PRIOR PASTORAL LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE

AND POST-SEMINARY EFFECTIVENESS:

A MIXED METHOD STUDY

―――――――――

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

―――――――――

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

―――――――――

by

William Ralph Cannon II

December 2015

APPROVAL SHEET

PRIOR PASTORAL LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE

AND POST-SEMINARY EFFECTIVENESS:

A MIXED METHOD STUDY

William Ralph Cannon II

Read and Approved by:

_____
Michael S. Wilder (Chair)

_____
Anthony Foster

Date_____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ATS   Association of Theological Schools

LPLI   Lewis Pastoral Leadership Instrument

MDiv   Master of Divinity

MOOC   Massive Open Online Courses

NOBTS   New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary

SBC   Southern Baptist Convention

SBTS   Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

S.D.   Standard Deviation

LIST OF TABLES

PREFACE

The task of shepherding a local church can be as daunting as completing the MDiv or completing academic research. Each of these endeavors requires the assistance of the Holy Spirit and others. Without the help of Dr. Wilder, this research could not have been completed. He has demonstrated the love and care necessary to shepherd this student through the process. In addition, Dr. Foster faithfully served on my committee. I also cannot neglect to mention my Ph.D. cohort that was there in the beginning, self-described as the "imposters." I am grateful for the assistance of Mark Tew, Jinyan Fan, Ginger Montgomery, Mona Crawford, Corky Carter, the loving members of First Baptist, Union Springs, and others too numerous to name.

I am blessed with a wonderful and patient wife and family. No words are sufficient to express my appreciation for my wife, Anitra. Without the support of our children, Maddee, Daniel, Hannah-Beth, and Ian, we would not be at this point in life and in the dissertation phase.

I also want to remember those the Lord has called home to be with him during the completion of studies and research, Elaine Smith, D. W. Dansby, Hollis Powell, my father-in-law Jackie Thomas, and my mother Virginia Cannon.

William Ralph Cannon II

Auburn, Alabama

December 2015

CHAPTER 1

RESEARCH CONCERN

When God calls one of his servants to pastor a church, that person is called to love and lead the flock of God. The call to serve a church as pastor is also a call to study and prepare in order to lead in an honorable manner and to fulfill this God given ministry. Seminaries partner with churches to prepare graduates to pastor churches effectively. Students enrolled in theological education at seminary begin their studies with varying amounts of ministerial experience. Some students serve a church as pastor before enrolling in seminary and some students serve a church as pastor concurrently while completing the Master of Divinity (MDiv), the standard seminary degree. Other students graduate without serving a church as pastor and without any further experience beyond the curriculum requirements of supervised experiences in ministry. Therefore, this study will seek to examine the relationship between prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary effectiveness within the first ten years after graduation.

Research Problem

Churches expect seminary graduates to effectively lead churches immediately upon graduation. This expectation is based on the perception that seminaries prepare pastors for the ministry of pastoral leadership even though many seminary graduates "have had little sustained leadership experience in congregations" (Foster 2005, 87). Seminary student expectations are similar, and they begin their education "with a desire that the institution will prepare them to go directly into the ministry" as an effective pastoral leader after graduation (Selzer 2008, 25). However, there are some seminary

graduates who are ineffective as pastoral leaders, as evidenced by a lack of growth in churches, by pastors who abandon the role of pastor, and through forced terminations.

Ineffective Pastoral Leadership

Congregations in general are not growing according to the 2008 national congregational study. This study reported churches experiencing at least a 2% growth decreased from 45% in 2005 to just 38% in 2008 (Roozen 2009, 5). The decline in congregational growth was evident across denominational lines. Southern Baptists congregations witnessed a decline during the five year period between 2002 and 2007. During this period, 27% of Southern Baptist churches lost 10% or more of their membership and 43% were plateaued, showing no change during the five year period (Lifeway [2007], file/?id=7303). In addition, during the five year period between 2007 and 2011, the most current data available showed declines in church membership (288, 808) and baptisms (12,600). These numbers are dismal; equally disheartening is the fact that 85% of protestant pastors attended seminary (Baptist Press 2010, ID=32668).

Studies consistently show that pastors are abandoning the role of pastor. The Fuller Institute of Growth found that 50% of pastors "had dropped out of full-time ministry within five years" of graduating from seminary (Meek et al. 2003, 339). In another study, 44% of individuals surveyed were no longer serving a church as pastor and the average pastoral career was thirteen years (Barfoot, Winston, and Wickman [2005], vistis.pdf). The average attrition rate in pastoral ministry is 2% per year among Evangelical seminary graduates and is greater than Mainline seminary graduates (Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire 2007, 5). A high percentage of pastors are working in secular work at "mid-career" and the percentage "increases throughout the career" (Chang 2005, 15).

Forced pastoral terminations may be further evidence of ineffective pastoral leadership. A 2005 study of pastors found that "one in four pastors experience a forced

termination from the pastorate in America's evangelical churches" (Barfoot, Winston, and Wickman [2005], visits.pdf). Of those responding to this study, 35% were seminary graduates, 18% held a master's degree other than the MDiv, and 19% had earned or were pursuing the Ph.D. From their research Barfoot, Winston, and Wickman concluded at the least "more education does not necessarily protect one from a forced exit, and to a point actually may increase the likelihood of it" (Barfoot, Winston, and Wickman [2005], visits.pdf).

Classroom to Congregation

Seminary graduates assume advanced theological education will prepare them to be effective pastoral leaders. Despite this assumption, many seminary graduates "feel ill prepared on completion to enter the work force" as pastors (Selzer 2008, 25). The primary measure of whether seminaries are successful is the extent to which a graduate meets "the ministry needs" of the church he serves (Harder 2007, 127). Naman and McCall's study of mainline denomination seminary graduates found that "seminary education did not adequately prepare senior pastors with the essential skills necessary for their leadership role" (Naman and McCall 1993, 3). The national study of congregations in 2008 found that "congregations with leaders who had a seminary education scored lower, overall, on a wide range of vital signs including growth, clarity of purpose, spiritual vitality, financial health, and openly dealing with conflict" (Roozen 2009, 32).

The transition from seminary classroom to pastoral responsibility is challenging. Seminary students are not able to learn the practice of ministry in a practicum or a supervised ministry experience in the same manner that one learns it "on the job and deeply immersed in practice" (Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire 2007, 24). In addition, the academic culture of the seminary is different from the culture of the church in which seminary graduates serve. Seminary graduates often experience culture shock,

and "the cultural clash between the academy and the church after their studies" can be very challenging (Dash, Duke, and Smith 2005, 75).

Research suggests that during this critical transition period, seminary graduates face at least six potential pitfalls. First, time is needed for seminary graduates to navigate the first years of ministry. That is, seminary graduates need to be given "permission to develop rather than be expected to receive instantaneous political understanding as a result of ordination" and graduation (Burns and Cervero 2002, 318). Second, seminary graduates do not know how to manage differing expectations by various parts of the church (Meek et al. 2003, 344). Third, seminary students gain great knowledge and experience through internships because "so much of what a pastor is called to do can be learned only in the actual doing of it. And just as in bicycle riding, there will be crashes and scraped knees—all a necessary part of learning" (Cole 2008, xii). Fourth, the concept of pastoral leadership itself is constantly changing. Drummond suggests that "the best skill we can provide our students is an ability to adapt" to change (Drummond 2008, 59). Fifth, seminary graduates often find their first call is to churches with smaller memberships and budgets (Chang 2005, 7). The smaller membership and budget may limit a pastor's opportunity to lead. Finally, seminary graduates often find that they become shaped by the "unknown collective will and history" of the church (Hess 2008, 15), rather than shaping these churches.

Previous Research

Over the last sixty years, much research has focused on pastoral ministry and pastoral education. In the area of pastoral ministry, Pulpit and Pew (Chang 2002) and others (Blizzard 1995 and Brunette-Hill and Finke 1990) completed time allocation studies, examined pastoral leadership, and identified necessary competencies for effective pastoral leadership. Researchers also examined pastoral ministry by cataloging Christian

leadership training (Foster 2010), evaluating seminary training (Kiedis 2009), and studying seminary students and graduates (Hillman 2006; Lincoln 2010).

