristics of the content of the church's vision for many of these high effective pastors reflects the current "post-religious" environment that the church finds itself in. In this respect, these pastors realize how society has changed so dramatically in terms of church attendance and attraction. These are the pastors who "get it," in the sense of having a realistic sense of where the church stands in light of contemporary society values. The "attractional model" of the 1960-1970's in the U.S., where people sought out and attended church on a regular basis is no more, and insulating the church from the surrounding neighborhood and community is no longer an option if the church wishes to have a future.

So, 7 out of 9 (78%) specifically reported "engagement with their surrounding mission field," which represents the immediate neighborhood and community in which the church is located. These pastors realize that the church must reach out beyond its own doors to engage others if the church is to survive. As one pastor articulates how his vision effects the surrounding community:

For me the local church is that thing that matters; I guess that's where I feel invested in...I feel that the church has the ability to transform lives, and to really transform our culture and community, and so knowing that what I do here affects what the church members are with their family and community and how we as a

whole, express to the community, values. Sometimes, the thing that's really weird around here, every now and then we will get people who come from across the street, and they'll say, "You know, I don't go to your church, and I'm not Christian, but I really believe in what you are doing, so here's a donation." And for me, that's the kind of church I want us to be, that we kind of become that beacon of hope and light for people, and they see... You know one of the comments we get from people who drive down the street all the time is, "Your parking lot is never cold; you know, there's always something going on at your church." And for me, that's exciting, and it's not always church stuff—its Scouts, and it's music ministry, and there's lots of stuff that goes on, but it helps people in the community to see that positive things are happening here. This is a good place for people to bring their kids and to engage in things, and it speaks to the community even if they don't necessarily support us in our faith perspective; they do support the values that we try to be. So those are kind of things that I'm willing to work hard on because I feel like they matter; not just for us personally, but for our community. (D. Nakano, personal communication, August 5, 2010)

Another pastor talks about this outreach in quantitative terms:

...that we're equipping people for ministry and that we're developing a greater percentage of our church that is self aware of being engaged in ministry. That ultimately, just in terms of thinking in terms of numbers—80% of my congregation's ministry should not be here. So, ideally, if I had 100 people coming to worship, 80 people out of 100 should understand that their ministry is

not on this campus. 20% should understand that their ministry is on this campus.

(C. Brown, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

The other clear characteristic about these pastors' visions is the deep biblical and theological reflection that has shaped such visions. Seven out of 9 (78%) report a biblical or theological concept that forms the foundation of their vision. Of course, there is an element of personal experience in the formation of their visions, but clearly, such personal experience is formed in the crucible of a life bound in faith. Certainly, this is a distinctly different perspective than other secular professionals, and living a life where faith is a central touchstone and forming element sets this group apart from others.

An example of this faith informing vision is expressed thusly:

The mission and vision of my life is very clear—I think that's one thing I have a good understand of. My vision is to restore the church. Just 3 words, "Restore the Church." So, my mission is not to bring revival, renewal, exponential growth—none of those things are my mission and vision. My life is about coming to a church that's forgotten how to be a church, and doesn't know what a church is or looks like, and restoring it to what it should be. So, it's kind of like a classic car, you know you go out to the junk yard and buy the rusty shell of what a car used to be, and my vision and mission of my life is to restore that car to it's correct condition—not mint condition, not it's luxurious condition, but it's correct condition, and that's it. Once I've done that my work my work is essentially finished. And so, that's where this church was—this church was a rusty, kind of wrecked out car sitting in a garage that was up on cinder blocks, and hadn't really ran in 10-15 years the way it needed to, so that's the congruity, so my vision for

restoring the church, along with their need to be restored when those two things met—that’s what I meant, the success is more about coincidence and timing and what people would call luck, that for me, I call it the Holy Spirit at work bringing things together. (C. Brown, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

Another example of this biblical and theological depth comes from another pastor’s description:

When I had to first preach for my Local Preachers license, I came up with image that the reason was going into the ministry was because of the Parable of the Sower: that I wanted to cast my life into the good soil, not the hard soil, etc. I wanted my life to bear fruit and to grow. My re-call definition is that’s not what I’m called to do anymore. My vision here is to create “Kingdom soil,” so that more seeds can grow. So, the vision they know I have here, is the Kingdom of God vision—we are not a personal salvation theology. I teach them almost every week, you know. Ours is about increasing the swath of God’s Kingdom so that seeds can plant and bear fruit, so we’re a community serving community, expanding out into the community, expanding within yourself growing. So, it really is to me, my vision is that we are constantly increasing good soil—we’re making good soil, in your soul and in our community so that Kingdom of God can take root and bear fruit. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

So in summary of the effect a highly effective pastor’s personal vision has on the vision of the church where they serve in Question 3:

- These highly effective clergy do possess a personal vision.

- There is a strong correlation between these pastors' personal vision and the vision expressed by the congregation in which they serve.
- These pastors understand the current reality of our "post-religious society," and their congregational vision involves reaching out beyond the walls of the local church where they serve into the mission field of the surrounding neighborhood, community and society.
- These pastors possess a deep biblical and theological foundation on which they ground their personal and church community's vision.

Question 4

Question 4 was an attempt to elicit what kind of style of leadership these high effective pastors demonstrated in their ministry. The question is straight forward and to the point: *How would you describe your leadership style in the local church?*

The qualitative analysis of these personal interviews does mirror the quantitative analysis conducted with the Leadership Practice Inventory, but expands and deepens the criteria of Transformational Leadership.

To reiterate this paper's literature review definition of transformational leadership as reported by Bass and Avolio (1994) and Northouse (2007), this style is exemplified by four primary factors:

- Charisma: A specific vision and high ethical standard.
- Inspirational motivation: Building a team through communication and inspiration of a shared vision.
- Intellectual stimulation: Challenging followers by innovation and problem solving.

- Individualized consideration: Developing followers by coaching and mentoring them to reach individual fulfillment (Northouse, 2007, p. 181).

Given this definition, all 10 of these pastors (100%) demonstrate one or more of these qualities in the qualitative research of these interviews. This high percentage underscores the transformational style of these high effective pastors.

Subjectively, the majority of these pastors exhibit a certain amount of charisma, as commonly defined in an appealing and winsome way. In providing a more quantifiable definition in the form of having “a specific vision and high moral standard” (Mannarelli, 2006, p. 47), one pastor expressed it in this way:

I think my leadership style would be vision driven, but not necessarily detail oriented. Except that sometimes I do obsess over details unnecessarily. I think I have always been able to go into places and say, “there is a vision of what we can do here, and this is where we are going, and I’ve usually been able to get people to come with me on board with it, but I think part of that is I have been able to in every place, and I’ve been getting better each time I go is to be able to push for the vision, but honor the traditional. I think that has been a real helpful thing. For example, in the church: I’m pretty sure that when I went to Kailua—the reason that I was brought there was to bring in younger people into an aging and dying church. So, I did put in a contemporary service in, but that took 3 years before I put that in, so you know, building the relationships, getting it ready, but also letting the older folks realize that they are still valuable, so one of the first things I installed was a living treasure tradition, where one person who was a charter member of the church was about to die, and we all knew it, it was just a manner of

time, and we said before he dies let's honor him and say he is (and that's kind of a Hawaii thing—this living treasure thing, and actually other countries do it to), but the living treasure thing really said we honor these people, we honor our tradition, we honor where we've been...we're also going this way too. My motto every since I got to Kailua was “all the people some of the time.” Some pastors who will do some of the people all the time—that gets them in trouble, and I have always tried to say “all the people some of the time: we're going to do something for the old folks, we're going to do something for the young folks, middle, whatever...” (T. Choi, personal communication, July 11, 2010)

A total of five (50%) pastors specifically report their style as “vision driven,” and “vision casting,” leadership. To quote another pastor:

I think if people were to describe me, I can be intense and focused, but that has to do with the vision. I think once I get a sense of clarity about the vision I get so focused on that, and again, going back to that attention to detail, I can see how all of those pieces can help us to assemble toward that vision—to move toward that vision, and so I can be sometimes hard on people, I think, but I'm willing to go the extra mile to pursue those visions. And so, that in a couple of different ways, and I think it does absolutely mean that I'm willing to go 110% to do it here, but I think that always means to that I have to constantly be a growth trajectory myself. (D. Nakano, personal communication, August 5, 2010)

Seven of the 10 (70%) highly effective pastors report specifically a collaborative empowering style, and this reinforces the second factor of Transformational Leadership:

Inspirational motivation, or the ability to build a team through communication and inspiration of a shared vision. As one pastor puts it:

So, what I did when I got here was to continue that practice: What do we have going for us? Who is God calling us to serve? What would stretch us beyond where we are, but is somewhat within reach—that we might have the chance to continue the momentum. I know you’re familiar with Jim Collins work: a little bit of the flywheel: that it actually takes a lot to get it going, but it doesn’t take that much to keep it going, and when you have some momentum as a community, some things happen because that’s just what we do. They don’t require action, oversight, and pension as people begin to get it, and I’m sure some of that has happened. The particular character of the afterschool program and the summer camp program, I didn’t decide any of that, but I did help encourage some of the right people that we would support them with where they were going, and where they were going we trusted, and I don’t mean just me, but we were in communication with the Board... We were in communication with Staff-Parish... We were in communication with the Trustees, and we were all saying, “This feels like where we’re supposed to be. (J. Chute, personal communication, August 10, 2010)

All 10 of these highly effective pastors exhibit deep thinking and reflection skills, and this is exemplified in the third factor of Transformation Leadership: “Intellectual stimulation,” or the ability challenge followers by innovation and problem solving. As one pastor reports:

I would define it as collaborative, seeking to build a team. I'm blessed with a wonderful clergy team, as you well know, and we try to build that in the church Council and the committees: that we are there to resource them...to provide some ideas, but also to help them generate some ideas. We really want to encourage creativity; imaging what ministry might look like in each of the areas, and permission giving, but with a sense of responsibility to each other. (J. Standiford, personal communication, July 12, 2010)

The final component of transformational leadership involves "individualized consideration" or the ability to develop followers by coaching and mentoring them to reach individual fulfillment. As one pastor describes it:

Working with people to call out their gifts, so that their leadership contributes to the whole. So I feel like now we have, because of my leadership and leadership style, we have more leaders who are contributing more, and therefore we have a much stronger and richer congregation. (P. Farris, personal communication, February 19, 2010).

So, the defining characteristic of these high effective pastors is a Transformational Leadership style. However, as a sign of the times, this is coupled with the need to adapt to a post-religious society. Here the work of Daniel Goleman (2000) is extremely helpful, and his use of the "Situational model" of switching leadership styles according to the specific situation or context is appropriate. As outlined in the literature review, Goleman highlights six different styles that can be used by the leader like golf clubs, and interchanged depending upon the situation called for. These six styles include: Coercive

style, Authoritative style, Affiliative style, Democratic style, pacesetter style, and Coaching style (Goleman, 2000).

Four of the respondents (40%) specifically report their need to adapt their style of leadership according to the situation faced in the local church. Examples include:

I don't know how relevant it is, but the analogy I use on myself is that I use to play the viola. I spent a lot of years playing the viola. The viola is sometimes a solo instrument, but not usually. And I love playing in string quartets where there's not a leader—there are four musicians, and to play well, you have to play your part really well, and to always be listening to each other, and create a whole. I have come to realize that that's my preferred work style, so I expect of a staff team that that's how we are going to work...I expect of my lay leader that's how we are going to work. Well, what I have to learn, sometimes the hard way is that not everybody works in that style...thrives in that style, and so I have had to really develop what I would consider additional kinds of leadership modes which are sometimes more leading and directing and shaping and claiming the role of leader. (P. Farris, personal communication, February 19, 2010).

Another pastor expressed this changing leadership style this way:

I think I am able to be in a lot of different styles. I'm able to sit in a room and be quiet. If someone else is clearing setting what the vision is...where we're going, then I can easily be part of the team, and help carry that forward. To me, it's kind of like being in a choir where you have the different voices and different voices at different points carry the music, and for me leadership is like that; I don't have to be the leader; I can be a leader among leaders; I can be a follower; I can be just a

team player; I think I can do all of those things. (C. Coots, personal communication, August 5, 2010).

One final reminder of a theme that runs throughout these interviews with highly effective clergy: the biblical and theological models that provides the foundation of their thought and work. In speaking of leadership styles, one pastor exemplified this perspective:

My leadership style is collaborative—team building, empowering. My style is not command and control. My style is not singularity. Last year, I went to the Willow Creek Leadership Summit, and in the very opening talk, Bill Hybels told an interesting and farcical story: He said for many pastors we think that our leadership should work like we went way onto a mountain for a month, and we communed with God, and read the Bible, and prayed incessantly. And then we returned, and sat down with our Board, and told them all: “God has given me a vision of what we need to do.” And so the fantasy that too many pastors and leaders have is that’s the modality of leadership: That one person goes off, has some experience, and then comes back and then imparts that. And what Hybels says is that’s clearly the Moses model of ministry. Moses goes up on the mountain, gets the commandments and then comes down. What is effective is the model Jesus presents to us of leadership, for Jesus knows where were going, and what we’re about, and knows us better than we know ourselves, but yet the reality is that he chooses to be in collaborative ministry with his disciples, so that really stuck in my mind—that model that Hybels, but I’d never juxtaposed Moses and Jesus as leaders. And each has these kind of unique strengths, but the things that

Hybels was pointing to was what makes them different, and what makes Jesus in many ways a superior model of leadership. I hadn't quite thought about it in those terms before, and that's one of those moments when you hear it said, and you go: "Finally, someone can describe exactly what I am trying to either do or live," you know, before that you didn't quite have words to grab it, and that's really what model is. My model of leadership is I think I know where we need to go, but if we don't go there together, and if it's not shaped by the experience of going there together, than we actually have gone nowhere--Because Moses is a command and control leader. (C. Brown, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

So to summarize the leadership styles of highly effective clergy:

- On the qualitative level, these highly effective pastors demonstrate a Transformational Leadership style.
- The Transformational Leadership style is vision driven, inspirational, innovative, high ethical standards, collaborative, team building, and always seeking to improve others around them.
- Many of these high effective clergy are able to adapt their leadership style to meet the existing context or situation, and so demonstrate a sophisticated form of "Situational Leadership."
- These highly effective clergy are grounded in the Christian biblical and theological traditions that enable them to reflect and act in a deeply spiritual way.