Pastoral Leadership

      Researchers conducted time allocation studies to determine how pastors spend time on daily and weekly activities. Pastors were either observed or self-reported these activities. Blizzard's study (1985), conducted in 1955 with findings republished in 1985, provided insight into activities in which pastors engaged at the time of his study. Brunette-Hill and Finke (1999), in a study conducted in 1994 and published in 1999, replicated Blizzard's study with a limited group of pastors in Milwaukee. Brunette-Hill and Finke compared the 1994 mainline pastor time allocation findings to Blizzard's 1955 study. (Hours are listed by the year of the study and not the year of publication.) Pastors reported working 69.3 hours per week in 1955 in contrast to 47.7 hours per week in 1994. Pastors reported day-to-day activities in four categories: teaching, priestly/preacher, pastoral, and administrator/organizer. The greatest change in hours worked was observed in the administrator/organizer where pastors reported working 34.6 hours per week in 1955 and 18.7 hours in 1994. Pastors reported working 18.9 hours in 1955 compared to 12.9 hours in 1994 in the pastoral category and 12.4 hours in 1955 to 11.9 hours per week in the priestly/preacher category. The one increase in hours from 1955 to 1994 was reported in the teaching category, 3.4 hours in 1955 to 4.2 hours in 1994 (Brunette-Hill 1999, 54).

      The Lily Endowment sponsored a focused study on pastoral ministry conducted by the Pulpit and Pew Center at Duke Divinity School (2002). This study found that pastors worked a median of 45 hours per week. During those 45 hours, pastors spent 33% in worship and sermon preparation, 19% in duties related to pastoral care, 15% in administration, 13% in teaching and training, 7% praying and meditating, 6% in

denominational and community affairs, and 4% reading (McMillan 2002, pulpitandpew.duke.edu).

In addition to time allocation studies, researchers have also focused on leadership styles. Carpenter (2006) wanted to ascertain if there was a link between pastoral characteristics and transformational leadership. He found four characteristics (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) that correlated with transformational leadership styles of pastors and that pastors had a higher than average rating for transformational leadership than the national average among all other types of leaders (Carpenter 2006, 154). Scuderi (2007) compared servant and transformational leadership styles of pastoral leaders to determine if either style was a predictor of effectiveness. Scuderi's research found that both styles were linked to effectiveness in various areas but that no one style predicted effectiveness. In addition, Feltner (2009) ascertained influence tactics used by pastors to effect change.

Conflict management studies are a subset of pastoral leadership styles research. Two notable studies are Works (2008) and Chu (2011). Works reported that 65% of terminated pastors surveyed employed an integrating conflict management style (a style that is open and allows exchange of information) and that among terminated pastors there was no correlation between a pastor's conflict management style and years of experience (Works 2008, 153). Works' study reports a correlation between education and termination; more education correlated with fewer occurrences of termination (Works 2008, 159). This finding is in contrast to Barfoot, Winston, and Wickman (2005) who found that education does not protect a pastor from forced termination. The sample of each study may explain the difference in findings. Works' population was Tennessee Baptists and consisted of 26 terminated pastors, while the Barfoot, Winston, and Wickman sample consisted of 108 terminated pastors not limited to geography. Chu

found that a majority of pastors employed an integrated style of conflict management (Chu 2011, 156) and that education had no effect on conflict management style.

Several researchers focused on pastoral ministry competencies including Purcell (2001), Barnett (2003), Welch (2003), Coggins (2004), and Flahardy (2007). Tunnicliff (2005) studied how persons develop into pastoral leaders. In addition to identifying necessary competencies, Purcell studied effectiveness among a group of Southern Baptists pastors in Kentucky and Cardoza (2005) among urban pastors. The research will examine effectiveness among a broad sample of SBC pastors who are seminary graduates of SBC seminaries.

Researchers previously studied pastoral leadership time allocation studies to ascertain the number of hours worked and areas in which pastors invested their time in fulfilling their call to shepherd the flock of God. Leadership styles and conflict management styles were identified through previous research for pastors to lead effectively. In addition, Purcell studied pastoral leadership effectiveness in a limited group of SBC pastors and Cardoza studied an effectiveness of urban pastors. Adding to the pastoral leadership findings, researchers also focus attention on pastoral education.

Pastoral Education

Christian leadership education, seminary education in general, and how the seminary prepares students and graduates in particular are three areas in which researchers have focused attention. Foster (2010) focused research in the area of post-baccalaureate leadership studies, both seminaries and non-seminaries. Foster reported two important points that relate to this research. First, he reported that of the programs offering post-baccalaureate leadership training, 20% are Southern Baptist (Foster 2010, 168). Second, and more important to this research, Foster reported that research skills was the number one competency listed by leadership programs and research skills "ranked number two in course frequency." Foster concluded that if leveraged in practical

leadership situations, this competency could be the most important leadership competency of post-baccalaureate programs (Foster 2010, 187). Foster recommended that this competency be leveraged in practical leadership "situations, especially crisis situations, where such skills could prove transformative" (Foster 2010, 187). McKenna, Boyd, and Yost also studied pastoral leadership development in particular and found that pastoral leaders acquire agility through lessons learned through experiences (McKenna, Boyd, and Yost 2007, 190). Foster and McKenna, Boyd, and Yost combine to show that leadership education and development are taught in various programs and that a part of leadership development is the practice of pastoral leadership.

From Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafuson in the 1950s to Foster, Dahill, Goleman, and Tolintino in the 2000s, researchers examined seminary education to determine if it adequately prepares graduates to lead churches effectively. One examination of how seminaries are doing found that more practical instruction is needed but may not be effective because "students may not be ready to learn about practice until they are actually on the job and deeply immersed in pastoral leadership (Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire 2007, 29). Studies focusing on seminary graduates from individual seminary models have been conducted including Finke and Dougherty (2002), Nelson (2005), Harder (2007), and Selzer (2008). Recent attempts to make seminary education more practical have produced various seminary training models. Kiedis (2009) categorized and produced a taxonomy of seven seminary training models. Kiedis found that there was no significant relationship between a graduate's seminary model and effectiveness (Kiedis 2009, 192). Kiedis also found that seminary graduates of the apprentice model (a model focused on field based education in contrast to a classroom focused model) were least likely to be employed five years after graduation (Kiedis 2009, 205).

Finally, researchers focused on seminary students and seminary graduates to learn more about how seminary affects them and prepares them for pastoral leadership.

A systematic literary narrative that addresses how the seminary experience changes students does not exist (Lincoln 2010, 208), and there are few "studies of how theological education effects students" (Lincoln 2010, 218). Despite the lack of literature related to the effects of seminary study on students, it is apparent that today's seminary student "may be a husband, a local pastor" and work an additional job while attending seminary (Lincoln 2010, 212). The experience of students who are married and pastor churches while working on their degree may be substantially different from the student who is single and not engaged as a church pastor during seminary. Hillman conducted a study of seminary students at Dallas Theological Seminary to identify "differences in leadership practices between master's level students at Dallas Theological Seminary" (Hillman 2006, 141). This study relied only on student self-assessment through the Leadership Practices Inventory-Self inventory (Hillman 2006, 146). Hillman found that current ministry experience was a significant predictor of higher leadership effectiveness scores (Hillman 2006, 153). This study demonstrated that ministry experience raised the self-perceived level of leadership effectiveness of MDiv students. This study was limited to currently enrolled seminary students, did not address seminary graduates, and did not employ the multi-source component of the leadership instrument. The research will focus on MDiv seminary graduates.

Dash, Dukes, and Smith, in their second order research relating to the first years of ministry after seminary, noted that many church traditions permit pastors to serve churches prior to and concurrent with seminary training. They suggested further research is needed because the experience of these seminary graduates would be different (Dash, Dukes, and Smith 2005, 75). These researchers noted the culture clash between the academy and the church after graduation would be similar among all students and that seminary graduates with prior experience or concurrent experience "would be moving back and forth between the two worlds while pursuing their theological education"

(Dash, Dukes, and Smith 2005, 75). They reached the following conclusions: (1) a gap exists between seminary education and the graduate's first years in ministry (p. 71); (2) a relationship is needed between the church and the seminary—the congregation is the primary sphere of ministry and needs to be the focus of education; (3) seminaries are no longer the place of formation they once were (p. 73); and (4) there is a group of seminary graduates that bring considerable pastoral leadership experience with them to seminary (p. 75). Dash, Dukes, and Smith suggested that further research should focus on the pastor that attends seminary with prior pastoral leadership experience or concurrent experience with seminary education (Dash, Dukes, and Smith 2005, 75).

Previous research has revealed what pastors do to fulfill their calling. Competency studies have ascertained what is necessary to educate pastors to prepare for pastoral leadership. The research will study pastoral leadership effectiveness as it relates to activities and competencies in practice. Kiedis addressed effectiveness by linking effectiveness to a particular seminary model. The research will explore effectiveness of seminary graduates from the six Southern Baptist seminaries regardless of the seminary model experienced by the graduate. The research will also distinguish between pastoral leaders with prior and concurrent pastoral experience and seminary graduates without prior experience, thereby contributing to the research and knowledge needs noted by Dash, Dukes, and Smith and Lincoln.