Question 5

At first glance, Question 5 seemed somewhat close to the previous question, but the research attempt was to isolate leadership “qualities” from “styles” in this specific question. Hence, the question was asked: *“What leadership qualities do you possess that have led to your success in the local church?”*

The dominant quality most reported by these highly effective pastors clusters around the key concepts of Emotional Intelligence. Seven (70%) of the pastors report some element of Emotional Intelligence in their work. A perfect example of this comes from one pastor’s self assessment:

I think I’m good at assessing people and situations, sometimes more quickly and better than others, but by in large, I think that if I’m sitting in a meeting and there’s something kind of funky going on, I usually find a way to at least probe it a little bit and try to see if we can get there, and not just take the face value of what their saying verses what I’m feeling. Emotional Intelligence is very intuitive for me. (S. Rhodes-Wickett, personal communication, July 13, 2010)

Five (50%) pastors specifically report hard work as a quality that they believe has led to their success in the parish. In most cases, it is casually mentioned and not elaborated on with much reflection, and there is almost a feeling that it is a given that everybody should work hard in the ministry. However, one pastor ties his work ethic as a strategy to overcome what he believes are deficiencies compared to others:

I learned a long time ago, that there are a lot of people smarter than me. In any room, and I’m not being modest, but in most of the rooms I go to most of the people will have a higher intellect and they will be smarter. People that I went to

school with, they generally made better grades, and they scored better on SAT's.

So, a long time ago, I'm thinking okay what can I do: I'll work harder. They're very few people in the room, or among my peers that will work harder than me.

If you put me on a treadmill or something, I think Wilson had said in an interview, "you put him on a treadmill with anybody, he's not going to stop." So, I work harder than...so that's one of my traits, I work harder. (K. Walden, personal communication, July 16, 2010)

One unexpected quality mentioned by half of those interviewed: 5 or 50%, was knowledge of and the ability to work on some form of organizational culture. A number of these pastors read widely in the secular management and leadership literature. They believe as a whole that there is much to learn from the secular business world, but that it must be adapted for use in a religious organization. Some people might be surprised at the level of sophistication that some high effective clergy have in the area of organizational development and culture. As one pastor describes himself:

So, I think that's one of the qualities that I have, I think I have an ability to communicate in an inspirational manner. One thing I can do well, I can make staying here sound untenable. For me, all leadership is, very simple, it's getting from here to there. That's all it is, and the way you get from here to there is commonly been told that you have to make "there" so inspirational, that everybody wants to go there. No, you start that by making here untenable—we can't stay here anymore. If we stay here this is what's wrong...this is what's wrong...this is what's wrong...this is what's going wrong. Then when everybody actualizes that "here" is a place we cannot stay, then you talk about "there."

I'm guilty of changing things too much and too often, because I really am, it's what Jim Collins talks about in even "Built to last" and "Good to Great," I'm the guy who will try everything, and I'm number one in line to say it didn't work, because I believe you just have to constantly keep at it, and that's how great solutions come about, just by constantly, constantly bringing change processes into place for people, so most of the leadership reading is on change, change management, change systems—almost all of it. (C. Brown, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

In summarizing the qualities of highly effective clergy:

- Once again, one of the key self identified qualities is Emotional Intelligence, as these clergy realize that working with and understanding people is one of their greatest resources.
- A strong work ethic is another self-identified quality, but most of these pastors speak of it matter-of-factly, as if it is simply a given in order to succeed in ministry.
- The ability to understand and work with systems and organizational theory also stands out, as these pastors talk about the qualities that enable them to succeed. Many of these high effective pastors are well read in this area, and have the ability to work with a fairly sophisticated understanding of organizational development and culture.

Question 6

Question six is an attempt to broaden the reasons for success or failure beyond the individual gifts and graces of the leader. In an attempt to assess how important a factor

the church where they are assigned is to their own success, the question was posed: *How important a factor has been the church itself (congregational make-up, demographics where the church is located, and church history) as a variable in the success/failure of our your ministry?*

Seven out of 10 (70%) believe that the church itself plays a fundamental role as they assess their own leadership in the church. Two of those stated that they believed the church itself meant “everything” to their current success, and downplayed their own abilities in the church’s current success. The majority of those who responded in this way, or five (50%) believed that the church itself was a “pretty strong” component in the overall success.

Of the remaining respondents to this question, one believed it was only “somewhat significant,” and two believed it was a balance between their leadership and the church itself. One of these pastors articulated it very well:

I recognize that who (cites the former pastors to serve the church), there’s isn’t doubt that having strong leadership skills has played a large factor in achieving things, but I do think that the congregational culture and context has played a large factor in that. Now, I guess the way I look at it is it’s kind of a shaping influence in both directions, that I don’t think it’s all culture or context, it’s not all leadership, it’s how they work together, and feeling like we as a church have been able to maximize that. I think my gifts have helped to push the congregation in ways that have shaped them as a church, but I also think too, that who they are as community has also shaped me and what I can do in the context of that. (D. Nakano, personal communication, August 5, 2010)

Among the church factors that these pastors believe has made the biggest difference in the success of the church are:

- Clergy and lay leadership (mentioned by 6 pastors).
- History of the church (mentioned by 5 pastors).
- Appointment of clergy history of the church (mentioned by 4 pastors).
- Culture of the church (mentioned by 4 pastors).
- Location and demographics of the church (mentioned by 3 pastors).

On this last factor mentioned, much of the current church growth literature emphasizes the geographic location of the church in relationship to the demographic of the church itself. In other words, does the surrounding neighborhood of the church reflect itself in the actual membership? Too many of our United Methodist churches have a discontinuity between the immediate neighborhood and who is currently attending the church. In this regard, with our North American value of independence and ease of individual travel, people can commute into a church without living in the immediate surrounding neighborhood. This is especially true in California, where ethnic enclaves have moved into a neighborhood, yet the church consists of the original members who mostly have moved to other areas. This phenomenon has set up some interesting cross-racial dynamics, as for example in the Watts area of Southern California, a Latino-American population now surrounds a historic African-American Church. The irony of this is that 40 years ago, the church was predominately Hispanic, but as the neighborhood changed to an African-American population, the Hispanic congregation gave the church to an African-American group, only to have the switch in the surrounding community be

made again in current times. This speaks volumes of how the changes in neighborhood demographics play a huge impact on the attractional church model.

It thus becomes increasingly important for churches to understand their surrounding mission field, and to identify their demographic “niche” in order to outreach and attract that particular demographic. As one pastor talks about how the church he is serving has done this successfully:

Another thing is we’re the only alternative down here to the mega-evangelical churches. (Neighborhood pastor’s name), on top of the polls, New York Times on this gay issue—he’s conservative around the corner, and Shadow Mountains, which is 6,000 Southern Baptists, and Sunrise, and another one, Journey and the Rock: I mean these are all 3-6,000 members and they’re all personal salvation, Charismatic, Pentecostal. So, we’re the small church here; we’re 1,300 members, and yet we can do everything. So, it’s an interesting demographic that you either have to go to one of these big conservative churches, or a little mom and pop shop, or us. So, demographically, we become the alternative for a lot of people, and I think that works for us in terms of: it’s not just that we do well, but that place for us because we are known as the alternative out here. I mean I don’t have to do much to be considered the liberal church, you know. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

Finally, one striking element from these high effective pastors is their clear understanding of good and bad leadership, and how it has affected the church in the past. One pastor cited his immediate predecessor, and the fact that she provided the pastoral leadership that enabled the church to grow. In his own words:

What I would say is when (previous pastor's name) came here 1988, the church was stable and declining, and had been for most of the 8 years previous. The zip code was the same. But it was dying on the vine, and so, yes, there are resources that we have, that lots of places don't, and challenges that are faced here differently than place where people are struggling to eke out their existence, but I can show you a picture of the same church here 25 years ago when it looked like a disaster, so you know, I don't think socio-economics is destiny. One dear friend, active lay member here would compare this church with San Pedro, and said in 1988 when (previous pastor's name) came here, another minister went to San Pedro, and the churches were about at the same place, and today our average worship attendance is about 450, and San Pedro's is about 50. She believes that (previous pastor's name) tenure was decisive. (J. Chute, personal communication, August 10, 2010)

However, some of these pastors are equally clear about the effects of bad leadership on the church. From a systems standpoint, bad leadership can afflict the whole system, and if it is allowed to stay and work its way into the DNA of the culture, the church has a very difficult time recovering. As one pastor artfully analyzes bad leadership from a systems perspective:

Yeah, I think when you have poor leadership in a congregation, the good leadership, again, unhealthy—you're going to create an unhealthy system because the healthy people are going to leave, and the unhealthy people are going to stay, and it's real hard to turn that around. Toxic environments are real hard to clean up, and you can think about it, how long does it take to build a car, and you slam

it into a wall and a couple of seconds it is ruined. So, it's much easier to destroy something than it is to build it. It's hard to rebuild, because there are wounds that occur, scar tissue, memories...yeah. So, I think when you find it—there can be a mortal wound in a church I think that just kind of festers. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

Another pastor spoke about bad leadership in terms of both individual deficiencies and broader systems. One will notice from his reflection, that there is a distrust in the way we educate our pastors (the seminary), and also a critique of the attitudes of pastors who demonstrate bad leadership. This pastor also expresses a deep personal core value in the form of gratitude for the privilege to do ministry, and by implication, an example of bad leadership expressed in those who are not grateful, but complain about their ministry:

It's like we don't know what good leadership looks like so much so, we keep naming it wrong, and putting the wrong people in the wrong place, doing the wrong job, and so, bad leadership is people who forget that the main thing is the main thing. They forget what their role needs to be in the body of Christ. It's a hard thing to do because, in the case of this church for example, we cut down one of the Associate Pastors this year, we had 2 Associates, and we went with 1, and we didn't go to 1 because we cut our budget; our budget went up this year. It went up last year. The reason that we cut our Associate is that he had another appointment, and I didn't want an Associate because I had enough exposure now to see the shoe we send out of the ordination factory, and I don't want to buy those shoes. I'd rather grow my own, and so if it takes me 2 or 3 or 4 years to

grow someone in my congregation into the pastoral role, I would rather do that than buy a shoe I don't want. Because that's the sense of bad leadership—I know what bad leadership looks like. It looks like someone self absorbed with their own agenda; bad leadership looks like someone who has forgotten what the main thing is; bad leadership is every time I hear a pastor complain—that just drives me up a wall. Now, I understand complaining and what goes on in our churches is the reality, and it's hard being in leadership—I get that, but whenever we complain that's like us telling God, "I was better off before you got a hold of me." It's just like the Israelites wandering in the wilderness: "Moses, we were better off in Egypt than we were here," and complaining is an act of defiance to me, against the Grace of God. I should wake up everyday thankful that people actually pay me to do this job. To be honest, and that's how I feel, I still feel—I felt that way the first day I got my first paycheck, "I can actually get paid to do this?" Really? I still feel that way today. I'm amazed when I get paid money to do this. So, the complaining thing—when I'm sitting in a room and I hear a bunch of pastors complaining: "My people are this...this church is this...it's like well, okay...Unfortunately, I've drawn the box around them, I get it—It's about them, not about the Gospel. That's what I mean about the main thing: It's not about the Gospel; it's not about changing lives; it's not about impacting the world; it's not about redeeming people from the hell they live in everyday—it's about me. (C. Brown, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

From this quotation, one notices the deeply drawn theological distinction between good and bad leadership for this particular pastor. Good leadership is self sacrificing, and

stays with the “main thing” of the Christian faith: having compassion and care for others. Bad leadership is expressed in the opposite: A self-centered existence that cares only about oneself.

In summary of Question 6 which tried to ascertain the role that the church itself played in the ultimate success of these pastors:

- The majority of these high effective pastors acknowledge the critical role the church plays in their own ministry success.
- The deeper nuance to this question is probably best expressed in the dynamic relationship that the pastor’s individual leadership has with the dynamics of the church were one is appointed. In this regard, both factors are important, and they both serve to shape each other in a successful ministry.
- Some of the other factors mentioned in the effect the church has on the ultimate success of the ministry are: clergy and lay leadership, history of the church, including its past clergy leadership, the culture of the church, and the location and demographics where the church is physically placed.
- A clear delineation between good and bad leadership, and how it affects the church.

Question 7

Throughout the centuries, the Christian faith has been transmitted from generation to generation, and especially for ministers, there is a distinct place for role models and mentors. Question 7 was to elicit an identification of those role models and mentors for the high effective clergy, and also to probe what qualities these clergy wanted to emulate in their own ministry. The question was posed: *Who are your role models or mentors in*

ministry? What qualities do they have that you wish to emulate or make a part of your own ministry?

All 10 of these high effective pastors (100%) acknowledge that they have or had role models and mentors throughout their lives that have affected their ministry and identity as clergy. The breadth of time span that these mentors and role models have been a factor in the lives of these clergy is very long. In other words, some of these pastors mention role models and mentors from the time of their formation and “calling” period, or fairly early in their lives. Others acknowledge the place of role models and mentors during their formal education periods in college and seminary. Still others report role models and mentors as they lived into the role of pastor. Finally, many of these pastors report current role models and mentors even as they themselves have mastered elements of the ministry to a high degree.

The effects of role models and mentors on their ministry clustered around some key principles. Six of the pastors (60%) reported how role models and mentors enabled them to discover things about themselves that they had never thought about or realized before. In this regard, mentors opened up the doorway of self-discovery and self-knowledge for these pastors. As one pastor puts this:

So many...(name of mentor): who was probably the only person initially who took my call to ministry seriously, and after I graduated from high school in El Central, I came to Los Altos Church in Long Beach and he was Associate Pastor Number 4 in charge of youth, and when I told him that I felt a call to ministry, he was just amazing. He said: “Oh that’s great! Well, then we need to have some different experiences,” so he got me involved in the vocational internship program

for 2 summers, and working with youth group at the church, and Urban Plunge, and Mission of the Church Store, and he just had me involved in all kinds of ways to sort of test myself. And because I could play guitar, and we had a bunch a youth groups at this giant, giant church. So, they'd bring all the youth groups together for music, and he said: "Oh, I'd like you to lead the music." And it really didn't go very well, and I was feeling badly about it, and he came up to me and he goes "Sharon: that was a great beginning...that's just great, now let me suggest that next week when you do this..." And I thought "Are you kidding—I'm never going to do this again in my life," and he didn't even pause, "Next week when you do this, Let me suggest that you keep a steady tempo when you do the song." He didn't even give me a chance to protest, or grovel to say how badly I felt, or I can't do this...Just moved it on. It was like he really believed in himself, believed in God, believed in me, threw me out there, but he was there with me. (S.