Purpose

The purpose of the sequential study is to examine the relationship between no experience, prior, and concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary effectiveness within the first ten years of pastoral leadership experience.

Delimitations

The research necessitates delimitations to achieve the research purpose. The following are the delimitations:

1. This research is delimited to lead pastors serving in a Southern Baptist church.

2. This research is delimited to Master of Divinity graduates of Southern Baptist seminaries.

3. This research is delimited to pastors with one to ten years pastoral leadership experience post MDiv seminary graduation.

4. This research is delimited to self-assessed perceptions of pastoral leadership as measured by the Lewis Pastoral Leadership Inventory.

Research Questions

The following research questions will guide the study:

1. What relationship, if any, exists between pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary effectiveness within the first ten years as measured by the LPLI?

2. What difference in post seminary leadership effectiveness, if any exists, among pastors with no prior, prior only, concurrent only, and pastors with both prior and concurrent experience?

3. What relationship, if any, exists between select demographics and pastoral leadership effectiveness of seminary graduates?

Terminology

Lay observers. Persons who are familiar with the work of the pastor and agree to complete the Lewis Pastoral Leadership Inventory (LPLI) instrument (Lewis Center, lpli.org). Lay observers are church members and include, but are not limited to, deacons, elders, committee members, ministry leaders, teachers, and others. Lay observers may not include family members of the participating pastor.

Lead pastor. "Refers to a minister who is actively engaged in ministry to a congregation" (Reid et al. 1990, 871). Responsibilities of the pastor include, but are not limited to, leading, shepherding, teaching, and praying (Estep, Anthony, and Allison

2008, 247). The subject of this research is the lead pastor which is understood to be the shepherd of the flock of God under leadership of the Good Shepherd.

Lewis Pastoral Leadership Inventory. Inventory developed by the Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, DC. This instrument combines self-appraisal "with the feedback of observers who are familiar with your work. The result is a personalized report summarizing how you see your strengths and weaknesses and how your observers see them" (Lewis Center, lpli.org). The LPLI measures pastoral leadership in the areas of character, who a leader is; competency, what a leader does; and contribution, what a leader accomplishes.

Master of Divinity. "The normative degree to prepare persons for ordained ministry and for general pastoral and religious leadership responsibilities in congregations and other settings" (Association of Theological Schools, DegreeProgramStandards.pdf).

Pastoral leadership. "Everything that a pastor does involves (or should involve) leadership, broadly conceived, by helping both the congregation and individual members grow in faithfulness to the gospel in light of the issues they face corporately and individually in the context in which they find themselves" (Carroll 2006, 127).

Southern Baptist church.

> A New Testament church of the Lord Jesus Christ is an autonomous local congregation of baptized believers, associated by covenant in the faith and fellowship of the Gospel; observing the two ordinances of Christ, governed by His laws, exercising the gifts, rights, and privileges invested in them by His Word, and seeking to extend the Gospel to the ends of the earth. Each congregation operates under the Lordship of Christ through democratic processes. In such a congregation each member is responsible and accountable to Christ as Lord. Its scriptural officers are pastors and deacons (Southern Baptist Convention 2000, 13).

Southern Baptist churches are affiliated to the Southern Baptist Convention through giving to and supporting the Cooperative Program.

Southern Baptist Convention. A group of autonomous Baptist churches that cooperate together for missions efforts and theological education through various

offerings and the Cooperative Program. The Southern Baptist Convention is an organization that is "voluntary and advisory [body] designed to elicit, combine, and direct the energies of our people in the most effective manner" (Southern Baptist Convention 2000, 18). The Baptist Faith and Message is the SBC's statement of faith.

Southern Baptist seminaries. Seminaries that are supported by the Cooperative Program of the Southern Baptist Convention, are united in theological convictions, and educate for ministry: Golden Gate, Midwestern, New Orleans, Southeastern, Southern, and Southwestern.

Supervised experiences in ministry. A field education program of the Master of Divinity that provides an "opportunity to gain expertise in the tasks of ministerial leadership within both the congregation and the broader public context, and to reflect on interrelated theological, cultural, and experiential learning" (Association of Theological Schools, DegreeStandards.pdf).

Theological education. Graduate education that prepares "persons for the practice of ministry and for teaching and research in the theological disciplines" (Association of Theological Schools 2007, FactBook/2006-2007.pdf).

360° assessment. A multi-source instrument whereby "feedback is collected systematically, simultaneously, and (often) anonymously from each relevant rating source to give rates a 360-degree view of their behavior as it relates to successful job performance" (Kraut 1996, 118).

Procedural Overview

This research is a mixed method study (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005) that examined the relationship between prior and concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary pastoral leadership effectiveness within the first ten years of graduating from seminary. The pastor rating version of the LPLI, a multi-source assessment instrument, was used to quantify pastoral leadership effectiveness in

character, competency, and contribution through self-assessment. Follow-up interviews were conducted to ascertain further insights and to qualify the quantitative data collected via the LPLI. The LPLI is a two part instrument: the demographic profile and the leadership inventory.

The population consisted of lead pastors who graduated from seminary with no less than one year and no more than ten years post seminary pastoral leadership experience after earning the MDiv. The researcher contacted personnel from the six SBC seminaries, state denominational leaders, associational missionaries, Lifeway Research, and other pastors not in the population to generate a list of pastors who meet the inclusion criteria. Members of the population who were referred to the researcher or who contacted the researcher directly were invited by email to participate in this research, provided instructions for participating, and an online link to complete the LPLI.

The Lewis Center for Church Leadership granted permission to use the LPLI for this study. The researcher used Survey Monkey to host the online version of the LPLI and for data collection. The first part of the LPLI gathered demographic information on participants and their church and the second part was the leadership effectiveness inventory. The data collected from completed LPLI surveys via Survey Monkey was statistically analyzed and presented in chapter 4.

Assumptions

The following assumption is needed for this research:

1. Pastors and lay observers will assess accurately the effectiveness of pastoral leadership.

Conclusion

Although always desired, effective pastoral leadership is not always an outcome of seminary education. Seminary students begin and graduate with various levels of pastoral leadership experience including no, prior, concurrent, and prior and

concurrent experience. The purpose of the research is to examine the relationship between prior pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary effectiveness. The research findings will help fill a void in the literature relating to prior pastoral leadership experience and effectiveness among seminary graduates and the research findings will be useful for all stakeholders in congregational ministry and seminary education. The literature review in the next chapter (2) examines pastoral leadership through the biblical metaphor, qualifications, and skills of shepherd leaders. The review will continue with a look at seminary education history, aims and purposes, and practices. Previous research will be explored to identify voids in the literature. The next chapter (3) will detail the research design by explaining the population, sample, limitations, and procedures. The remaining chapters will display the analysis of findings for each research questions and conclusions will be drawn from the findings after completion of the research.

CHAPTER 2

PRECEDENT LITERATURE

The purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between prior and concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary effectiveness within the first ten years after graduation. This literature review will explore the biblical nature of shepherd leadership and present examples of biblical figures who exercised shepherd leadership. Pastoral leadership in the contemporary context will be explored by identifying qualifications and actions necessary for effective pastoral leadership. In addition, this review will explore ways pastors are equipped, trained, and educated to become effective pastoral leaders.

Shepherd Leadership

Pastoral leadership is primarily understood through the shepherd motif of Scripture. Shepherding is found throughout the Bible and is "at the very heart of the biblical picture of leadership" (Witmer 2010, 2). Shepherd leadership is recognized in biblical settings because of the prevalence of shepherding. The authoritative and compassionate shepherd leadership exercised by God is characterized by the "judicious use of authority" through sympathetic expressions of compassion (Laniak 2006, 2), including leading and feeding Israel during the wilderness wandering after the Exodus from Egypt. Biblical leadership begins with God, the ultimate shepherd leader as he exercises authority over creation, his people, and through entrusted human leaders.

God the Shepherd

God exercises his authority over creation and his people. His authority is evident in the creation of the universe through the power of his word (Gen 1:3). God's authority over Adam and Eve is evidenced by his placing them in the Garden of Eden to "cultivate it and keep it" (Gen 2:15). Additionally, God's authority is evident through his giving Adam and Eve permission to eat from every plant and tree except the tree of knowledge of good and evil (Gen 2:17). God shepherding Israel to prepare for and during the wilderness wandering further demonstrates his authoritative nature. His authority over Israel is witnessed by walking with his people to provide manna, water, and protection. His authority is also evident in the victories he provides Israel over their enemies (Deut 24:14). In addition, the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah offer examples of ways God exercises his authority as a personal shepherd of his own sheep. God tended to his people Israel like a shepherd tends the flock (Isa 40:11), takes ownership of the flock (Jer 23:1), and searches and seeks out his flock (Jer 34:11). King David recognized and wrote about the God's authority to provide and protect as he shepherded his people in a personal manner when he penned the Twenty-Third Psalm. This psalm begins with "The Lord is my shepherd" (Ps 23:1). God continues to exercise his authority as he shepherds his creation and delegates shepherd leadership to human leaders.

God Delegates Authority

God does not limit authority to shepherd his creation and people to himself. Instead, he delegates authority and responsibility to human leaders for shepherding his people. God appoints shepherds after his heart to lead his flock (Jer 3:15). God is able to delegate authority to humans because the divine image "makes man God's representative on earth" (Gentry 2008, 24). The divine image and the command for man to rule focuses attention on the consequence "which is humanity's rule over the terrestrial world of life" (Matthews 1996, 164). The human authority to rule is a derived authority that is granted

17

from God (Witmer 2010, 88). This derived authority is on display in the lives of biblical leaders such as Adam, Moses, and David.

Adam. God delegated authority to rule over his creation to Adam and his descendants. God placed Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden to "cultivate and keep" the garden (Gen 2:15). As a result of the divine image (Gentry 2008, 25), Adam was given the role of viceroy. As the viceroy over creation, Adam became a "royal figure representing God as his appointed ruler" (Matthews 1996, 169). Adam and his descendants "reflect and represent to the world the kind of kingship and rule intrinsic to God" (Gentry 2008, 39) as they carry out the responsibility and authority to lead. God delegated authority to Adam first and then called others into shepherd leadership.

Moses. God delegated to Moses the authority to lead the people of God out of slavery, through the wilderness, and to the Promised Land. The Psalmist wrote that God led his "people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron" (Ps 77:20). Moses was tending the flock of Jethro, his father-in-law, when God called him to lead Israel out of Egypt (Exod 3). He functioned as God's undershepherd and as an extension of God's rule, provision, and deliverance (Carson 2006, 87) by adjudicating legal matters among the Israelites, leading the people to water, and leading the people to prepare to enter the Promised Land. Moses was the prototypical prophet who delivered the word of God and interceded on behalf of God's people (Witmer 2010, 17).

Even though a great leader, Moses serves as an example of how God delegates authority to sinful leaders. Moses appeared to take credit for the water at Meribah saying, "Listen now, you rebels; shall we bring forth water for you out of this rock?" (Num 20:10). The Lord wanted the people of Israel to know that he alone provided Israel's needs. Moses' act of insubordination could have led to confusion among the people as to their true provider (Witmer 2010, 18). However, this sinful decision did not

prevent God from using Moses, yet he was only permitted to see the promised land from Mount Nebo and not permitted to enter the land (Deut 34:4).

David. God delegated to King David the authority to shepherd his people, the nation of Israel. David was keeping sheep when Samuel visited Bethlehem to anoint him as king of Israel (I Sam 16). God commanded David to shepherd his people (2 Sam 5) and David obeyed with integrity in his heart and with skillful hands (Ps 78:72). David was the prototypical king of Israel (Witmer 2010, 17) and the standard of effective godly leadership for all kings that succeeded him. Even though David was a man after God's own heart, he committed adultery with Bathsheba and arranged the death of her husband, Uriah (2 Sam 11). David's sinful decisions limited his effectiveness as Israel's king (Witmer 201, 17). Yet, his human weakness did not prevent God from delegating authority to David to lead Israel. However, the standard set by David for effective shepherd leadership was surpassed only by Jesus, the chief shepherd of God's people.

Jesus the Chief Shepherd

Jesus provided the ultimate example of shepherd leadership. He fulfilled the prophecy, delivered by Moses, that revealed another leader like him would be sent by God (Deut 18:15). Jesus, as the Promised Messiah, fulfilled the promise God made to David that a king from his house would lead Israel. He described himself as the good shepherd (John 10:11) and he is also the chief shepherd (Schreiner 2003, 234). He called and trained a small group of individuals within a short amount of time and "had them qualified to lead his mission to change the world" (Huizing 2011, 334). Jesus called for a new leadership that contrasted with the strict leadership exercised by the Gentiles (Matt 20:25). Instead, Jesus instructed his followers to be servant leaders (Matt 20:26) and "censured those who sought rank above other persons" (Erikson 1983, 1092). After his ascension, Jesus delegated authority to the Apostles to shepherd his flock, his church.

**Jesus Delegated Authority
to His Apostles**

Jesus' authority was witnessed by people in Capernaum in contrast to the authority of the scribes and Pharisees. Jesus modeled authority before his disciples as he prepared to delegate his authority to them. First, the people in Capernaum recognized Jesus taught as one with authority in contrast to the authority displayed by the scribes (Mark 1:22). Second, Jesus referred to his authority when appearing before Pilate. Jesus said Pilate's only authority was granted from above and his life could only be taken by authority from above (John 19:10). Finally, Jesus modeled authoritative shepherd leadership through a relationship with his disciples. He called the twelve to follow and learn from his teaching and example. Then he sent the twelve out with authority over unclean spirits (Mark 6:7). Jesus prepared and delegated shepherd leadership to the Apostles knowing his time on earth was limited.

Peter. Jesus delegated to Peter the authority to lead the early church. Peter was an early follower of Jesus, a part of the inner three (along with James and John), and a leader among the Apostles. Jesus commanded Peter to tend and shepherd his lambs (John 21:15-17). Peter accepted Jesus' call to lead and prepare other shepherd leaders. Peter recognized the flock belonged to God, asked the elders to oversee the "flock of God," and established that the church belongs to God and not the shepherds (Schreiner 2003, 233).

Paul. Paul, the untimely born apostle, considered himself the least of the apostles (1 Cor 15:8). God named Paul an apostle and set him apart for spreading the gospel. Using his delegated authority, Paul charged the Ephesian elders to be shepherds of the church of God (Acts 20:18). He exemplified shepherd leadership by caring for, feeding, and leading the churches he planted. Paul was a "recognized leader of the church instructing other leaders of the church how to develop the next generation of

leaders" (Huizing 2011, 334). His epistles to Timothy and Titus are especially helpful in teaching and guiding pastoral leaders.

Under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, Paul delegated church leadership to elders. He followed the example of Jesus by appointing elders for the flock in every church. He mentored Timothy, Titus, and other elders to effectively shepherd churches through direct relationships and written correspondence. He acknowledged the presence of bishops and deacons with him when he wrote the Epistle to the Philippians (Phil 1:1). The terms bishop, elder, and pastor/shepherd are used interchangeably in the New Testament (Dever 2007, 800).

Delegated Leadership throughout Church History

Delegated shepherd leadership set forth in the Bible was evident throughout church history. The simple plan of shepherding faded as layers of church order were added from the Pope-led Church in Rome to the local church. Before the time of Martin Luther and the Reformation, the church structure set aside the Pope as the leader of all churches in the Roman Church. Martin Luther began to restore shepherd leadership to the complex Roman Church structure through a renewed focus on local churches. Luther recognized that pastors were called by God and chosen by the local church (Allison 2011, 602). This biblical model remains prevalent in and continues to be at the forefront of church leadership in the twenty-first century (Witmer 2010, 33).

Pastoral leadership in the present-day church is informed by the scriptures and history. Just as Apostles led the early church through delegated shepherd leadership, present-day pastors follow the same model. The writings of both Paul and Peter record how the leadership of the church developed into a two-tier system which included pastors and deacons (Allison 2011, 589). Later, Ignatius added another tier to the Papal system by distinguishing between elders and bishops and by the "fourth century the church had

21

become a highly organized hierarchical institution with the responsibilities of its office of bishop, elder, and deacon" (Allison 2011, 595). Papal leadership dominated the middle ages and was not greatly challenged until Martin Luther questioned papal authority in the Protestant Reformation.

The renewed focus of the Protestant Reformation on the Bible and the local church contributed to clarifying the mission of the local church and the role of the pastor. The Anabaptists advanced the focus on the local church and pastor "by rejecting the state church movement in the Catholic Church and the new Reformation" (Allison 2011, 604). These historical movements helped turn the focus back to local churches and pastors. Present-day pastors, serving in contemporary Southern Baptist churches in the scriptural office, shepherd the flock of God through similar delegated leadership (Southern Baptist Convention, 2000).