Rhodes-Wickett, personal communication, July 13, 2010)

Another example is how a mentor/role model effected the basic self identity of a pastor, and by learning from this mentor, shaped how he lives out his own ministry:

(Mentor's name) was certainly one, and the qualities that I think of with him was his down to earth character, his sense of humor—even wackiness, but also that he was very serious about things that really mattered. He was my Youth Pastor, but I also came to know him as a colleague and friend when we were both in parish ministry in years later. He did my Mother's Memorial service and shared the internment of my Father, and I spoke at his retirement, so it's been a continuing relationship. So, when I've talked about the number of clergy—United Methodist

clergy who came out of that youth group when (mentor's name) was our leader, people have said "Well, he must be really spiritual person." But, you know that's just not anything you would ever say about (mentor's name). It's not that he doesn't have spirituality, but you know, No, he's actually kind of sarcastic...easily riled, but if you meet him, you don't have the feeling that there's some other persona, sort of the pastoral mask that he's wearing—he's just him. That was very important to me, and remains important to me: that I don't try to be somebody else in Sunday worship or pastoral visitation than I am...I think what am I doing if I pretend to be somebody completely else in that setting—Am I really being authentic. Not that I go out of my way to offend people, or stick my finger in their eye, but that I knew and saw lived out in (mentor's name), and that continues. (J. Chute, personal communication, August 10, 2010)

Four of these pastors (40%) specifically report a role model or mentor having an affect on their call into ministry. One of these pastors talked about his college professors in religion, and then about role models when he entered ministry, and how their emphasis on youth in ministry has effected his own commitment to nurture and mentor young people:

There were a number of people who drew me to consider ministry...when I think God was calling me originally. But probably the most profoundly effective of those was a Professor I had at Redlands in Old Testament, (mentor's name), whose spirit, I would say, he talked about the Old Testament Prophets like they were good friends—he knew them so well, and I had read that Old Testament material, and he caused me to go back and read again for the spirit that was being

said, not just the words. And it opened my life. I think he's the one who opened me to the Holy Spirit, through the reading of the Prophets. And he began the process—I did camps with (mentors names), and they really refined my whole concern for young people, and presented the opportunity for young people to consider ministry. The way they functioned as the leaders of the Sr. High camp was really the testing waters for youth looking at Christian vocation. They never really said that, but in retrospect that was really what it was geared toward. They wanted the youth to have an authentic experience, and they always lead up to an opportunity to make that concrete. (J. Standiford, personal communication, July 12, 2010)

These formative experiences then had a profound effect on the priorities of his ministry. As this pastor responds to a follow up question on how his past mentors have influenced his current commitment to young people:

You bet. We have 3 college students and 2 high schoolers, and 2 more young adults... We have 7 people who are seriously considering going to seminary, or involved in seminary right now. (J. Standiford, personal communication, July 12, 2010)

The high effective pastors also reported other specific skills sets that their role models and mentors had passed onto them:

- Preaching and the ability to communicate well.
- The ability to inspire.
- Vision and especially the ability to enlist others in their vision.
- Leadership.

- Relational skills and Emotional Intelligence.

One might naturally think that role models and mentors of these high effective pastors would be confined to other clergy, but in two instances, pastors mentioned lay people as their mentors. One pastor boldly stated that of the 12 people he would list as shaping his life tremendously, all were lay people, and he could only think of one pastor who had much influence on him when he was already in ministry (C. Brown, personal communication, August 11, 2010).

Another pastor acknowledged clergy mentors, but then went onto mention young people in a very provocative way:

I often think of youth as my mentor, because they're the ones who think new.

People who have done it for a long time don't think as innovatively. So, I always look to the person who thinks they don't know something for an idea I can't think of as well as they can because they're thinking new, so they see it better than me.

So, I have to look to the people who are here for first time. The mentors to me are becoming the new persons, not the people with past wisdom—the past wisdom didn't work because the church is dying. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

This pastor goes on to reflect more deeply about learning from the young:

I had always thought about a theology of the adolescent church: You know, an adolescent is not done with their development. You know, the frontal lobe doesn't finish until around age 25, and my Masters in Marriage and Family Therapy was “Humor and Play in Psychotherapy to Assess the Inner Child,” and it was the study of “neotromist” traits of the human being, which is the ability to

continue to grow young. We are one of the only species, if not the only species—at the time I thought that—that we can learn until the day we die. Most species learn and develop behaviors as adult creatures and then live at that level. So, young people model this ability to think differently and new, and to me that was what Christ was doing. That people kept thinking in terms of the old law, and he said: “No, no, no, it’s not longer in this zone—it’s in this living being—it’s new. And to me, that’s what youth always are...and that’s what Christ did: Christ tried to get us to see ourselves in a new way...God in a new way...the law in a new way...the world in a new way, and young people who aren’t stuck in the old way, to me teach us who we should be as a church—to see it in a new way, so I have a theology of the adolescent: We need to be as a church, not 2,000 years old, but teenagers theologically, constantly the ability to grow deep in our knowledge and see things new, and they love new relationships. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

Finally, one female Senior Pastor reported the lack of women Senior Pastors leading large churches, so her role models for the large church she was asked to lead were absent (P. Farris, personal communication, February 19, 2010). This is an important observation, for in the recent past, those pastors who have been appointed at large churches have been predominately male.

To underscore this point, a quick check with one of the chief researchers of the United Methodist Church, pointed out that of the 730 local churches with an attendance of over 500 in worship, he could identify only 30 women as Senior or Lead Pastors out of the 730 (4%; J. Southwick, personal communication, January 31, 2011).

The above pastor's observation and the startling statistics point to the reality of sexism in the UMC ministry, and the fact that women pastors have the added burden of sexism in their leadership. Even though there was not a specific question addressing sexism in their ministry, 2 of the 3 women pastors interviewed mentioned sexism as a factor in their leadership. As one female pastor reports:

...Certainly I experienced it as a woman coming into the ministry, I certainly was marginalized...there was no question about that....I have no doubt that it has, whether I have perspective to know all of that because that's all I've got. I mean...I certain got hurt a lot...there was hurt: people said mean things. But both anti-female and kind of conservative points of view—both, hurt me and it wasn't always clear what was really operating. You know, the guy who was critical of me because I didn't preach like Jimmy Swaggart at Santa Clarity. Well, was it really that I wasn't preaching like Jimmy Swaggart, or was it really because I wasn't a male, or maybe both...I don't know. So I certainly experienced hurt, and in the moment it's sometimes hard to discern what's going on, and it's hard to keep perspective on is it about me or is it not about me. So I just needed to have other people to talk with and bounce ideas off of. But also I think it also has made me get toughed up too...so has being a DS. You know, I think it toughed me up, where if somebody needs to leave the church because I'm female, "God bless you." I didn't start off that way; in the beginning, it was devastating. (S. Rhodes-Wickett, personal communication, July 13, 2010)

It is clear in these interviews that the two women clergy have learned to deal with sexism, and to overcome it with their own leadership gifts and experience. Both of these

women (and the 3rd clergywoman interviewed) have made it to near the top of their denominational profession having served as District Superintendents, and now, large church Senior Pastors. In this regard, these women pastors have overcome any barriers of sexism, but acknowledge the pain and difficulty dealing with it in the United Methodist Church.

In summarizing this interview question of role models and mentors for high effective pastors:

- All of clergy interviewed report having key role models/mentors in their own ministry.
- Not all of these role models were other clergy, but in two instances, lay people and young people were mentioned as mentors.
- The effect of these role models/mentors clustered around these key principles:
 - Role models and mentors were helpful in the process of self-discovery and self-analysis.
 - Role models and mentors were impacting on the identity and current practices of high effective clergy.
 - Role models and mentors had an impact on the call and formation of these high effective clergy in their vocation.
 - Role models and mentors effected basic skill sets for these interviewed pastors such as preaching, visioning, inspiration, leadership and relational skills.
 - The lack of female Sr. Ministers as role models and mentors prompted the realization that women clergy face definite attitudes

of sexism in their work as pastors in the church. These high effective women clergy have learned to cope and deal with sexism, and ultimately to overcome its barriers, but the pain of dealing with sexism is real and harmful.

Question 8

Because coaching is so prominent in today's corporate and business environment, question 8 was asked to see if these high effective clergy were using coaches on a regular basis. Question 8 simply asked: *Have you used, or are now using coaches in your ministry. If you have used them, how important a factor have they been in the overall success of your ministry?*

In a very surprising response, all ten of the high effective pastors interviewed did not use official coaches whom they contracted or hired. This fact was unexpected given these highly professional and resource rich high effective clergy.

Four pastors used unofficial coaches, whom they did not pay for their services. Among this group of unofficial coaches were retired and active colleagues to whom the pastor had a personal relationship with, personal friends, and gifted people that they had worked with in their ministry or past history.

Three pastors reported consultants that the church had hired for specific ministry areas, and whom they consulted during the consultation, or after as an informal source. One pastor mentioned his Spiritual Director, as the closest thing to a coach, but the subject matter was confined to issues of personal spirituality, and not his general ministry. Three pastors reported that they thought it might be helpful for them to engage

a professional coach, and only one pastor did not feel it would help his ministry, or provide anything that he might have needed.

In summarizing question 8, this was the shortest interview section of the questions asked, and because no one engaged a formal coach, there was little deep reflection or discussion on coaching. Given the current climate of using coaches, this is a somewhat surprising fact.

In reflecting on possible reasons why there was little history of working with a coach by these pastors, one might suggest that the paradigm of coaching is still relatively new for the corporate world, and the religious community has not caught up yet. One might pair this with the fact that this is not a model that the religious community has developed in the past, and hence, the lack of a coaching paradigm in the church. These high effective pastors have also been successful, and there hasn't been the great need for them to seek out a coach to help them.

This last point underscores a very prominent coach who once remarked: "60% of clergy I cannot help with coaching; 30% I can help by improving their behavior and moving them to better results; and the last 10% are so good they don't need coaching, and they will get results without my help" (J. Griffith, personal communication, May 20, 2005).

Currently, there is much more emphasis in the United Methodist Church to engage and use coaches for clergy and churches. The Baltimore-Washington Annual Conference has strategically redeployed all of its District Superintendents and Executive staff to serve as coaches for their clergy, and systematically trained a cadre of pastors to

coach each other, so that every clergy person has the availability of working with a coach (Bishop John Schol, personal communication, June 28, 2008).

There are more and more clergy who are becoming certified coaches through the secular coaching systems, and a number of annual conference cabinets that are moving to this paradigm. Many cabinets are also seeing more and more requests by individual clergy and churches to engage a coach.

So, it would seem in the future, coaching may become an established paradigm for the United Methodist Church, and other mainline denominations. However, it is clear that these high effective clergy did not engage official coaches, and they have succeeded without the need for external coaching.

In summarizing question 8 on the use of coaches by high effective pastors:

- None of the high effective pastors interviewed used official coaches in their ministry.
- Some of the pastors used “unofficial, non-paid” coaches or consultants.
- In the future, coaching might become a popular and helpful resource for United Methodist clergy.

Question 9

As mentioned in the literature review, the topic of resiliency has become more and more important to understanding the practice of leadership, and as an important quality that enhances leadership. With this background, question 9 was asked: *How has the quality of “resiliency” affected your leadership? In other words, have you faced personal and professional setbacks that you have bounced back from and learned from in order to succeed? Can you describe these setbacks?*

Overall, in answering this question, seven of these high effective pastors (70%), responded that they felt that resiliency is a very important factor in their church leadership and history. The three other respondents implied that this was true in their response, but did not speak about it directly, so by implication all 10 (100%), felt that resiliency is a factor in their personal ministry.

In speaking about specific setbacks, four of the pastors reported a crisis at the church where they were serving, two reported personal issues, and two reported a crisis in their personal careers, one of which was dealing with sexism. Only one pastor admitted that he did not have any big ministerial setbacks, but of course, faced difficult life transitions.

In responding on how they coped with crises, and where their resiliency ultimately came from, seven, or 70% reported God, prayer, or spiritual depth as the source of their resiliency. As an example, one pastor put it this way:

When I've been faced with a really big problem, prayer is so important, and to me, prayer really is about opening yourself up and being willing to hear what God has to say, which to me is the ultimate resiliency. I would not be the person I am today if I didn't have those experiences, and didn't make the choice of how to deal with those experiences. I think for some people, those experiences are about—they have to prove they're right and it becomes kind of about defining the ego strength kind of thing, and for me, I do like to be right, but it's almost a game being right. It's not a real—deep inside I feel a confidence that comes from being a child of God, but never leaves me, and so whenever I do go on those big crisis times, it might be that confidence that allows me to really open myself up and

listen to where God is leading me. (C. Coots, personal communication, August 5, 2010)

Another pastor talked about how faith provides the inner resources to deal with setbacks:

Well, yeah, when you fail and then you suffer, you learn a lot of stuff about yourself. When you live through that, and your faith actually helped you, you're much more credible when you preach because you preach from your faith. My sons have told me interesting things: Like my son (name), you know, (name: his wife) is wonderful person—we love her, but she didn't grow up in the church, even though she has an uncle who is a pastor, and he said, "One of the things she doesn't have is as much hope in the future. When things go bad for her, she really feels despairing," and he said, "I've realized my faith is what always helps me believe that we will get through this, because I always have this belief in the future"—this trust that's part of my faith, and when you lose a brother to cancer, and many other things, and you have to have it. Not preach your faith, but it has to be there for you. You have to find out that's there something really to hold onto. There's an intangible knowledge that lives in you, so when you sit with someone who has lost a brother, you can be a witness to them. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

Eight of the pastors interviewed (80%), had personal stories of specific setbacks, what they learned from such setbacks, and how resiliency has helped them become stronger in the process. As to be expected, there was not a uniform conclusion as to the

content of what they learned, but there were some profound insights as to what setbacks have taught them.

One pastor talked about what he learned about resiliency in the form of stepping back and finding different ways to move ahead. Rather than fighting a blockage or resistance, he learned how to look for alternative routes through the problem. In his own words:

The only thing I will say about resiliency has been the issue of clergy burnout, that I think one of the things that I've modeled out of that burnout period was the need for renewal, and so I say "renewal" in the larger sense, because I haven't even been thinking about it in terms of organizational leadership. I guess I've come to feel that I have to be willing to step back from things to be able to see it from a different place—to get people to help me to see it a different way, and sometimes to step away from it completely, and that's helped me to be resilient. So I feel like coming out of my renewal leave I was more able to deal with the day to day struggles of what I was doing because I had a whole different perspective on myself and what I was doing. So, I think some of that is there too: Resiliency comes from just a constant need to be renewing within myself, and know that I'm able to go back passionately to something when I can step away from it. So, I think that anything I've learned during that burnout period was I would just sometimes press so hard...so hard...so hard: that I would get people who would start to resist just to resist. But I kind of learned this ability to back up, and to either take a different route, or to release the pressure a little bit, so I could step into in a new way and get people to embrace it in a different way. So

the Spiritual Director that I go to, he wrote these books and one of the things that he said was: there are lots of ways to do things...he used this example of cutting chicken—you know if you want to cut the chicken and try to cut through the bone, you're always going to hit resistance, but if you find the space between the bone and cut there, that you're always going to find it easier. So, his thing was stepping back and finding a way to find the space, and then move into that space and find you all have a greater ability to move through things. Maybe that's been more of it, resiliency, I guess the way you're describing it sometimes feels like to me: My way of doing things was just to continue to chop at the bone in the same place until I could get through, and maybe my way of being resilient has been to be able to step back and find the space and then move into it in a different way.