Shepherd Leadership Summary

God exercises shepherd leadership while caring for his creation and his people. According to the Bible, God delegated his authority to Adam for tending the Garden of Eden, to Moses for leading his people out of Egyptian Bondage, and to David as a help in leading Israel. Furthermore, God led through Moses and David in spite of their shortcomings in personal decisions. In addition, Jesus delegated leadership to Apostles for building his church and spreading the message of the Gospel. The apostle Paul, through the Holy Spirit, delegated leadership of the flock of God to elders. Finally, Jesus is the chief shepherd and provides the ultimate example of shepherd leadership.

<div align="center">

Pastoral Leadership

</div>

Delegated shepherd leadership continues in the church today through pastoral leadership. Southern Baptists recognize the work of the pastor as part of a two-tier system of pastors and deacons (Baptist Faith and Message, 2000). The work of the pastor

begins with a calling from God to shepherd the church. The calling to pastor is then confirmed by the local church (Allison 2011, 602).

Pastoral leadership is grounded in and flows from a "humble personal relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ" and is impossible without a relationship with him (Stott 1993, 101). Jesus said he would build his church (Matt 16:18); he builds it through pastors who are given to the church by Christ (Eph 4:11). The nature of pastoral leadership demands pastors participate in the work of building the church by allowing Christ to lead them (Seamands 2006, 20). Meeting the qualifications for pastoral leadership is a first step in teaching and leading the flock of God. The pastor must meet the qualifications set forth by Paul in his letters to Timothy and Titus. The church uses these biblical qualifications to determine if an individual is qualified to serve as pastor.

Qualifications

Churches call pastoral leaders after examining them by the qualifications listed in the Bible. The Baptist Faith and Message recommends the qualifications outlined by Paul in 1 Timothy and Titus as the model churches should use in identifying qualified pastoral leaders. These biblical qualifications for pastoral leaders are summarized in three areas, including behavior, relationships, and skill.

Behavior. Shepherd leaders are to be blameless, above reproach, and respectable. Pastors should act in such a manner in the church and throughout the community so that persons cannot accuse him of living a life unworthy of the office he holds. In both 1 Timothy and Titus, Paul listed positive character traits that describe blameless living. For example, pastors should be temperate (1 Tim 3:2), that is to "maintain command of his reason, to be watchful, and observant of things going on around him, and balanced in his assessments" (Towner 2006, 251). Additionally, he should be self-controlled, upright, holy, disciplined, and not greedy for gain. Being

23

above approach also includes avoiding certain negative behaviors to include not being overbearing, quick tempered, given to drunkenness, violent, nor pursing dishonest gain. The pastor's behavior, should "be able to withstand assaults from opponents inside or outside the church" (Towner 2006, 250) and should be consistent in the home, church, and community. A pastor's behavior should not interfere with the building of Christ's church. The requirement to behave above reproach begins before and continues after one becomes a pastor.

The Lewis Pastoral Leadership Inventory (LPLI) instrument was used to collect data for the research containing questions that rate pastoral leadership effectiveness in the area of qualifications of behavior. The LPLI's first section, entitled Character, gives pastors the opportunity to evaluate integrity, honesty, godly behavior, and personal faith in God. These questions on the LPLI recognize the biblical qualification of behavior in the home, church, and community.

Relationships. The manner in which a pastor conducts himself in relationships is described in the biblical qualifications. The pastor lives in and acts through a variety of relationships where he is commanded to live above approach. The pastor's relationship with his household is singled out in particular. The pastor's relationship with those in his household is essential and is linked to the skills necessary to qualify him to be a pastor. If he can manage his own house well, he can best manage the house of God (1 Tim 3:4). The household relationship includes being faithful to his wife. Additionally, household management involves his relationship with his children by keeping them under control with dignity (1 Tim 3:4) and by his ability to "exert his authority downward along clearly defined lines" (Towner 2006, 254).

The household during the period Paul addressed involved more than being a husband and a father. The management of the household expanded to "management of slaves, property, business interests, and even maintenance of important relationships"

24

(Towner 2006, 254). In relationships outside the household the pastor must be hospitable (1 Tim 3: 2) as persons in the early church "depended on those who would open their homes and share their goods" (Towner 2006, 252).

The relational qualification for pastoral leaders demonstrates the importance of relationship in leadership. James Kouzes and Barry Posner defined leadership as a relationship (Kouzes and Posner 2002, 20) and further stated that success or effectiveness as a leader is linked to how well people work together (Kouzes and Posner 2002, 21). Walt Wright adds that leadership is a relationship of influence (Wright 2009, 3). The relationship between a pastor and his family, church, and community is an avenue God uses to influence family and church members and persons outside the church. The purpose of the pastor's relationship of influence is to lead persons toward a closer relationship with God through Christ.

Interacting in relationships with other persons is a qualification for pastoral leadership. Taking this qualification into account, the LPLI instrument examines pastoral leadership effectiveness by asking questions about relationships. The instrument asks questions about the pastor's support system through relationships with colleagues, friends, and family. Additionally, the LPLI rates the pastor's effectiveness in receiving feedback, response to criticism, and his ability to listen to others. Relationship questions are essential in rating a pastor's effectiveness because interacting well with others in relationship is a biblical qualification pastoral leadership.

Skills. The skills of teaching (1 Tim 3:2) and management (1 Tim 3:7) are clearly outlined by Paul as essential qualifications for pastoral leadership. Teaching flows from the pastor's firm hold on "the trustworthy message as it has been taught" (Towner 2006, 257) because there were and are "many rebellious men, empty talkers and deceivers" (Titus 1:10) and savage wolves speaking perverse things (Acts 20:29-30). Teaching includes the areas of instruction and correction. Instruction is accomplished by

preaching the word, reproving, rebuking, and exhorting (2 Tim 4:2). Teaching is also closely connected to the shepherd motif as the overseer shepherds the flock (2 Pet 3:2). Finally, instruction is connected to Jesus' command to Peter to teach or to "feed my sheep" (John 21:15-17).

In addition to teaching, pastoral leaders must possess an ability to oversee, manage, or lead the flock. These qualities are observed in his ability to manage his own household (1 Tim 3:3). In listing qualifications for pastors, Paul asked whether a man can manage the household of God if he cannot manage his own household. Overseeing the flock of God involves the ability to "exercise authority" (Dever 2007, 798). This qualification listed by Paul and alluded to by Peter, provides a framework for churches when assessing a man's ability to shepherd the church.

Additional qualifications. In addition to the qualifications discussed above, scholars offer further commentary on the qualifications for pastors. Accountability, service, and suffering are not usually listed as qualifications for leaders. However, according to D. A. Carson, many who dream of leadership and pastoring seldom think through the demands and responsibilities of leadership. Seldom, if ever, do they think about the sacrifice, hardship, and responsibilities of leadership. Paul's list of qualifications for pastors "contains nothing about intelligence, decisiveness, drive, wealth, power" and in fact, "almost everything on the list is elsewhere in the New Testament required of all believers" (Carson 2004, 95). Finally, these additional qualifications can be helpful in determining if one is qualified to serve as a pastor.

Teaching

The Pastoral Epistles, 1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus do not give a detailed account of what pastors do to fulfill their call to shepherd the flock of God. However, Paul does provide two key responsibilities in these Epistles: feeding and leading (Lea and

Griffins 1992, 32). Shepherds primarily provide good pasture for food and water.

Pastors provide for the flock through feeding or teaching the flock the word of God.

Paul's list of qualifications for pastors include the necessary skill of being able to teach (1

Tim 3:2). In addition, Paul challenged Timothy to "preach the word" (2 Tim 4:2). Paul

made clear the importance of teaching and preaching the word because "in later times

some will abandon the faith and follow deceiving spirits and things taught by demons" (1

Tim 4:1). Paul warned the Ephesian elders of savage wolves coming into the flock

"speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples" (Acts 20:29).

John Stott stated that pastors are teachers, teaching the message of the Bible,

and faithful stewards of the Word of God (Stott 2002, 104). Stott challenged pastors to

focus on faithfulness in teaching the truths of Scripture. He also appealed to pastors to

teach and lead with the gentleness of a father. Teaching is linked to leadership by Gary

Bredfeldt. Bredfeldt wrote, "Those who teach and teach well are truly the greatest of

leaders. Teachers are great leaders for three basic reasons—they have great influence,

they bring about great change, and they can invoke the highest levels of follower

development" (Bredfeldt 2006, 19).