(D. Nakano, personal communication, August 5, 2010)

Another pastor had a husband who was tragically diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease at a fairly young age, and had to care for him through the debilitating process of the disease while continuing her ministry. He died only the year before this interview took place. Powerfully, she explains how her faith changed in light of this experience:

I don't know the resiliency—sort of like the energy, where does it come from—it's there, a kind of persistence. And of course, obviously (her spouse's) diagnosis was another time of ...you know...feeling like splat up against the wall, and sliding down, and awhile feeling kind of panicky about the future, and what's this going to mean and are we going to be financially bankrupt, and what are we going to do, and so I kind of finally went, we can't do this...can't live like this, and I just kind of said to God: “you have been with me through it all, and I know

that's not going to change, so here we are." And I tell people this sometimes—talking about faith—because I hated the word “surrender;” people talking about surrendering your will to God, it's like “no way, not me!” I remember being in church as a college student and that song about something about “quell the rebel's sign...” I refused to sing that line: It's like “I'm a rebel and I'm not going to give up my rebel's sign,” so I had to learn something new about surrender with (her spouse's) disease, because I couldn't do a thing about it—completely powerless—So, that sense of “I surrender to this” has also been good, and I think I feel less personally associated with decisions that church makes too, so if they make a decision I think is stupid, well okay, okay, we'll learn something from it—its not going to kill us—we're not going to die, so let's get over it. So we lost \$5000 on a family, okay, guess what somebody died and the family gave \$5000 for refugee ministry because their parents loved it so much, it got replaced. I'm not saying that's how God works, but I'm just saying ministry happens—it happens and it comes, and so...I'm still a fighter...I mean I realize that it doesn't change anything, but I think it caused me to have more recognition of what I can and what I can't do, and to be at peace with what I can't do, and to trust God in that.

(S. Rhodes-Wickett, personal communication, July 13, 2010)

Even in this short paragraph, one can see the depth of maturity that she went through. From a fighting spirit that realizes there are some things in life that one cannot change or impact, and the growth of maturity that is at peace with that reality. In her resiliency and faith is developed a basic trust in God.

In summarizing how the quality of resiliency has effected these high effective pastor's leadership:

- By implication, all of the clergy interviewed believe that resiliency is an important factor in their leadership and past experiences.
- In responding how they coped with crises, overall, they responded that faith, prayer and spiritual disciples and practices were the source of their resiliency.
- There were many stories of personal and professional setbacks, and the majority of these pastors were able to learn and glean a deeper insight or truth from having experienced them. There were profound insights and depth to these learning's.

Question 10

Because the United Methodist Church is struggling with dwindling membership, finances and influence, a great deal of pressure is being put on the clergy serving local churches to be more growth producing, or “entrepreneurial” in business language. The religious community has yet to find a substitute word that nuances the intent of a growth producing definition while still maintaining the integrity of our faith and history. Some have substituted the word, “apostolic,” but the word carries a long history of theological and ecclesiastical meaning, while missing the attempt to be more growth producing. Question 10 uses the standard word “entrepreneurial,” but as was learned in the pilot interview, a workable definition would help in the interpretation of the question. The intent of the question was to see if these high effective pastors possessed an entrepreneurial mindset and attitude that made them successful in their ministry. Since all of the pastors interviewed had a demonstrated history of growing churches in number,

the question was interested in finding out if entrepreneurialism was somewhat behind this fact. The question was stated to these pastors: *“If ‘entrepreneurial’ was described as ‘immediately seizing on opportunities that present themselves to you in your ministry, and avoiding hazards that would set your ministry back:’ do you consider yourself an ‘entrepreneurial’ type of person? How important has entrepreneurial practices led to the success of your own ministry?”*

Although the word “entrepreneur” was defined in the actual question, as to reflect it’s applicability to the church setting, the business world has its own parameters for the word. The classical definition provided by Economist, Joseph Schumpeter (1883-1950), started with the fact that “entrepreneurs are not necessarily motivated by profit but regard it as a standard for measuring achievement or success” (“Entrepreneur”, n.d., p. 1). The qualities that Schumpeter attached to entrepreneurs: (a) greatly value self-reliance, (b) strive for distinction through excellence, (c) are highly optimistic (otherwise nothing would be undertaken), and d) always favor challenges of medium risk (neither too easy, nor ruinous; “Entrepreneur”, n.d.).

In both the interview definition of an entrepreneur, and Schumpeter’s classical definition, 6 of the high effective pastors (60%), fit both definition’s criteria. The remaining four of those interviewed (40%) self acknowledged themselves as “somewhat entrepreneurial,” but had clear tendencies toward both the interview definition and Schumpeter’s.

As one pastor describes how one “immediately seizes on an opportunity:”

Yeah, I’ve done a fair amount of that: I remember one thing that was really exciting, when I was at Tempe First, we had a grade school Principal who came to

me one day and he was commenting on how lonely his position was, and I said, “You know, pastors often complaint about that same thing,” and I said “What if we got a number of pastors and principals together and we just looked at our communities and shared ideas back and forth, not with any purpose of proselytizing or anything like that, but I said, “These are two positions of influence in the community where you can be pretty lonely, and maybe we have something to share.” We had a number of churches that were surrounding ASU, the University that were already together, and there were a number of public schools around the University, and so we just gathered those, and we called it “Tempe Preachers and Principals,” and it was a fun time. We never met in the church, we always met in the school, and had school lunch—met for lunch. The principals got to tell us about what they were doing, and we would listen and reflect on that, and it was really a time of growth for all of us. And all of us, because of the strong influence of the university, all of us had educators in our congregation, and it really strengthened those relationships. (J. Standiford, personal communication, July 12, 2010)

What are noticeable from this example are Schumpeter’s criteria of “striving for distinction through excellence.” Obviously, this is a pastor who values excellence in thought and profession.

Another pastor talks directly about his constant need to strive for excellence, and underscores the distinction with non-entrepreneurial pastors:

I think where it’s getting more and more difficult is the farther away a get from the product itself, the more I’m having to manage those who manage the product,

and I think that's been a little bit harder for me, because I tend to be a little bit more uncompromising about things, and I think the people that I work with have...one of lines that I'm really horrible about is when the people say, "Well, that's good enough." (laughs)... "Well, this is the newsletter, but it's good." And I say, "No." I can't count that, for me we have to be willing to do everything we can to make it excellent, and if that means that we have to work longer hours, or do it again... One of the things that I am notorious about in this church is for throwing things away and making people redo them (laughs)... It's bad because I know that people say, "It's a waste of resources..." So, we just did a golf tournament flyer and there were all those typos in it—and it probably was my fault for not catching that, but recognizing that I just couldn't let it go out that way—it just felt wrong to let it go out that way. So, we redid the whole thing, and people are laughing at me and looking at me, and saying "What's wrong with him? Wasting resources..." But I just knew that we couldn't let it go out that way. And so, that is more of my entrepreneurial spirit. (D. Nakano, personal communication, August 5, 2010)

The flip side of the interview's definition of entrepreneur as "avoiding hazards," is exemplified in another pastor's reflection about herself:

I absolutely do see myself as entrepreneurial; In the DISC Profile, I come out, the word is "entrepreneurial." I'm defined as an "entrepreneurial leader." I know I'm good on seizing on opportunities, but I'm also really good at avoiding hazards, and that's the thing where...when I went into ministry, that ability to avoiding hazards was either genetic in me, or it was groomed in me by my

parents—that I do have a natural—it is part of my daily living, just to size situations up and to avoid those really big hazards, but I also, and so intuition is a part of that too, it's not about a fear based avoiding hazards, because I'm also looking for opportunities and seeing the next thing to go. And I think those things have been huge in the success of my ministry, before I named it as such, I think it was huge in my ministry, but also, now that I've named it for it myself I'm more aware of it, I think it will continue to be. (C. Coots, personal communication, August 5, 2010).

This pastor goes on to describe specific examples of how she seized on opportunities and avoided hazards in her ministry. From her perspective, these demonstrated entrepreneurial practices.

From her quotation above, this pastor also brings up whether this entrepreneurial spirit is innate or developed, and she confesses that she is not sure where it comes from, but confident that she does have it. Another pastor clearly sees his entrepreneurialism from a development standpoint, and sees it coming from his family of origin:

I think its part of my family systems. I definitely—we were always—my parents were both creative, my mother was very creative: she could make something out of anything. “Let’s do this this time...Oh, I thought I’d do this...Well, I changed this...” So, I grew up in an environment of change, of getting outside yourself, and engaging, and open to new people coming in: we always had a college student living with us, or an exchange student, or going off into mission. We were an open system, so that means always looking for something new and

allowing something new to come in... Yeah, so I think it was developmental. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

One high effective pastor demonstrated almost all of Schumpeter's criteria of entrepreneurialism in his description of himself. Notice especially the emphasis on self-reliance, optimism and taking risks:

I've been here 5 years, we've revitalized and restored this congregation to the congregation it needs to be for this size facility, so we need either to build something or I need to start another campus, you see, I'm already... Most pastors who are going to do a long haul pastorate, they get to 5 years, and they say "Well, I'm finally settled in," for me it's like 5 years, geez, what the hell's next? What's the next thing that we've got to do right now. I'm on that. If those things don't materialize, I will be a (another pastor's name): I will start creating problems, so that I got something to sink my teeth into and solve, and the problem I want someone to give me is the problem where they say to me: "You can't fix it—it's impossible—there's nothing you can do." I mean, when I came here, the appointment was offered, and I called other people around this church, and they said "That church is impossible... That church is impossible," and every time I had that phone call, I'd just be licking my chops—that would excite me about being here... Tell me it can't be done (laughs). Nothing gets me more excited than that. (C. Brown, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

This same pastor reflects Schumpeter's criteria of "always favor challenges of medium risk, neither too easy, nor ruinous," ("Entrepreneur", n.d., p. 1) almost to the letter. As he talks about what he learned from an interview with Jack Welch:

Just this last week I got back from the Willow Creek Leadership Summit; I go every year, and there was an interview that Bill Hybels did with Jack Welch, and Welch talked about entrepreneurial enterprise and risk—part of that conversation, and what Welch had to say is “you are always willing to risk, but you never risk the whole.” That’s how I see it: You risk; It’s not a gamble, but risk: You risk, but you never risk anything that jeopardizes the whole; that would set back the whole. It might set back that effort, but never set back the whole, so that’s how I describe drawing the line between how much risk exposure I would want to have any new or entrepreneurial venture. We need to reach 20-somethings in the community, so we’re going to make this investment, but I would never invest to the point of wounding the whole to do that. (C. Brown, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

Two additional pastors interviewed reported their ability to take measured risks, and it reinforces this notion of the relationship between entrepreneurialism and risk taking. This discussion is magnified in light of the church’s overall tendency to be risk averse.

In terms of coding this question, three pastors had trouble with the word “entrepreneurial,” and it was somewhat similar to the difficulty some had with the word “success” in the first question. They basically saw this word as “of the world,” and saw their ministry conforming to a different standard. As one pastor reflected on this:

It is a word of the world, and it usually means money, but I am an opportunist, yes. I mean, I’m always looking for an opportunity to connect with someone.

Like I said at the beginning, if I hear, if there is a buzz around, energy around an

idea, I'm going to jump on that. If I meet somebody that looks like they've got some good spirit energy, I want to talk to them, and I want to get to know them, and get them included. If I see a new drummer...The next person whose talking about call to ministry, you need to be in liturgy...you need to be part of this leadership design team. I mean, entrepreneurialism to me is that always looking for the bud that is just opening, and helping it open, and that can be in terms of business. One of things that I thought about was these cell towers—boy that was not a good idea, I didn't do that, and that was good, we avoided that pit-fall, but it was an entrepreneurial thing to many people—we can get money! That is not always the best way to go—these little things; it's almost pimping yourself, you know...you've got to get it another way. So entrepreneurial: we started a third service—we're doing a third service, that's crazy, but we had to stretch out to grow. The church maxed—we have a 550 seat sanctuary, and 2 services with our parking and the turn around. You get 250 in each service, it's never going to go much beyond 500-550, until we started a 3rd service, and now we have 565-575 out of that. You just have to start that next franchise. You have to do something—what's next. And you're either going to go forward or backward, because you can't stand still. I often wonder when will the wave crest...Have I maxed out?...you don't want to overdo. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

One final insight on this question of entrepreneurialism is the familiarity that many of these high effective pastors have with business and organizational concepts. As mentioned previously, three of them had difficulty with the word because of its business

connotation, but 6 of the pastors (60%) used a standard business or organizational concept that they would not have learned in seminary. Thus, there is a level of well-rounded sophistication that these high effective pastors bring to their work and ministry. Notice how one pastor frames his self-understanding around some basic business or corporate practices:

As I think about entrepreneurial: having vision and a goal orientation, bringing resources together for production, overseeing means of production, and demanding quality of product—those are all things I think I do well. The piece that...I was reading this book and it said: “Sometimes entrepreneurs make bad CEO’s,” and that is really where I’m challenged now is that my role as an entrepreneur was to get myself in the middle of the mess, and see how I can bring resources together, and oversee the production of it and the product itself, and then help it to really achieve what we’re trying to do. I can do that—I feel like I’m really good at that. Where I think I get stuck now is CEOs have to learn how to step back and give other people that vision and then allow those people to carry it out—that’s been the real challenge of moving both into the Board of Ordained Ministry role and also the Sr. Pastor role. (D. Nakano, personal communication, August 5, 2010)

In summarizing the interview responses to question 10, of these high effective pastor’s self evaluation of their entrepreneurial practices:

- Six of the 10 clearly identify themselves as “entrepreneurial,” and an additional 4 self acknowledge that they are “somewhat entrepreneurial,” but

clearly have examples where they demonstrated entrepreneurial practices, so it is safe to state that these high effective pastors are entrepreneurial.

- As a group, they could give specific examples of:
 - Immediately seizing on opportunities and avoiding hazards,
 - Valuing self-reliance,
 - Striving for distinction through excellence,
 - Are highly optimistic,
 - Always favor challenges of medium risk (neither too easy, nor ruinous).
- Overall, these high effective pastors have a well-rounded sense of theological integrity as well as business and organizational knowledge and sophistication. Many of these pastors are well read and can put into practice organizational development concepts in the local church settings.

Question 11

The final question was designed to wrap up the interview process, and to elicit any thoughts about leadership that the interviewees wished to share that were not covered in the standard questions. Thus, the final question was posed: *“Is there anything that I did not ask you about from a theoretical or practical framework that has a bearing on your leadership in the local church?”*

In coding this final question, the overwhelming response was spiritual in nature. Seven of the high effective pastors (70%) specifically point to God, Jesus Christ, or the Holy Spirit as deeply impacting their leadership and ministry. In some cases, it was as if the leadership question had boxed them into a more secular business response, and this

final question opened the door to talk about the main foundation and substance of their leadership: their deep personal faith in a Triune God.