Pastors fulfill their teaching ministry by doing the work of theologians. Paul,

in his letter to Timothy, commanded Timothy through "five aorist imperatives" (Lea and

Griffin 1992, 242). The first command was for Timothy to preach the word (2 Tim 4:2)

and the next four commands address how to preach the word. Timothy was to be

prepared to preach the word, to correct error, to rebuke a stray conscience, and to give

hope to the fainthearted (Lea and Griffin 1992, 243). According to R. Albert Mohler, the

work of the pastor leader is essentially an exercise in theology. Pastors do the work of

theologians through "teaching, preaching, defending, and applying great doctrines of the

faith" (Mohler 2007, 927). The health of the church depends on the pastor's leading as a

theologian. Mohler identified four actions pastors take to fulfill their call to teach:

27

reading, teaching, preaching, and studying the Scriptures. Paul encouraged Timothy to actively pursue these four actions in order to guard the treasure entrusted to him (Mohler 2007, 928).

The Lewis Pastoral Leadership Inventory (LPLI) recognizes the biblical mandate that pastors teach. The instrument includes questions relating to a pastor's teaching ministry in the competency section. The questions in this subsection ask pastors to rate the intellectual grounding in biblical and theological knowledge areas. The LPLI also asks questions relating to accurate preaching, feeding the congregation, and understanding of denominational heritage. Pastors must possess an ability to teach as a qualification to be a shepherd leader. The LPLI questions a pastor's ability to teach in assessing his pastoral leadership effectiveness. In summary, pastors lead effectively and fulfill their calling to shepherd the flock of God through teaching the Scriptures and by overseeing the affairs of the church.

Overseeing

In addition to teaching the Word of God, pastors fulfill the Lord's call to shepherd the sheep by overseeing the church. Leading the church is also referred to biblically as overseeing. Every organization needs leadership and the church is no different. Jesus, the head and chief shepherd of the church, delegates leadership of the flock to pastors who are accountable to the Lord for leading in a manner that builds the church.

Peter addressed the overseeing role of pastoral leadership by instructing elders to "shepherd the flock of God that is among you, exercising oversight" (1 Pet 5:2). Shepherding was clearly an oversight role wherein pastors give leadership and supervision to ministries of the church. Biblical shepherding does not "suggest an aggressive, dictatorial style of leadership" (Davids 1990, 178). Rather, the oversight provided by elders was to be provided willingly and eagerly while setting an example to

the flock. Peter also made clear the elders had no "proprietary right" to the flock since the flock belonged to God (Davids 1990, 178).

Pastoral oversight shapes and molds congregations according to Jackson Carroll. Carroll alludes to the language of Paul in 2 Corinthians 4:7, "But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, so that the surpassing greatness of the power will be of God and not from ourselves." Carroll purported, "If we extend Paul's metaphor, if congregations can be thought of as clay jars, then we can think of clergy who lead them as potters—God's potters—whose work is shaping, glazing and firing those congregational clay jars so that they reveal rather than hide God's power in their life and practices" (Carroll 2006, 2). According to Carroll, the vitality and success of churches is directly linked to the vitality and success of pastoral leadership that is used by God to mold and shape churches.

Summary

Delegated shepherd leadership continues in the church today through the work of the pastor. Pastors shepherd the church through a personal relationship with Jesus, the head of the church. Paul's list of qualifications for pastors can be outlined into three areas: behavior, relationships, and skills. The behavior of the pastor must be godly and consistent because his behavior has an impact with persons inside and outside the church. Closely linked to behavior is the qualification relating to relationships. Pastors live and work within relationships and both their behavior and skills are observed through relationships. Pastors engage in pastoral leadership primarily through teaching and overseeing. Teaching and preaching the truth of God's Word requires pastors to engage in the work of a theologian. Overseeing the flock of God provides a unique role for pastors in forming and molding the church. Pastoral leadership is understood through these theological and theoretical concepts and current empirical research provides insight into how pastors are actually fulfilling their call to shepherd the sheep.

<center>**Previous Research**</center>

Pastoral leadership is shaped and informed by biblical teaching, historical example, and contemporary context. Research of pastoral leadership provides insight into how pastors fulfill their call to shepherd the flock of God. Areas of research relating to pastoral leadership include time allocation studies, pastoral leadership practices, and pastoral training.

Time Allocation

Time allocation studies identify how pastors spend time each day and demonstrates priority placed on each activity. Samuel Blizzard's 1955 time allocation study laid ground work for future pastoral leadership allocation studies. Brunette-Hill and Finke (study completed in 1994 and published in 1999) replicated Blizzard's study with a limited group of pastors in Milwaukee. Brunette-Hill and Finke compared their 1994 mainline pastor time allocation findings to Blizzard's 1955 findings. (Hours are listed by the year of the study and not the year of publication.) Pastors reported working 69.3 hours per week in 1955 in contrast to 47.7 hours per week in 1994. Pastors reported activities in four categories: teacher, priestly/preacher, pastoral, and administrator/ organizer. The greatest change in hours worked was noted in the administrator/organizer category with pastors working 34.6 hours per week in 1955 and 18.7 hours in 1994. The difference may be attributed to the growth in specialized staff during the thirty-nine-year span. Pastors reported working 18.9 hours in 1955 compared to 12.9 hours in 1994 in the pastoral category and 12.4 hours in 1955 to 11.9 hours per week in the priestly/preacher category. The one increase in hours from 1955 to 1994 was reported in the teaching category, 3.4 hours in 1955 to 4.2 hours in 1994 (Brunette-Hill 1999, 54).

The Lily Endowment sponsored a focused study on pastoral ministry conducted by the Pulpit and Pew Center at Duke Divinity School (2002). This study found that pastors worked a median of 45 hours per week. During those 45 hours, pastors

<center>30</center>

spent 33% in worship and sermon preparation, 19% in duties related to pastoral care, 15% in administration, 13% in teaching and training, 7% praying and meditating, 6% in denominational and community affairs, and 4% reading (McMillan 2002, pulpitandpew.duke.edu). Finally, time allocation studies focus singularly on how pastors lead churches by spending time on daily activities of the pastor.

Pastoral Leadership Styles

Understanding pastoral leadership involves more than studying how pastors spend time daily and weekly. To understand pastoral leadership, researchers have conducted research into various areas of pastoral leadership in general. Scott Carpenter (2006) researched the link between pastoral characteristics and transformational leadership among SBC pastors. He found that the characteristics of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration correlate with transformational leadership styles of pastors. In addition, he found pastors had a higher than average rating for transformational leadership than the national average among all other types of leaders (Carpenter 2006, 154). Noelle Scuderi (2007) compared servant and transformational leadership styles of pastoral leaders to determine if either style was a predictor of effectiveness. Scuderi research found that both styles were linked to effectiveness in various areas but that no one style alone predicted effectiveness.

In addition to leadership styles, researchers Charles Works (2008) and Raymond Chu (2011) also explored conflict management styles among pastoral leaders. According to Work's study, a majority of terminated pastors (65%) surveyed used an integrated conflict management style (a style that is open and allows exchange of information). Terminated pastors also demonstrated no correlation between a pastor's conflict management style and years of experience (Works 2008, 153). Works' study reports a correlation between education and termination; more years of education correlated with fewer occurrences of termination (Works 2008, 159). This finding is in

31

contrast to Barfoot, Winston, and Wickman (2005) who found that education does not protect a pastor from forced termination. The sample of each study may explain the difference in findings. Works' population was Tennessee Baptists and consisted of 26 terminated pastors, while the Barfoot, Winston, and Wickman's sample was larger and consisted of 108 terminated pastors. Chu found that a majority of pastors employed an integrating style of conflict management (Chu 2011, 156) and that education had no effect on conflict management style.

Pastoral Leadership Competencies

Pastoral ministry competencies have been researched by several researchers including Purcell (2001), Barnett (2003), Welch (2003), Coggins (2004), and Flahardy (2007). Tunnicliff (2005) studied the development of pastoral leadership among pastors. Among the competencies identified or ranked by pastors, professors, administrators, and church members were Bible knowledge, God-centered ministry, leading through change, knowledge of spiritual disciplines, relating faith to the modern word, managing time, visionary leadership, teamwork, communication, and knowledge of persons being served. Purcell studied the effectiveness of Kentucky Southern Baptist pastors and Cardoza (2005) studied urban pastor effectiveness. The present research will examine effectiveness among a broad sample of pastors who are Mdiv graduates and pastor Southern Baptist churches.

Adair Lummis led the Pulpit and Pew research that explored which competencies lay leaders, specifically through perceptions of leaders of pastor search committees, expect and/or desire in a pastor. Lummis found that congregations want pastors who seek theological solutions and patterns for the future and pastors who have talents to lead their congregations through these solutions and patterns. Lay leaders are also looking for a pastor who "can preach wonderful sermons, conduct inspiring worship

services, competently teach, care, counsel, and console." However, there was no clear consensus on how to prioritize the list of expectations (Lummis 2003, 24).

Additional Research Areas

The Pulpit and Pew Research Project researched the life, training, and work of the American pastor by gathering a group of pastoral leaders together in a colloquium to discuss the ideas of pastoral leadership and excellence. The colloquium was led by researchers L. Gregory Jones and Kevin Armstrong. Jones and Armstrong focused their research on excellence, a clear goal of American culture. With excellence being the "Holy Grail," pastors pondered what excellence in pastoral leadership looks like in contrast to "a world of make-or-break rankings, mission statements, and business plans. 'Excellence' is too often interpreted as the capacity to come out ahead, to exercise strength at the expense of weakness—indeed, to leave an encumbering weakness behind. Such interpretation has crept into the church without any adaptation or translation into Christian terms, leading even pastors we would characterize as excellent feeling frustrated" (Jones and Armstrong 2006, 1-2).

Jones and Armstrong posed the following questions related to excellence in pastoral leaders: "How do we calculate the effect of reconciling forgiveness, the value of deepened prayer life, the impact of passing on faith to a child, the quiet presence of sitting with a dying parishioner, or hammering nails to help provide housing for a homeless family? Such activities are crucial to the way of discipleship" (Jones and Armstrong 2006, 5). These crucial activities are often overlooked or forgotten when persons in the church are evaluating their pastor's effectiveness. Excellence in pastoral leadership is limited because pastors are pulled in various directions simultaneously. Jones and Armstrong characterized this state of the pastor being pulled in various directions leading to many hindrances and as a result pastors being spread too thin.

Previous research has focused on what pastors do to fulfill their calling. Competency studies have ascertained what is necessary to educate pastors to prepare for pastoral leadership. This research explored pastoral leadership effectiveness as it relates to activities and competencies in practice. Kiedis (2009) addressed effectiveness by linking effectiveness to a particular seminary model. However, this research will explore effectiveness of Southern Baptist pastors who graduated from seminaries regardless of the seminary model experienced by the graduate. The research will also distinguish between pastoral leaders with prior and concurrent pastoral experience and seminary graduates without prior experience, thereby contributing to the research and knowledge needs as noted by Dash, Dukes, and Smith (2005), and Lincoln (2010).

Pastoral Leadership Summary

Pastoral leadership is understood through the biblical motif of the shepherd. God exercised authority over his creation as a shepherd who provided and protected his flock. God delegated authority to humans to tend to and care for his creation through Adam and his decedents. Moses exercised God's delegated authority by leading Israel through the wilderness and by delivering the Word of God to God's people. David continued to shepherd over Israel with a heart of integrity and skillful hands. David and Moses set a standard of effective shepherd leadership that was not surpassed until Jesus, the Chief Shepherd, was sent forth by God the Father (Gal 4:4).

Jesus is the ultimate example of shepherd leadership. Jesus introduced a leadership style that contrasted with the "lord it over" style exercised by the Gentile leaders. Jesus trained and delegated authority to his Apostles who trained them and delegated authority to elders. Peter and Paul listed overseeing and feeding as the primary responsibilities of pastors. Paul outlined qualifications of pastors that include behavior, relationships, and skills. Finally, the LPLI takes into account each area of these

qualifications in assessing the effectiveness of pastoral leaders and will therefore be utilized in the research.

Previous research focused on time allocation studies, leadership styles, and leadership competencies. Populations in these studies were pastors in general and were not limited to seminary graduates. These studies did not specifically address overall leadership effectiveness of pastors. However, the population in this study included lead pastors serving SBC churches and seminary graduates from seminary and will address overall pastoral leadership effectiveness.

Seminary Education

It may well be the case that a combination of pastoral leadership experience and seminary education best prepares pastors to effectively shepherd the flock of God. Learning to be effective pastoral leaders begins with a relationship with the Good Shepherd and continues by learning from the Good Shepherd. The Good Shepherd taught and trained the twelve Apostles to accept the authority needed to lead the church in his absence. Pastoral leadership experience is attained most directly through serving a church in a pastoral role. Presently, shepherd leaders learn through various avenues of informal and formal education, including serving as pastor before or during seminary, participating in internships, and seeking seminary education. This review explores the history of formal seminary education in the United States, the aims and purposes of seminary education, and MDiv (Master of Divinity) curriculum. In addition, this review will look at informal education by exploring seminary education practices among Southern Baptists, examining seminary student pastors, and seminary graduates. Finally, the tension between informal and formal education for the seminary student will be examined.

Learning from the Good Shepherd

Preparing shepherd leaders to lead effectively begins with the pastor following the Good Shepherd. Following Jesus and learning to follow the Father through discipleship is essential to effective pastoral leadership. The call to follow Jesus was given to the earliest disciples. Jesus called the twelve to "be with Him" (Mark 3:14). Jesus took a group of fishermen, a publican, other "relatively untrained individuals and within a short period had qualified them to lead his mission to change the world" (Huizing 2011, 334). Jesus intentionally selected the twelve, intentionally taught and trained them, and provided them with opportunities for practical application.

Intentional selection. Jesus deliberately selected his disciples and asked them to follow him. The Gospel of John begins with Jesus' response to two of John the Baptist's disciples. When the two disciples asked Jesus where he was staying, he said, "Come and you will see" (John 1:39). One of these disciples, Andrew, went to his brother, Peter, and announced, "We have found the Messiah" (John 1:41). Andrew brought Peter to meet Jesus and on the next day Jesus "purposed to go to Galilee" to call Philip to follow him (John 1:43). These encounters demonstrate Jesus' intentional selection of these and other men who became the twelve apostles.

Jesus further demonstrated intentional selection in calling the twelve and commissioning them to go out "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt 10:5) as he spent time alone praying the night before he named them (Luke 6:12). After the night of prayer, Jesus selected and sent the twelve out with "authority over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal every kind of disease and every kind of sickness" (Matt 10:1). In addition to calling and commissioning the twelve, Jesus began to refer to them as apostles (Luke 6:13), apostles meaning one who is sent out (Stein 1992, 267). After the twelve were intentionally selected, Jesus prepared them for their mission by intentionally teaching them about himself and his mission.

36

Intentional teaching. Jesus called the twelve to follow him and invested time to teach them about himself and his mission. Jesus' teaching of the twelve prepared them for the time when he would depart and they would assume authority to shepherd the flock of God. Jesus asked the twelve to believe in him and to spend time following and learning from him (Bruce 1889, 11). The twelve learned about Jesus and his kingdom's purpose by "hearing and seeing the words and works of Christ" day by day as they followed him (Bruce 1889, 41). These twelve listened to Jesus teach in the synagogues (Matt 4:23). Jesus taught the twelve how to interact with persons who were sick (Mark 5:22-42), how to respond to persons in need (Mark 14:13-21), how to pray (Luke 11:1-4), and that he was the Christ and son of the living God (Matt 16:16). He equipped them to serve and lead his people.

Practical application. Jesus encouraged the twelve to put into practice what he taught them. Jesus knew his ministry on earth was limited to only a few years. Therefore, he instructed these twelve to be ready to accept authority to continue his mission. To assure the twelve were ready, Jesus provided opportunities for the twelve to apply what he taught and demonstrated. Jesus sent the twelve out to "to heal every kind of disease and every kind of sickness" (Matt 10:1). Jesus realized the importance for the twelve to become like him and to act in the same manner he acted so that they could continue his work (Matt 10:25).

Summary

Jesus called, taught, and encouraged the twelve to apply what they had learned from him. He prepared the twelve knowing the difficulties they would face, the attacks they would endure, and the great challenge of continuing his mission to change the world. By so doing, Jesus set a pattern for individuals to put into practice what is learned through a teacher. The early church followed Jesus' example of preparing shepherd

leaders through teaching and practical application. The early church in and the church in America continued to employ the earliest methods for teaching and training pastors. The methods used in the United States combine teaching and application through an undergraduate college education and application through observing and working with seasoned pastors.

Historical Background

The method of training used by Jesus was practical and effective in preparing the twelve to shepherd the flock and to build his church. Jesus' example was later followed by the church in equipping pastors to shepherd the flock (1 Tim 1:18, 3:15, and 4:11). A renewed focus in pastoral ministry training occurred during the time of the Reformation under the leadership of Martin Luther. Luther advocated a return to biblical instructions for training pastors with emphasis on the original biblical languages (Muller 1996, 103). Luther's focus on biblical training also impacted the focus of pastoral leadership education in Europe and the United States. Theological education in the United States that purposed to train and equip pastors began with pastors earning a baccalaureate degree and then apprenticing under an experienced pastor for a period of time. With the founding of seminaries during the early 1800s, the focus shifted to the academic training of the pastor with little focus on mentorship or practical education (Hart and Mohler 1996, 15).