In categorizing how their faith shapes their leadership in ministry, a number of specific themes emerged. One prominent theme was that of humility, but it was not humility for humility's sake. Rather, it is humility in service of a higher calling and higher source of authority. As one pastor put it:

Because I'm not the leader—the Holy Spirit is the leader, and that's what makes this different from any other enterprise. If I'm a CEO of a corporation, I'm the leader, and I have no one to follow other than mentors, trainers, friends—that's who informs that leader. For me, as the leader in this church, the Holy Spirit's is the leader. My job is to attenuate the church to that leadership; I'm very, very, very Pentecostal in spirit—I believe that the Holy Spirit is still leading the church powerfully and dynamically, and the church's success hinges on that, following that leadership, because if you're following the leadership of the Holy Spirit for your congregation, you will enjoy the success of the Holy Spirit. Now, success of the Holy Spirit may not look like material success or cultural success, or any of those things...But that's who the leader is, and that's what makes this enterprise different from any other enterprise, and that's what makes it better, is because sometimes following the Holy Spirit's leadership, I'm being led by the Divine. The CEO of Amazon isn't. He makes a ton of money, and he has a great business, but believe it or not, I buy just about everything on the planet from Costco or Amazon, okay. But at the end of the day, Jeff Bezos sells stuff, right? And at the end of the day, I'm selling salvation. That's what makes it different,

so the spiritual life of the leader is everything. Any pastor who is not spending time in prayer, everyday, journaling everyday, spending reflective time, everyday—not going to do it...Not going to happen. So, some of those values were instilled in me through the Evangelical background that I have, in terms of, you know I went to college at Biola, a fundamentalist Christian school, which in practical terms, in practical theology, I couldn't be more opposite, but in terms of pietistic terms, I couldn't be more like, because of the emphasis on personal piety and spirituality, because of the emphasis on the time spent in prayer, reflection everyday—that is just pounded in the evangelical world—pounded, and I get that. So, I have a very, very progressive application of my faith, but a very, very evangelical practice of personal piety and holiness. So, for me that's everything. I'm glad you asked about that because for me, I can't imagine doing what I do without that—because again, I'm not the leader—the Holy Spirit's the leader, and I tell people in the congregation we're in a quest to follow the Holy Spirit. You're not following me—I'm just a poser; I'm just one of you, along with the journey. We're all in pursuit of the Holy Spirit, and our degree of success as a congregation will be completely dependent upon how well we listen to the Holy Spirit, and how well we follow. That's it, and for me that's what it's all about. (C. Brown, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

Another pastor posed the issue of humility in light of her internal struggle to be more prophetic while maintaining her authenticity to who she is and how her faith is expressed. In her words:

Just to come back full circle, to me it is paradox around leadership and humility, and I think humility is essential in leadership lest we become ... On the other hand, I don't know if it is a gender thing, or a personality thing, but I think that sometimes I'm too reticent to claim the role and the potential, so I'm almost thinking in public settings as much as church setting, because I've thought a lot of the role of the church in the larger society—how ministers are viewed—how the church is viewed, and I've so bent over backwards not to be the obnoxious Christian, and to be sensitive to others...that I think that I have abdicated a voice that I could bring...that people look to me for. So how to do that with humility, but also with authenticity and with strength that is not overbearing and negative, but is solid and clear. I think our world needs that of us at this time...that is what I have been pondering a lot lately. (P. Farris, personal communication, February 19, 2010).

An equally compelling theme that emerged was how foundational faith is for these high effective pastors in terms of their lifestyle, leadership, and ministry. For many of them, it is the core of all their values, and the very reason that they are in ministry in the first place. As one pastor reported:

Maybe, getting a bit theological at the moment, I think recognizing the presence of the Holy Spirit, especially in times of difficulty, and I confess that I'm not merely as spiritual as I could be, but when push comes to shove, opening myself to the Spirit's direction and trusting that God has called me, and God will give me the guidance. I just need to listen a little harder—listen to other voices—You

know, God uses those people around us so often to speak to us. (J. Standiford, personal communication, July 12, 2010)

Another pastor gives the example of what the bottom line must be for the church:

It is not growth per se, but faithfulness that is the aim. As he remarks:

And we're sure that God is inviting us to exponential growth, why? Or, in what?

I mean what growth is he (person who made a growth statement) talking about?

I'm not anti-growth, but I feel as though when people put the growth as a goal, they actually have it backwards, so maybe there is that one more thing to say: It's in the Gospel, something about "those who would save their life, must first lose it... Those who would lose their life for my sake and the Gospel, will save it." If our goal is, to prop up our churches and keep our conference alive, we're doomed.

If our goal is to meet and serve people in the name of the Christ; to help them with their ordinary life in the grace of God, then if people find that encouraging and come on board in helping ways, that's wonderful. But if we make that the goal, then we have the whole thing upside down. It's like, we're invited to faithfulness and service and compassion. I'm not sure we're invited to exponential growth; that just seems odd to me. (J. Chute, personal communication, August 10, 2010)

Another theme that emerged was faith's relationship to resiliency. As one pastor describes it, "Some clergy are not able to appropriate the experience of hitting a wall." (C. Coots, personal communications, August 5, 2010). Instead of bouncing back and moving forward, they resort to defense mechanisms that keep them trapped. So the bottom line for her is keeping the faith the main thing. In her own words:

We did talk about it, but the thing about resiliency, and the thing about a maze and hitting a wall. I feel like too many of our clergy either aren't able or aren't willing to do that, and they want to construct for themselves a picture of who they are, and then they operate out of defending anything that happens...Like anything that shows them a different picture of who they are, they reject it, and it becomes a defensive mechanism, and it is ultimately unhelpful. To me, just in terms of how I see people operating, I think that's a really big one, and there might be a better word to use to define that, so it's not just about resiliency; it's maybe a little bit about ego-strength; maybe a little bit about laziness, but I see that as huge in church leadership, and maybe it's also about, do we do this for our success, or do we strive to be led by God, so it's not really about whether we're successful or not; it's whether we're engaging in the mission of the church. (C. Coots, personal communication, August 5, 2010).

To highlight one final theme: there must be a balance between developing leadership skills and the faith component that motivates one to use such skills. One high effective pastor describes how he started by trying to train his leaders with secular skill sets on how to lead, but that these acquired skills sets did not bear much fruit. He cites the example of one of his parishioners, whom he can put in any leadership position at the church, and he will excel, not because he's so skilled in various positions, but because he is so driven by his passion for the church and his faith, that he will learn whatever he needs to in order to make the organization more fruitful. So this pastor has come to realize that there must be balance between faith development and leadership

development. One will notice also his reference to resiliency in light of this discussion.

In his own words:

And so then, what I recognized, is if I'm going to do leadership training what I need to do is to focus on skills, I think that's important, but I also have to focus on the content and passion of their faith, and get them to feel a sense that they have something to contribute. Then, they'll develop the skills that they need to be able to put that into practice. But I think when we put the skills before the faith what we get is people who have great skills, but who either don't have the passion to see them all the way through, or who don't know how they are impactful to the organization as a whole...And, I actually think that that's what sometimes makes passion wilt: going back to this resiliency question that you asked, is if there's anything makes me feel like I've been resilient, its because I know that I'm driven more than just my need to be the Sr. Pastor, or to get people to do what I want them to do; It's faith driven, so maybe the resiliency doesn't feel like it's that hard a thing and it's because it's driven more by my passion for the faith and the local church. And so if there's anything about as I was reflecting on these questions is knowing that in the Methodist church, we want to have skills that help our organization to be fruitful, but ultimately, if it is driven by our faith then we will do whatever we need to do to get there. But when we have skills without faith, or faith without skills what we find is that organization can't survive, so I think the thing that you push, that is really important is we have lots of people who have wonderful faith, but who don't have the skills that are going to help our organization called the United Methodist Church to move to the next level. So,

we have to stop ordaining some of these people who are wonderful faith people, who are pastoral and caring...I mean, I'm not saying we shouldn't ordain them because we have lots of churches that need that, but if we're really looking to advance our organization, we have to have people who have both that and skills to be able to move us to the next level. If we get skills alone with no faith then we'll just spin around in circles and we won't go anywhere. If we have faith without skills then we're going to have lots of pastors, but nobody who is going to be able to advance the organization, and that's not to say advancing the organization on it's own purposes, but for kingdom purposes, it feels to me that we have to have both of those to be able to make this work. I guess I worried sometimes that we focus on both ends, and fail to see that we need both, in the middle, that we have people who are wonderfully skilled in terms of organizational leadership as you're describing, but if that doesn't have faith underneath it, I think that's where passion and resiliency gets lost, because we are going to constantly meet roadblocks that are going to stop us, but if we have both passions for our faith and the skills, then every time we meet a roadblock, we just going to keep going. (D. Nakano, personal communication, August 5, 2010)

Again to emphasize a reoccurring theme, 3 of the pastors reported how important Emotional Intelligence is for their work. Because Emotional Intelligence involves a broad range of abilities and qualities, these pastors differ in what they emphasize as important in their ministry, but these high effective pastors exemplify all of the basic foundations of Emotional Intelligence. As one pastor talked about the need to be constantly self aware:

Well, I would borrow from my training in therapy: They expect every therapist to be in therapy. You don't say this is valuable for you, and not participate in it. I think we should be, and I've always had covenant groups where I've tried to be in right relationship, and that's supported me, and I have a lot of small groups here—I have different groups where we support each other, where we go through grief together and struggle, where we hold each other accountable. I think—this would be a high demand—I think every seminary student should be in therapy all during seminary. We should have pastoral care therapists—they can have Christian therapists, I don't care, but that self-discovery—that's not journaling, that's not meditation—that's somebody who is trained to say, "What just happened there?" "I'm feeling some resistance here—what's going on for you." Because they catch things that we don't feel—We drop into our reactive being—we don't notice that we're being that way. And then I have my staff person come out and say, "You're very intimidating, John." I'm like "What? I'm the baby of the family—My image is that I need to be tough because I'm not." They are all going: "you are that way," but I don't see myself that way at all, but she tells me, "Come out and have lunch with us so people don't feel like you're just working away and the Ogre." "Me?" So, we're not self aware—we need a context to constantly keep getting self-aware. (J. Farley, personal communication, August 11, 2010)

To compliment the emphasis on Emotional Intelligence, two of the pastors reported the need for life-long learning and growth. All of these pastors exemplify life-

long learning in their own ministry, but two specifically reported the need to be continually learning. Here is how one pastor expressed it:

I think one of the crisis that I didn't mention was with the Associate Pastor who left after 2 months: My openness and willingness to see a counselor, so in other words, I think that goes along with the coaching, but I think good leaders understand their limitations and willing to go for help. I mean before all of his trouble, Tiger Woods was a wonderful example of someone—you know: the world's number one golfer who still had a swing coach. You know...that kind of thing. The pastors that I have the most difficulty with are the ones who really think they know it all, and they are usually pretty mediocre, and I'm constantly wanting to learn more. The biggest reason why I went to do the Doctor of Ministry was I said, "Gee after 20 years, I have to learn a lot more things," and so that's the biggest reason why I did a Doctor of Ministry. So, I think the willingness to learn and be educated is also a major important factor. All the great leaders constantly want to learn more. (T. Choi, personal communication, July 11, 2010)

Notice how this pastor began his explanation with another Emotional Intelligence quality: to understand one's limitations and weaknesses, and being willing to seek out help and outside resources. When you couple this ability to understand oneself with a commitment to life-long learning, one can understand why these pastors are highly effective.

In summary of this last question, which was designed as a "catch-all," to cover anything important about their own leadership, we find that high effective pastors:

- A high percentage of these pastors wanted to emphasize their faith and spiritual grounding as to the reason for their success in ministry.
- A number of specific themes emerged as to how faith impacts their leadership in the ministry. These included:
 - Faith as the foundation of their core values and identity, i.e. their leadership flowed from the foundation of the Triune God as the source of their being.
 - A deep sense of humility in service of a higher calling and higher source of authority.
 - The relationship of their faith to resiliency, and the fact that when they do face set-backs and challenges, their faith and spirituality enables them to cope and bounce back with strength.
 - Finally, the theme of a healthy balance between faith and leadership skills and abilities is important to maintain. In this regard, faith fuels the passion of ministry, but it must be coupled with strong leadership skills in order to be effective in the church or any organization. Both are necessary if the church is to grow and thrive.
- The reoccurring theme of Emotional Intelligence was again emphasized by these high effective pastors in the form of constantly being self-aware, knowing both strengths and weaknesses, and a commitment to life-long learning.

Summary of the Qualitative Findings

In summary of the qualitative analysis of this research project, some key qualities and traits have emerged from the interviews of high effective pastors. First, the qualitative analysis confirms the results from the quantitative analysis, that there is a positive correlation between high effective pastors and Emotional Intelligence. Second, to give a counter to the second part of the quantitative analysis that was inconclusive, these high effective pastors demonstrated Transformational Leadership qualities. A number of key traits and qualities of high effective UMC clergy have been isolated and coded. A complete summary of these traits will be included in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

Research Conclusions and Recommendations

The BarOn Assessment of Emotional Intelligence

To summarize once again the four dimensions of comparing high effective and low effective UMC clergy. An analysis of variance was done on (a) the BarOn Assessment to compare the two groups on their Emotional Intelligence, (b) the Leadership Practices Inventory to compare the two groups on this test's definition of transformational leadership, (c) The size and vitality between the two group's local church appointment, and (d) The self-identification of the two groups as to a ranking of their leadership effectiveness and ministry effectiveness.

Overall, the BarOn Assessment was fairly clear that high effective UMC clergy have a significant correlation with higher emotional intelligence as compared to lower effective clergy. There was a significant difference between the two groups on the "Total Emotional Intelligence Quotient," and on 4 of the 5 general categories of the BarOn Assessment. There was also a significant difference between high effective and low effective UMC clergy on 9 of the sub-scales of the BarOn. There were five sub-scales that showed no correlation between the two groups, and a brief analysis of these five may give some explanation. The caveat for this researcher is the fact that these explanations are subjective projections, and do not carry research level conclusions.

The first sub-scale with no correlation is "empathy," which the BarOn Assessment, or EQI (2007) describes as "measuring an individual's ability to be aware, understand, and appreciate how other people feel" (p. 8). The fact that there is no significant difference between the two groups on this scale may have to do with the

tremendous emphasis in seminary training on empathy in the “Pastoral Care and Counseling” area of pastor’s course work. Empathy is a key concept in pastoral care and counseling, and one of the tangible concepts that can actually be practiced in the classroom. The classic line for many seminarians in their reflective listening practices is “is this what I hear you saying?” Clearly, it is the one skill set that can be worked on and improved, and is greatly emphasized in the pastoral care and counseling classes.

The second sub-scale with no correlation is “Social Responsibility,” which is defined by the BarOn Assessment (2007) as being “a cooperative and constructive member of your work group, and quite responsible and dependable” (p. 8). One might explain that there might be no significant difference between the two groups here due to the United Methodist Church polity on “vital connection,” or the fact that the UMC emphasizes mutual cooperation and relationship, especially among its clergy members.

One major category of the BarOn, “Stress Management” and a fourth sub-scale, “Impulse Control” showed no significant correlation. The BarOn Assessment (2007) describes this generically as having “a calm disposition, and are generally not impulsive” (p. 10). This particular general category and its sub-scale are unique to the BarOn, and not reflected for example in another major assessment, the “Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT).” Whereas these stress management indicators would prove helpful in professional relationships, it is not certain that they are essential to the core of Emotional Intelligence itself, and may represent a tangential aspect of EQ.

This may also be true of the final sub-scale of non-correlation, “Reality Testing.” This is described by the BarOn Assessment (2007), as “taking the proper steps to look past our emotional biases so that we can recognize situations for what they really are” (p.

11). Again, this sub-scale appears to be specific to the BarOn Assessment only, and does not appear on the “Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT).”

The Leadership Practices Inventory on Transformational Leadership

As reported earlier, the findings of the Leadership Practices Inventory between high effective and low effective UMC clergy is mixed and inconclusive. As highlighted in the literature review, Kouzes and Posner (2003) have five specific dimensions in which they define transformational leadership. Some of the limitations of the LPI have been discussed in Chapter 3, and the criticism of the test being “oversimplified” is duly noted.

When comparing high effective and low effective UMC clergy on the LPI, there was a significant correlation on only 2 of the 5 dimensions (Challenge the Process and Enable Others to Act). These two dimensions are very important qualities in light of this paper’s research. Kouzes and Posner (2003) describe some of the leadership qualities of “Challenge the Process” as:

- Leaders venture out: Those who lead others to greatness seek and accept challenge.
- Leaders are pioneers: They are willing to step out into the unknown. The work of leaders is change, and the status quo is unacceptable to them.
- Leaders are early supporters and adaptors of innovation: Leaders know well that innovation and challenge involve experimentation, risk and even failure. (p. 4)

As the qualitative interviews with high effective UMC pastors confirm, because the church is under great external and internal pressures of change, high effective pastors have the ability to find new ways to grow and keep the local churches where they serve

vital and alive. To remain in old paradigms of doing ministry means decline and ineffectiveness in ministry, and the high effective pastors studied do possess the ability to challenge the process in the form of creating new ways to do ministry in order to keep their personal and professional edge.

The second significant correlation between and high effective UMC clergy on the LPI is on the dimension of “Enable Others to Act.” Kouzes and Posner (2003) provide some key qualities of this dimension in the form of:

- Leaders know they cannot do it alone. Leadership is a team effort.
Leaders *Enable Others to Act* by fostering collaboration and strengthening others.
- Leaders help create a trusting climate. They understand that mutual respect is what sustains extraordinary efforts.
- The work of leaders is making people feel strong, capable, informed and connected. Exemplary leaders use their power in service of others: they enable others to act, not by hoarding the power they have, but by giving it away. (pp. 5-6)

Again, the qualitative research reinforces this key trait of empowering the laity so as to expand the ministry of the church itself. Again and again, in the in-depth interviews with high effective pastors, they emphasized that their role and task was to empower the laity to do the work of ministry by making them better disciples. It was not their job as pastors to do all the work of ministry for the church. Too many of our UMC pastors do not understand this key quality of Transformational Leadership, as they perform as the “Lone Ranger” centering ministry around their own activity and power. Common sense

tells us that one can only do so much individually and alone, whereas, to empower a whole congregation in the work of ministry, exponentially multiplies that ministry by the number factor of those involved. Of Kouzes and Posner's (2003) five dimensions on the LPI assessment, this one of "Enable Others to Act" seems to be the most important to the success of high effective UMC clergy.

On the other three dimensions of the LPI, there was no significant correlation when comparing high effective and low effective UMC clergy. These three included: "Model the Way, Inspire A Shared Vision, and Encourage the Heart." (Kouzes and Posner, 2003, p. 12)

All of these would seem to be important in Transformational Leadership, however these are very specific qualities and processes, and no conclusions can be drawn from the quantitative analysis of no significant correlation between the two groups studied. Since all of the numbers were higher for the high effective pastors as compared with the low effective pastors, increasing the sample size may have a positive effect on future results, but no significance means merely that: one cannot draw any conclusions from these findings, and the lack of a total LPI score leaves us with no conclusive and definitive results on this assessment.

Summary of the Qualitative Analysis

In summary of the qualitative analysis of this research project, some key qualities and traits have emerged from the interviews of high effective pastors. First, the qualitative analysis confirms the results from the quantitative analysis, that there is a positive correlation between high effective pastors and Emotional Intelligence. Time and

time again in the interviews of high effective pastors, there were behavioral examples and illustrations of Emotional Intelligence.

In terms of breaking down the four dimensions of emotional intelligence, these pastors demonstrated a strong sense of “Personal Competence,” starting with *self-awareness*. Overall, they were in touch with their emotions, and understood the effect they had on others, were able to talk about their own strengths and limits (accurate self-assessment), and had a sense of self-confidence, and self-worth.

As a group they were in touch with their own *self-management*. They demonstrated in their ministry: Emotional self-control, transparency, adaptability, achievement, initiative, and optimism. On the “Social Competence” side they possessed *social awareness* by demonstrating empathy, the ability to learn and work on their *organizational awareness*, and providing *service* to others.

Finally, they excelled in *relationship management* by providing *inspirational leadership, influence, development of others*, being a *change catalyst, building bonds*, providing *teamwork and collaboration*, and being able to do *conflict management*.

So in all respects, these were emotionally intelligent leaders, who demonstrated such skills and qualities on a regular basis in their day-to-day ministry.

Second, to give a counter to the second part of the quantitative analysis, which was inconclusive, these high effective pastors demonstrated Transformational Leadership qualities. On the key Transformational Leadership dimensions listed by Bass and Avolio (1994) and Northouse (2007), *Charisma, Inspirational motivation, Intellectual stimulation, and Individualized consideration*, these high effective pastors excelled and demonstrated these definitions in their ministry.

The most behavioral way that these high effective pastors demonstrated Transformational Leadership was in their priority of empowerment of the laity of their churches. One of the key paradigms mentioned was the ability to *see* the gifts in others, *name and cultivate* those gifts, and *unleash* these gifts and people into the ministry of the church and community.

Third, these high effective pastors possess a deep and grounding faith that does impact their leadership in a number of interlocking ways. Their faith starts with forming the core identity of whom they are and why they are in ministry in the first place. It is the central core of their own “core values,” and provides the necessary grounding for their ministry. Their faith also provides the grounding for some other key themes: vision, humility, resilience, and passion in ministry.

Fourth, these pastors have a passion for their work in ministry, and are engaged and focused in their work. Even for those who have been in ministry for decades, there is a sense of continued passion and engagement in what they are doing, and the overall feeling that they are making a difference in the world.

Fifth, there is a deep sense of humility that these quite successful clergy possess. In this regard, they exemplify Collins’ (2001) Level 5 Leadership, of “personal humility and professional will.” As Collins’ states: “Level 5 leaders channel their ego needs away from themselves and into the larger goal of building a great company. It’s not that Level 5 leaders have no ego or self-interest. Indeed, they are incredibly ambitious—but their ambition is first and foremost for the institution, not themselves” (p. 21).

Although Collins (2001) does not label his Level 5 leadership as “Transformational,” there is very little difference between how he describes this

leadership and the transformational Leadership qualities that other researchers cite. So, again there is a consistency on this issue of leadership with the transformational leadership qualities mentioned earlier. The difference in this research is the source of these high effective pastors' humility comes from their core faith that gives allegiance to a higher authority (the Triune God), and in service to a greater good.

Sixth, all of these high effective pastors have had significant mentors and role models that have shaped their faith formation, strengthened their leadership in ministry, and provided trusted counsel and advice in their ministry. Interesting enough, none of these pastors use official coaches in their ministry, nor seem to need them for their success.

Seventh, almost all of these high effective clergy demonstrate entrepreneurial behavior and traits. These pastors cite specific behavioral examples of entrepreneurial success as they talk about their ministry.

Eighth, all of these high effective clergy excel in communications, both oral and written. They represent some of the best preachers in their annual conference, and they are able to inspire, challenge and teach through the medium of preaching. They are also strong writers and again, they leverage their collaborative work with the congregation through their written communication skills.

Ninth, all of these pastors have had set-backs, both personal and professional, and they have demonstrated the quality of resiliency in being able to bounce back from such set-backs and learn from them. Again, their core faith is cited as the most important resource in dealing with set-backs, and their resiliency comes from belief in a higher source and power (the Triune God).

As a corollary to this quality of resiliency, there does exist a glass ceiling for women clergy in the church. All of the high effective women clergy interviewed cited examples of sexism in their ministry, and even though the women interviewed in this study have achieved a certain level of success, overall, men dominate the large church Sr. Minister positions in the United Methodist Church. It is a tribute to the women in this study that they have the resiliency to cope and bounce back from the effects of sexism.

Tenth, these high effective pastors do possess a personal vision, and their own vision does impact that larger vision that they have for the church. Many of them excel in vision casting and formation, another trait of Transformational Leaders.

Eleventh, the majority of these high effective pastors understand systems theory and the basics of organizational development. There is a remarkable sophistication that these pastors possess, not only in their formal theological and biblical training, but their study and reflection in corporate and business literature. Many of them are able to lead and teach basic organization and leadership development principles to their laity.

As a corollary to this leadership sophistication, and combining it with their deep faith roots and development, these high effective UMC clergy are able to combine these two qualities in a rather unique way. All of these highly successful UMC pastors possess both of these qualities, and it is the unique combination of both qualities that has led to their success. They exemplify this combination in their individual ministry, but also realize that to take the church to a higher level, both of these are needed in their staff and lay leaders. In other words, it is the reason for both individual and corporate success. Faith without leadership can lead to very pious and spiritual individuals who are not able to truly lead. Leadership without faith can provide efficiency in ministry, but without the

passion and motivation that leads to sustained and deep transformation. One without the other is incomplete and ineffective for the life of the church.

So, as exemplified in these high effective UMC clergy, both are equally important and needed. The same is true for a leader development model for the church: both faith development and leadership development are needed for a holistic and successful ministry.

A twelfth concept is the fact that the local church's situation and context does matter. The demographics of both the church and the surrounding community, the past history of the church, the strength or weakness of its past lay and clergy leadership, the amount of resources the church has, all add up to make a big difference in the present and future success or failure of the church. As Gladwell (2002) has pointed out, the social science research often proves that situation and context are more important than character and attributes when it comes to people's actual behavior.

The important leadership characteristic of these high effective UMC clergy studied is their ability to use Situational Leadership by practicing "Adaptive Leadership" (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz & Linksky, 2002; Williams, 2005; Heifetz, Grashow, & Linksky, 2009) in their ministry.

The perfect example would be Goldman's (2000) concept of using different leadership styles like a good golfer uses selected golf clubs for specific golf shots. These high effective UMC clergy are able to adapt and change their leadership styles to meet the specific situation and context in which they are dealing. Thus, the specific situation and context of the church where they are serving does make a difference, but these high effective pastors are able to adjust their leadership in order to meet the demands of those

situations, and find a way to lead and succeed through this adaption model. When you add an entrepreneurial mindset on top of this ability to adapt, these high effective clergy do find a way to succeed, even with difficult or changing contexts. Thus, whatever local church they are placed at, they will find a way to bring vitality and growth in that setting whereas others may not.

Overall Conclusions

The overall conclusion of the research findings of this paper is that there is a quantitative and qualitative difference between high effective and low effective United Methodist Church clergy on their Emotional Intelligence quotients.

In terms of transformational leadership style, the quantitative results are mixed and inconclusive. However, the qualitative research demonstrates that high effective clergy do possess a transformational leadership style on all of the major definitions from Bass and Avolio (1994) and Northouse (2007).

If one was to measure success on the size and scope of a clergyperson's church appointment, then it is clear that the high effective pastors have much larger churches that they are giving leadership to. Coupled with the quantitative measurement of sheer size, the complexity of the church's system also increases when compared to smaller churches.

In terms of self-analysis of their own personal leadership, high effective pastors rate themselves with a higher significant correlation as compared to lower effective pastors. As these clergy ranked themselves in terms of ministry effectiveness, high effective pastors also ranked themselves with a higher significant correlation as compared to low effective pastors.

It is clear from these statistics that high effective pastors are assigned to larger and more vital local churches as compared to lower effective pastors. It is also clear that high effective pastors see themselves as ranking higher in personal leadership and effectiveness in ministry as compared to their low effective colleagues.

Specific Research Concerns

One of the concerns of this research involves the poor response from low effective pastors to take part in the survey and assessments. From the research design, there was no indication that they were judged to be low effective, and any conclusions drawn that there was any judgment being placed on their effectiveness would have to be self-inferred. After two complete mailings, and follow up emails asking them to participate, the return rate was exceedingly low. There was also a self-addressed response form in which they were given the opportunity to decline to participate, but the return rate of that form was also low. In other words, the majority of low effective rated clergy simply did not bother to respond at all.

Since no definitive research conclusions can be drawn from this poor response without a careful follow up with specific participants, speculations are the only alternative. One might speculate that poor follow up could be an indication of ineffective leadership in general. This is only partially substantiated in one case, where the low effective participant emailed to say that he would be participating, and take the assessments within the week. Nothing was ever received from this participant, despite repeated emails to ask if the participant needed any more information. Communication simply ceased from this participant. One could only speculate why the participant

changed his mind, but to not receive any reason or indication that he had changed his mind is somewhat baffling.

Also in the research design was a guarantee that participation would have absolutely no effect on one's present or future job security, and the fact that this researcher had absolutely no supervisory relationship with the possible participants. Despite such assurances, speculation could turn to an overall suspicion that they are judged as lower effective clergy, and lead to an unwillingness to participate in any program or evaluation that would confirm such a judgment.

In reality, any speculation is only that: speculation, and a definitive answer is elusive without specific and sound research follow-up from the low effective clergy. Future research is definitely needed to explore the reasons for this low response.

Recommendations to the United Methodist Church

From the research findings of this paper, there are some key recommendations to be made to the United Methodist Church. These recommendations fall into some broad categories.

In terms of recruitment of ordained ministers, it would seem that Emotional Intelligence does play a major factor in the effectiveness of clergy leaders, and seeking out individuals who have a high EQ would seem the best recommendation.

This point naturally bleeds over to the area of assessment of candidates, as it would be absolutely essential that a standardized test of Emotional Intelligence be at the top of the testing of candidates. Currently, the national UMC Psychological Assessment testing does not include any EQ assessments.

Also in terms of nurture and development of candidates, Emotional Intelligence should be at the top of the list. There is any number of ways to improve one's EQ, and a study of the best techniques and processes should be a part of the denominations and seminaries' research and implementation. Since local districts and annual conferences Committees and Boards of Ordained Ministry are tasked with the nurture and development of candidates who are new in the ministry, it would seem imperative that these groups take seriously improving and strengthening candidate's Emotional Intelligence factors.

The United Methodist Church is also looking at ways to retool and retrain its clergy, as the society and the place of organized religion has changed so much in the last few decades. Here, the UMC needs to look into increasing the Emotional Intelligence of its clergy, and especially for those ineffective clergy who have a negative effect on their local churches. Hard statistics are not available as to why ineffective pastors are ineffective, and what they need to improve. Anecdotally, it would seem that many of the denomination's ineffective pastors lack the basics of Emotional Intelligence. In this regard, they are out of touch with their own self- understanding, and this bleeds over into their personal relationships. "Poor people skills" is often mentioned with ineffective clergy, and in a profession where one is constantly working with other people, and especially in empowering of other people as a sign of effectiveness in ministry, this proves to be a fatal flaw. Although there is no guarantee that increasing the Emotional Intelligence of ineffective clergy would lead to greater effectiveness, further study is important in this particular strategy, and will be mentioned in future research options.

Because of the denomination's need to provide leadership training for retooling purposes, there are leadership training courses being offered in annual conferences across the connection. There is no effort to coordinate this training in a comprehensive curriculum, and because the training is regionalized, the subject matter fluctuates tremendously. The effectiveness of leadership training would be greatly increased if there could be a coordinated effort across the denomination to bring together the trainers, and develop a national curriculum in leadership retooling. What this dissertation's research could provide is the importance of Emotional Intelligence, Transformational Leadership, and the 12 traits and qualities of high effective pastors.

Working with those who teach leadership in the seminaries would also be a natural extension of this dissertation's research. More and more of our Protestant seminaries are developing basic courses in leadership for those in the basic Master of Divinity ordination degree, and coordination and collaboration with the seminary professors who teach in this area would seem logical and helpful.

Finally, providing these research findings to the present UMC leadership seems to be imperative. Starting with the church's Bishops, District Superintendents, and then annual conference staff would provide the key leadership of the denomination with helpful findings and leverage points in leadership.

Future Research Options and Recommendations

This research study has opened many new questions that need to be examined in the future. As most research validates, for every question answered, a dozen more questions emerge. This study has proved to be no different in this regard.

To begin, since this study focused on high effective clergy, there was not a qualitative analysis done on low effective clergy. The research provides some insight into the traits and qualities of high effective pastors, but sheds little light on why low effective clergy are not effective. Two specific research options come quickly to mind in light of this study. One, a larger database of low effective clergy's assessment scores on emotional intelligence and transformational leadership styles would be helpful. Second, in-depth interviews of the same or additional questions asked of the high effective clergy to low effective clergy may shed insight as to reasons that hold them back from being more effective. Isolating specific reasons for ineffectiveness would be a counterpoint to this study's research of high effective clergy. A natural outcome of such a study of ineffective clergy could identify remedial alternatives to strengthening and improving their ministry skills. Performance coaching, therapeutic interventions, effective mentoring could all play a positive role in strengthening ineffective clergy, but further study is necessary to identify dysfunctions and corrective alternatives.

Another helpful research exploration would be to systematically examine the leader development models currently used by the church and nonprofit organizations. As a complex organization, the United Methodist Church is using leader development processes and systems all the time, but no critical examination of how effective or ineffective these systems are has ever been thoroughly researched. The one exception is seminary education, as there is a body of research that has examined critically the role and function of the seminary in the church's life. However, there are dozens of additional systems and processes (both formal and informal) that take place in the church's leader development function that effects both lay and clergy leadership. One

model might include an examination of the “inputs,” or the target audiences of the church’s leader development (children, youth, young adults, laity, church officers, clergy, etc.). Next, would be the formal programs and systems that attempt to train leaders in the church (bible studies, faith formation experiences, camping programs, mentoring programs, etc.). Such programs and systems should be evaluated as to the effectiveness of transforming the inputs into better leaders. Finally, the “outputs” in the form of the measured effectiveness of the leaders themselves should be explored and examined. In other words, is the church effectively producing the type of leaders that can sustain and continue the church into the future? Such a comprehensive and formal examination of the leader development systems and processes of the church would be extremely helpful to the general church.

Another research opportunity would be to specialize the study of United Methodist Church leaders. What makes for an effective Bishop, District Superintendent, and Lay Leader of a local congregation, church planter, seminary professor, or a whole host of other specialized leaders in the church? Numerous studies need to be conducted on other leaders of the church in order to increase the overall effectiveness of leadership in the United Methodist Church.

As mentioned earlier in the research, involving laity in the evaluation of clergy and their effectiveness would be a natural outgrowth of this study. In this regard, the conducting of 360 degree evaluations would provide a more comprehensive evaluation of both high effective and low effective clergy. The use of laity in future research on clergy would seem imperative in many ways.

Finally, a deeper analysis of sexism and racism in United Methodist Church leadership systems would seem imperative. If the statistics are true that there are very few women clergy as Sr. Ministers of the largest churches in the denomination, the question needs to be asked “why?” No hard data was also collected as to the number of ethnic clergy as Sr. Ministers of the largest churches in the UMC, and this would highlight the level of racism that exists in the upper echelon of leadership in the denomination.

References

- Anderson, J. A. (2005). Leadership, personality and effectiveness. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 35, 2006.
- Bar-On, R. (2007). *The Bar-On emotional quotient inventory*. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems, Inc
- Bass, B. M. (1985)c. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990a) . *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990b). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychology*, 52, 130-139T.
- Bass, B. M., and Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1982). A comparative analysis of situationalism and 9, 9 management by principle. *Organizational Dynamics*, Spring, 20-43.
- Blanchard, K., & Stoner, J. (2004). A vision thing: Without it you'll never be a world-class organization. *Leader to Leader*, 4, 21-28.
- The Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church (2004). Nashville, TN: The United Methodist Publishing House.

- Beugre, C. D., Acar, W., & Braun, W. (2006). Transformational leadership in organizations: An environment-induced model. *International Journal of Manpower* 27 (1), 52-62.
- Bowen, M. (1978). *Family Therapy in Clinical Practice*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson Inc.
- Bradberry, T., & Greaves, J. (2009). *Emotional intelligence 2.0*. San Diego, CA: TalentSmart.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper Torchbooks.
- Carr-Ruffino, N. (1997). *The Promotable Woman: 10 essential skills for the new millennium*. Pompton Plains, NJ: Career press.
- Catalyst (2009a). 2008 Catalyst Census of Women Corporate Officers and Top Earners of the FP500 reveals “a glass half-empty.” Retrieved from <http://www.catalystwomen.org>
- Catalyst (2009b). Catalyst 2008 Census of the Fortune 500 Reveals Women Gained Little Ground Advancing to Business Leadership Positions. Retrieved from <http://www.catalystwomen.org>
- Cherniss, C., & Goleman, D. (Eds.). (2001). *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups and organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chin, J. L. (2004). 2003 division 35 presidential address: Feminist leadership: feminist visions and diverse voices. *Psychology of Women's Quarterly*. 28, 1-8.
- Clark, M. C., Caffarella, R. S., & Ingram, P. B. (1999). Women in Leadership: Living with the Constraints of the Glass Ceiling. *Initiatives*, 59 (1), 65-76.

- Clinebell, H. (1966). *Basic types of pastoral counseling*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Cobb, J. (1995). *Grace and responsibility*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great*. New York, NY: Harper Business Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among the five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeShon, R. P. & Quinn, A. (2007). *Job analysis generalizability study for the position of United Methodist local Pastor: Focus group results* (Unpublished manuscript). University of Michigan, Michigan, IL.
- DuPree, M. (1992). *Leadership jazz*. New York, NY: A Dell Trade Paperback.
- Eagly, A. H. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129 (4), 569-71.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2001). The Leadership Styles of Women and Men. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 781-798.
- Emerald Group (2008). The World Needs Women Leaders. *Strategic Direction*, 24, 27-29.
- Entrepreneur, (n.d). *In Business Directory online*. Retrieved February 2, 2011, from <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/entrepreneur.html>
- Fiedler, F. E. (1972). The effects of leadership training and experience: A contingency model interpretation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(4), 453-470.

- Friedman, E. (1985). *Generation to generation: Family process in church and synagogue*. New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Frost, M. & Hirsch, A. (2003) *The Shaping of things to come: Innovation and missions for the 21st century church*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Gillian, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gladwell, M. (2002). *The tipping point: How little things can make a big difference*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Co.
- Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, March-April, 78, no. 2. 78-90.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: learning to lead with emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Graeff, C. L. (1983). The situational leadership theory: A critical view. *Academy of Management Review*, 8(2), 285-291.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219-247.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1982). *The servant as religious leader*. Peterborough, NH: Windy Row Press.
- Grzelakowski, M. (2005). *Mother leads best 50 women who are changing the way organizations define leadership*. Chicago, IL: Dearborn Trade Pub.
- Gumpert, R. A., & Hambleton, R. K. (1979). Situational leadership: How Xerox managers fine-tune managerial styles to employee maturity and task needs. *Management Review*, December, 8-12.

- Guralnik, D. (ed.); 1994. *Websters, New World Dictionary*. Cleveland: William Collins.
- Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Heifetz, R. & Linksky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Heifetz, R., Grashow, A, & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Heiman, G. (2002). *Research methods in psychology (3rd ed.)*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). Leadership style: attitudes and behaviors. *Training and Development*, May, 50-52.
- The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version (1989). Nashville, TN: Cokesbury.
- Hood, J. N. (2003). The relationship of leadership style and coo values to ethical practices in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 43(4), 263-273.
- Johnson, C. D. (2005). *Emotional intelligence: The core of church leader for missional living in the emerging culture* (Doctor of Ministry dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (AAT 3159465)
- Jones, L. G. and Armstrong, K. R. (2006). *Resurrecting excellence: Shaping faithful Christian ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J., E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: a qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 765-780.

- Kanne, D. (2005). *Emotional intelligence and the transformational learning journey of 30 senior pastors who participated in LEAD* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (AAT 3188224)
- Keller, T. (1999). Images of the familiar: individual differences and implicit leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(4), 589-607.
- Kest, R. T. (2006). Principles of leadership: Leadership management. *Futurics*, 30(1/2), 52-71.
- Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (2003). *Five practices of exemplary leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Litman, M., Campell, S., & Litman, J. (2006). *Retreats that work*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Lord, R. G., de Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 402-410.
- Maddox, R. (1994). *Responsible Grace*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Mannarelli, T. (2006). Accounting for leadership: Charismatic, transformational leadership through reflection and self-awareness. *Accountancy Ireland*, 38(1), 46-48.
- Masood, S. A., Dani, S. S., Burns, N. D., & Backhouse C. J. (2006). Transformational leadership and organizational culture: The situational strength perspective. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers*, 220(B6), 941-949.

- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of human intelligence* (2nd ed., pp. 396-420). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT): User Manual*. New York, NY: Multi-Health Systems.
- Mead, L. (1991). *The Once and Future Church*. Washington, D.C.: Alban Institute.
- Meznar, M. B., & Johnson, J. H. (2005). Business-government relations within a contingency theory framework: Strategy, structure, fit, and performance. *Business and Society*, 44(2), 119-143.
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Palser, S. J. (2005). *The relationship between occupational burnout and emotional intelligence among clergy or professional ministry workers*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database (AAT 3162679)
- Parks, L., & Birch, B. (2004). *Ducking spears, dancing madly*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life. (2008). *U.S. religious landscape survey*. D.C., Pew Research Center.
- Plake, B. S., & Impara, J.C. (Eds.). (1999). *The supplement to the thirteenth Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Lincoln, NB: The University of Nebraska Press.

- Plake, B. S., & Impara, J.C. (Eds.). (2001). *The fourteenth Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Lincoln, NB: The University of Nebraska Press.
- Porter, J. L. (2002). *An investigation of the glass ceiling in corporate America: The perspective of African American Women* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Capella University. Minneapolis, MN.
- Quinn, R. E. (2004). *Building the bridge as you walk on it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Rendle, G. (2010). *Journey in the wilderness*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Robbins, S. P. (2005). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Schaller, L. (2004). *The ice cube is melting*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Schaller, L. (2005). *A mainline turnaround: Strategies for congregations and denominations*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Schein, E. (2006). Leadership competencies a provocative new look. In F. Hesselbein & M. Goldsmith (Eds.). *The Leader of the Future*. (pp. 255-264). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Somech, A., & Wenderow, M. (2006). The impact of participative and directive leadership on teacher's performance: The intervening effects of job structuring, decision domain and leader-member exchange. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 42, 746-772.
- Southern, R., & Norton, R. (2001). *Cracking your congregation's code*. San Francisco,

CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Spinelli, R. J. (2006). The applicability of Bass's model of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership in the hospital administrative environment. *Hospital Topics*, 84(2), 11-18.
- Steinke, P. (2006). *Healthy congregations: A systems approach*. Herndon, VA: The Alban Institute.
- Strang, K. D. (2004). Examining effective technology project leadership traits and behaviors. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23, 424-462.
- Syque Consultants (2002). *Leader-Member Exchange Theory*. Retrieved from http://changingminds.org/explanations/theories/leader_member_exchange.htm
- Trevino, L. K., Hartman, L. P., & Brown, M. (2000). Moral person and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership. *California Management Review*, 42(4), 128- 142.
- Wang, H., Law, K., Hackett, R., Wang, D., & Chen, Z. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 420-432.
- Webster's New World Dictionary (1994). NY: William Collins Publishing Co.
- Weems, L. (1999). *Leadership in the Wesleyan spirit*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Williams, D. (2005). *Real leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler
- Willimon, W. (2002). *Pastor: The theology and practice of ordained Ministry*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Wilson, R. T. (1998). Servant leadership. *Physician Executive*, 24(5), 6-13.

Retrieved from www.acpe.org/publications/pej.aspx

Yeakey, G. W. (2002). Situational leadership. *Military Review*, 82(1), 72-82.

APPENDIX A

Analysis of Minister's Survey Demographics of Ministers

<u>Variables</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>
Age:	22	48.27	7.11	35	58
Years of Education:	22	20.36	1.09	19	24
Years in Ministry:	22	20.32	8.36	6	35
	<u>N</u>	<u>Male %</u>	<u>Female %</u>		
Gender:	16	13 (59%)	9 (41%)		
Ethnicity:	19 Anglo, 3 Asian American				






APPENDIX B

Summary Analysis of Minister's Survey

Response
SummaryTotal 22
Started
Survey:Total 22 (100%)
Completed
Survey:

Page: Default Section

1. Please share your personal information:

		Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
 Age		48.27	1062	22
 Gender: Male (1) Female (2)		1.41	31	22
 Ethnicity: Anglo (1) Black (2) Hispanic (3) Asian (4) Other (5)		1.41	31	22
 Years of Education		20.36	448	22
 Years in Ministry		20.32	447	22
	<i>answered question</i>			22
	<i>skipped question</i>			0

2. Please rank yourself on this question:							
	Extremely Successful	Moderately Successful	Neutral	Somewhat Unsuccessful	Completely Unsuccessful	Rating Average	Response Count
How successful a local church minister are you?	22.7% (5)	77.3% (17)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.77	22
	<i>answered question</i>						22
	<i>skipped question</i>						0

3. Please rank your answer to the question:							
	Extremely Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral	Somewhat Unimportant	Completely Unimportant	Rating Average	Response Count
How important is your personal leadership to the success of your local church?	81.8% (18)	18.2% (4)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.18	22
	<i>answered question</i>						22
	<i>skipped question</i>						0

4. How many books and classes have you read/taken on leadership in the last 5 years?	
Number:	

4. How many books and classes have you read/taken on leadership in the last 5 years?				
	0	1-3	4 or more	Response Count
I have read this number of books on leadership:	0.0% (0)	9.1% (2)	90.9% (20)	22
I have taken this number of classes or workshops on leadership:	4.5% (1)	31.8% (7)	63.6% (14)	22
	answered question			22
	skipped question			0

5. Please rank your answer to the question:							
	Extremely Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral	Somewhat Unimportant	Completely Unimportant	Rating Average	Response Count
How important is your personal spirituality to the success of your local church?	81.8% (18)	18.2% (4)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.18	22
	answered question						22
	skipped question						0

6. How many books and classes have you read/taken on spirituality in the last 5 years?				
Number				
	0	1-3	4 or more	Response Count
I have read this number of books on spirituality:	0.0% (0)	36.4% (8)	63.6% (14)	22
I have taken this number of classes or workshops on spirituality	13.6% (3)	59.1% (13)	27.3% (6)	22
	<i>answered question</i>			22
	<i>skipped question</i>			0

7. Please rank your answer to the question:							
	Extremely Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral	Somewhat Unimportant	Completely Unimportant	Rating Average	Response Count
How important is your interpersonal skills to the success of your local church?	86.4% (19)	13.6% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.14	22
	<i>answered question</i>						22
	<i>skipped question</i>						0

8. How many books and classes have you read/taken on interpersonal relationships in the last 5 years?				
Number				
	0	1-3	4 or more	Response Count
I have read this number of books on interpersonal relationships:	13.6% (3)	54.5% (12)	31.8% (7)	22
I have taken this number of classes or workshops on interpersonal relationships	36.4% (8)	63.6% (14)	0.0% (0)	22
	answered question			22
	skipped question			0

9. Please rank your answer to the question:							
	Extremely Important	Somewhat Important	Neutral	Somewhat Unimportant	Completely Unimportant	Rating Average	Response Count
How important is your knowledge of church growth information or training to the success of your local church?	45.5% (10)	45.5% (10)	9.1% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.64	22
	answered question						22

9. Please rank your answer to the question:				
	skipped question			0
10. How many books and classes have you read/taken on church growth in the last 5 years?				
Number				
	0	1-3	4 or more	Response Count
I have read this number of books on church growth:	4.5% (1)	36.4% (8)	59.1% (13)	22
I have taken this number of classes or workshops on church growth:	9.1% (2)	50.0% (11)	40.9% (9)	22
	answered question			22
	skipped question			0

APPENDIX C

Invitation to Participate in Research

DATE:**TO:** UMC Clergy**FROM:** Grant Hagiya**RE:** Invitation to participate in my dissertation research

Greetings with joy:

I am currently working on my doctoral dissertation research for Pepperdine University, and I would like to ask you to help me by participating in this study.

The study is trying to elicit traits and characteristics of effective UMC pastors. You are being asked to participate from a selected data-base of California-Pacific Annual Conference Elders.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you can remove yourself from the study at any point. Your identity will be kept completely confidential, and there will be no way to identify you individually from the study.

There will be no expense to you by participating in the study, and the only commitment will be your time. Participation or non-participation in the study will have absolutely no impact on your present and future appointments, and no personal information will be shared with any of your supervisors. The only purpose of the study is academic in nature and adding to the collective literature on clergy leadership.

The study involves the completion of a questionnaire, the taking of 2 assessments: the BarOn Emotional Intelligence inventory and the Leadership Practice Inventory, and returning these back to me in a self-addressed envelop supplied.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please fill out the enclosed questionnaire, and return it in the stamped envelop supplied. If you are not interested in participating please check the appropriate box and also mail it back to me so I may keep track of participants. For those of you who are willing to participate I will then send you the information on taking the 2 inventories.

Thanks so much for your time and consideration.

Blessings,

Grant Hagiya

APPENDIX D

Invitation to Participate in the In-depth Interview

DATE: June 14, 2010
TO: UMC Clergy
FROM: Grant Hagiya
RE: Invitation to participate in and in-depth interview

Greetings:

I want to thank you for your participation in my doctoral dissertation research. Your contributions have been invaluable to my overall research data.

The second phase of my research concentrates on qualitative interviews with selective participants of the research project. I would like to ask if you would be willing to be interviewed for about an hour and half at a location that would be convenient for you.

These interviews are designed to elicit deeper insights in your leadership style, effectiveness in ministry and specific traits and characteristics of effective leadership.

Your participation is strictly voluntary and there will be no personal expense except for your time. You may choose to remove yourself from this study at any point in time.

I will ask your permission to record the interviews for my coding analysis. Your personal identity will not be revealed in the dissertation, and all recording and transcripts will be destroyed after the dissertation is complete. I am required to get your signed agreement to participate at the time of the interview.

I have included a Phase 2 Consent Form and a list of questions for your perusal.

I will be contacting you in the next month or so to see if you would be willing to be interviewed, and to set up a convenient time and location to conduct the interview. I will be glad to come to your office if there is a quiet space where we can conduct the interview.

Thanks so much for your consideration. I remain grateful for your ministry.

Grant Hagiya

APPENDIX E

Demographic Survey

#

DISSERTATION RESEARCH
SURVEY

_____ YES, I AM WILLING TO VOLUNTARILY PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT, & I UNDERSTAND I CAN QUIT THE STUDY AT ANY POINT.
(Please proceed to fill out the complete questionnaire below)

_____ NO, I DO NOT WISH TO PARTICIPATE AT THIS TIME. (Do not fill out the questionnaire below)

NUMBER OF YEARS IN MINISTRY _____ HIGHEST DEGREE
ATTAINED _____

NUMBER OF YEARS AT YOUR CURRENT CHURCH _____

NUMBER OF CHURCHES YOU HAVE SERVED FULL TIME IN YOUR
CAREER _____

YOUR CURRENT AGE _____ YOUR ETHNICITY _____ YOUR
GENDER _____

DESCRIPTION OF YOUR CURRENT APPOINTMENT: Circle all that apply:

1. Rural 2. Urban 3. Suburban 4. Combination
1. Strong & Vital 2. Maintenance 3. Declining 4. Hospice
1. Strong/active laity 2. Medium active laity 3. Weak laity 4. Combative laity

Average age of your laity _____

Predominant ethnicity of the laity _____

Average worship attendance _____ 2009 Number of Profession of faith _____
2008 Percentage of apportionment paid _____

OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR PERSONAL LEADERSHIP:

1. Extremely Effective 2. Effective 3. Average 4. Below Average 5 Ineffective

OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR MINISTRY EFFECTIVENESS AT
YOUR CURRENT APPOINTMENT:

1. Extremely Effective 2. Effective 3. Average 4. Below Average 5 Ineffective

Please return this questionnaire whether you wish to participate or not in the enclosed self addressed envelop. For those willing to participate, I will send you information on the taking of the 2 inventories. Thank you very much.

APPENDIX F

*Informed Consent Form 1***Informed Consent**
Phase 1

The following information is provided to help you decide whether you wish to take part in the doctoral research for the dissertation completion of Grant Hagiya, a student in the Organizational Leadership program at Pepperdine University. The research is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Kent Rhodes at Pepperdine University Graduate School of Education and Psychology. Dr. Rhodes can be contacted for any questions or concerns at Pepperdine University, Irvine Campus

The purpose of the study is to learn more about the leadership qualities and characteristics of United Methodist Elders, and to isolate traits of highly effective UMC Elders. The first phase of this study includes the completion of a demographic survey, and the taking of two standardized assessments.

The benefits of the study has the potential to help the church and society better understand what makes for an effective church minister, enable our seminaries to provide better training methods, and help clergy to better understand what makes for an effective clergy leader.

The potential risks to you in this study might include the time commitment to complete the demographic survey and two assessments, and possibly boredom in their completion.

The research timeline of this first phase will be approximately one month in the completion and collection of all data. The timeline for the second phase will be from one to three months, as the in-depth interviews will be more time consuming. Your time commitment will be approximately one to two hours in the completion of the demographic survey and two assessments.

Since I am a doctoral student, I would like to be able to use what I learn today in my dissertation research and final dissertation. As such, our University requires that I present to you the following statement and ask for your permission to use the information from these assessments in my research. If my research is later accepted for publication, upon your request, I will be glad to present you with a copy of this research.

You should be aware that your participation in this study is strictly voluntary. You are free to decide not to participate or to withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with Pepperdine University or myself. Your name, your position and the name of your organization will be kept confidential at all times and in all of our research.

Please feel free to ask any questions about this study before you begin or during your completing the assessments. If you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact me personally at

At this point, I am required to ask you if you fully understood my statements and if so, sign this form, and send it with the completed mailing.

Signature

Date

If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I may contact Dr. Doug Leigh, chairperson of the Pepperdine University Graduate and Professional Schools Institutional Review Board (GPS IRB) at (310) 568-2389

APPENDIX G

Informed Consent Form 2

Informed Consent
Phase 2

The following information is provided to help you decide whether you wish to take part in the doctoral research for the dissertation completion of Grant Hagiya, a student in the Organizational Leadership program at Pepperdine University. The research is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Kent Rhodes at Pepperdine University Graduate School of Education and Psychology. Dr. Rhodes can be contacted for any questions or concerns at Pepperdine University, Irvine Campus

The purpose of the study is to learn more about the leadership qualities and characteristics of United Methodist Elders, and to isolate traits of highly effective UMC Elders. The first phase of this study which you have already participated in involved the completing of a demographic survey and the taking of 2 standardized assessments. The second phase of this study involves an in-depth interview where I will ask you about your leadership.

The benefits of the study has the potential to help the church and society better understand what makes for an effective church minister, enable our seminaries to provide better training methods, and help clergy to better understand what makes for an effective clergy leader.

The potential risks to you in this study might include the time commitment to complete the interview, and possibly boredom in the in-depth interview time.

The research timeline of this first phase will be approximately one month in the completion and collection of all data. The timeline for the second phase will be from one to three months, as the in-depth interviews will be more time consuming. Your time commitment for this second phase will be approximately one to two hours for the interview.

The purpose of our conversation is to learn about your leadership characteristics, style and decision-making. This study will allow me, and those who read my research, to gain a better understanding of leadership styles and approaches of leaders in the United Methodist Church. Since I am a doctoral student, I would like to be able to use what I learn today in my dissertation research and final dissertation. As such, our University requires that I read to you the following statement and ask for your permission to use the information from this interview in my research. If my research is later accepted for publication, upon your request, I will be glad to present you with a copy of our paper.

You should be aware that your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decide not to participate or to withdraw at any time without affecting your

relationship with myself or Pepperdine University. With your permission, I will be recording this interview. Please feel free to ask me to stop or resume taping this discussion at any point in our conversation. Your name, your position and the name of your organization will be kept confidential at all times and in all of our research.

Please feel free to ask any questions about this study before we begin or during our conversation. If you have any additional questions before or after the interview, please feel free to contact me at

May I use an audio/video recorder to record our conversation?

At this point, I am required to ask you if you fully understood my statements and if so, please sign this form.

Signature

Date

If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I may contact Dr. Doug Leigh, chairperson of the Pepperdine University Graduate and Professional Schools Institutional Review Board (GPS IRB) at (310) 568-2389

APPENDIX H

IRB Approval Letter

Graduate & Professional Schools Institutional Review Board

January 20, 2010

**Protocol #: E1209D04****Project Title: *Traits & Qualities of Highly Effective United Methodist Ministers***

Dear Mr. Hagiya:

Thank you for submitting the revisions requested by Pepperdine University's Graduate and Professional Schools IRB (GPS IRB) for your study, *Traits & Qualities of Highly Effective United Methodist Ministers*. The IRB has reviewed your revisions and found them acceptable. You may proceed with your study. The IRB has determined that the above entitled project meets the requirements for exemption under the federal regulations 45 CFR 46 - <http://www.nihtraining.com/ohsrsite/guidelines/45cfr46.html> that govern the protections of human subjects. Specifically, section 45 CFR 46.101(b) (2) states:

(b) Unless otherwise required by Department or Agency heads, research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories are exempt from this policy:

Category (2) of 45 CFR 46.101, research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: a) Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and b) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Your research must be conducted according to the proposal that was submitted to the IRB. If changes to the approved protocol occur, a revised protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB before implementation. For any proposed changes in your research protocol, please submit a **Request for Modification Form** to the GPS IRB. Because your study falls under exemption, there is no requirement for continuing IRB review of your project. Please be aware that changes to your protocol may prevent the research from qualifying for exemption from 45 CFR 46.101 and require submission of a new IRB application or other materials to the GPS IRB.

A goal of the IRB is to prevent negative occurrences during any research study. However, despite our best intent, unforeseen circumstances or events may arise during the research. If an unexpected situation or adverse event happens during your investigation, please notify the GPS IRB as soon as possible. We will ask for a complete explanation of the event and your response. Other actions also may be required depending on the nature of the event. Details regarding the timeframe in which adverse events must be reported to the GPS IRB and the appropriate form to be used to report this information can be found in the *Pepperdine University Protection of Human Participants in Research: Policies and Procedures Manual* (see link to "policy material" at <http://www.pepperdine.edu/irb/graduate/>).

Please refer to the protocol number denoted above in all further communication or correspondence related to this approval. Should you have additional questions, please contact me. On behalf of the GPS IRB, I wish you success in this scholarly pursuit.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'DL', enclosed in a rectangular box.

Doug Leigh, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Education
Pepperdine University
Graduate School of Education and Psychology
6100 Center Dr. 5th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
dleigh@pepperdine.edu
(310) 568-2389

cc: Dr. Lee Kats, Associate Provost for Research & Assistant Dean of Research, Seaver College
Ms. Ann Kratz, Human Protections Administrator
Dr. Doug Leigh, Chair, Graduate and Professional Schools IRB
Ms. Jean Kang, Manager, Graduate and Professional Schools IRB
Dr. Kent Rhodes
Ms. Christie Dailo