Martin Luther's impact. Martin Luther during the early 1600s contributed to the development of Protestant theological education in Europe which ultimately impacted pastoral training in the United States during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Richard Muller noted that Luther had a tremendous impact on reshaping theological curriculum in respect to the original biblical languages and theology in Germany (Muller 1996, 103). The model of education set forth by Luther focused on the original

38

languages and a certain type of theology characterized by faith alone (Luther 1967, 174), Scripture alone (Luther 1967, 217), Christ alone (Luther 1967, 255), and grace alone (Luther 1967, 262). Luther's model continues to impact seminary education today.

From the seventeenth century well into the nineteenth century, Protestant denominations founded most of the colleges in North America; and in the early nineteenth century, starting with Andover Seminary in 1808 (Weber 2008, 66), these denominations began to establish separate theological schools for the training of ministers.

Historian Glenn Miller (Miller 2007) divided the history of theological education in the United States into two periods: pious and professional. Each period reflected a different view of pastoral leadership and theological education for preparing pastors to lead churches.

Pious Period. The Pious Period (1700s-1870) of theological education in America was characterized by a baccalaureate education followed by an internship or apprenticeship with an experienced pastor. Miller held this period revealed "a world in which theological considerations trumped all other approaches to the education of Protestant ministers. Even the rise of cosmopolitan ideals during the Enlightenment did not substantially modify the basic paradigm" (Miller 2007, xxi). Divinity was the dominant focus for pastor education during this time.

In addition, during the Pious Period, the Puritans followed a model of theological education based on the model they experienced in England. The Puritans valued and employed university education as an important part of pastor education. A second essential part of pastor education was the apprenticeship. Before the seminary movement, men pursuing pastoral training began in the university alongside other professionals. According to David Kling (Kling 1996, 132), this model continued into the nineteenth century in North America. During this period, pastors did not receive

specialized training in leading a church. Rather, they learned pastoral leadership under the apprenticeship of an experienced pastor.

Professional Period. The Professional Period (1870-1970) in theological education reflects a greater emphasis on professional training common in other professions, such as law and medicine. The professional period, in contrast to the Pious Period, found seminaries shifting focus from divinity or piety to a focus on training for church leadership. The approach of the pious period on divinity was followed by, and the content of education replaced with, a plurality of theological subjects that involved teachers who were specialists in a particular field. Farley characterized this change as a shift in focus from a heart divine knowledge of God to a more educated or scholarly knowledge of subjects related to theological studies. This Professional Period produced a pastoral ministry that changed from "the minister as comprehensive interpreter and shepherd of faith to manager of a local society or some related institution" (Farley 1983, 11). Glenn Miller pointed out that during this professional period "the minister's work was more like that of a college or university teacher than that of a social worker or business-person. The minister was the resident Christian intellectual, equipped to teach in either pulpit or classroom" (Miller 2007, 16).

William Jeynes asserts that American history shows "seminaries generally placed more emphasis on students exhibiting the character of Christ rather than displaying a high level of esoteric theological information" (Jeynes 2012, 70). Seminaries placed emphasis on growth in student's character because they felt "vast academic and theological information was safest in the hands of the godly" (Jeynes 2012, 71) and they felt "if one's heart was where it should be before God, right theology would follow" (Jeynes 2012, 71). Jeynes asserts leaders believe America is paying a price for not adequately preparing ministers for "the practical realities of ministry" (Christine 2012, 75). Jeynes suggests seminary students graduate with a solid theological

foundation "but they too frequently have a dearth of familiarity with spiritual and practical truths" (Jeynes 2012, 76).

With the founding of seminaries at Andover and Princeton, the seminary replaced the former model of a university education. The seminary was simply an institution that provided education for pastors. Furthermore, this model focused "on training for the ministry at a separate institution after first receiving an undergraduate degree" (Hart and Mohler 1996, 15). Finally, the seminary model of education continued to gain acceptance and was the dominant form of clergy education and training by the mid-1800s.

Aims and Purposes of Seminary Education

From their founding, seminaries were tasked by constituents, boards, and later by accreditation agencies to train and equip effective pastoral leaders. Seminaries continue to engage in the education and preparation of students "for religious leadership" (Carroll et al. 1997, 4). The measure of success for a seminary has been based on whether "their graduates function in the roles that religious communities and the wider society expect them to fill" (Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire 2007, 2). However, if seminary graduates are not prepared to function in these capacities, the seminaries "are failing in their major task" (Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire 2007, 2).

Even though constituents, boards, and accrediting agencies place significant focus on church leadership as an outcome of seminary education, Charles Wood argued that theological education should "cultivate an aptitude for reflection on the quality of one's own and others' leadership as an instrument of the church's witness" (Wood 1994, 19) and not just on the skills required to lead society in its religious communities. He delegated spiritual formation and practical training to the local church and limited theological education in the classroom to cultivating and equipping for reflection on leadership. Wood's emphasis on leadership skills training is a part of an emphasis on the

minister "taking a higher leadership profile in order to revive the churches and evangelize the unchurched" (Witham 2005, 200).

MDiv Curriculum

Individuals involved in the revision of the MDiv have consistently considered the purpose of theological education in the curriculum development process. Richard Niebuhr, Daniel Williams, and James Gustafson, in conjunction with ATS (Association of Theological Schools), reviewed the literature and studied theological education in the 1950s. Regarding the MDiv curriculum, they concluded, "certain studies have always formed the foundation of the course because they stem from the Scripture and tradition of the Christian faith. Study of the Bible, the history of doctrine, the history of the Church, are established elements in all theological education" (Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson 1957, 78).

Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson discovered that over time,

four important changes had taken place in the theological curriculum during the previous generation. Subject matter had been greatly enlarged, partly by the subdivision of traditional studies, partly by the introduction of new courses; the elective system had been generally adopted; provision was being made for a differentiated ministry; changes in educational theory had emphasized the importance of 'learning by doing' and so led to the development of field work programs. (Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson 1957, 20)

This change in emphasis to a philosophy of learning by doing was beginning to take hold as seen by "the requirement that academic work in the classroom and library be accompanied by active participation in church work has been increasingly accepted during the past twenty years. A majority of schools now require their students to do 'field work' on weekends during the school year, during the summer months, and occasionally, during an 'internship' year" (Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson 1957, 22).

Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson also addressed the conflicting ideas of theory and practice. They stated, "The disciplines related to pastoral responsibilities, Homiletics, Pastoral Care, Church Administration, and Religious Education, are

somewhat less sharply defined as to content and method of teaching" (Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson 1957, 79). Even though pastor responsibility courses are less defined than biblical studies, church history, and theology, these courses remain relevant to the curriculum. Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson argued the fields of study of Homiletics, religious education, and church administration are often referred to as practical in contrast to theoretical. They suggested that labeling theology and the Bible as not being practical is as wrong as advocating that religious education and preaching have no body of theory. These fields relate directly to the meaning of the Christian faith and outline specific functions in the work of a pastor.

The Association of Theological Schools (ATS) set standards for the MDiv curriculum offered by member seminaries who were preparing graduates to lead effectively. The standards set by ATS for member institutions are designed to prepare pastors to perform identifiable tasks in their pastoral roles. Standard four, the capacity for ministerial and public leadership, directly addresses theological education for leadership when it states "The [MDiv] program shall provide theological reflection on and education for the practice of ministry. These activities should cultivate the capacity for leadership in both ecclesial and public contexts" (Association of Theological Schools 2012, G40).

Developed over time and built on the wisdom of the past, ATS MDiv standards include four areas of content that drive the outcomes of member institutions: religious heritage, cultural context, personal and spiritual formation, and capacity for ministerial and public leadership (Association of Theological Schools 2012, G40). New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary was highlighted by ATS as a seminary that has integrated the four areas of content with their mission. In addition, New Orleans Seminary has identified that the mission of these four areas is realized "through engagement in specific opportunities as provided by the school's curriculum" (Association of Theological

Schools 2006, 13). For example, NOBTS seminary offers a curriculum designed to meet

the standard in leadership. The following are specific goals of this standard:

1. *Interpersonal Skills:* To perform pastoral care effectively, with skills in
    communication and conflict management

2. *Servant Leadership:* To serve churches effectively through team ministry

3. *Spiritual and Character Formation:* To provide moral leadership by modeling   and
    mentoring Christian character and devotion (Association of Theological Schools
    2006, 13).

Tension in Seminary Education

Churches, pastors, and educators expect seminaries to prepare graduates with a

capacity for effective pastoral leadership.   However, scholars lament the disconnect

between 'academic' scholarship and the theological needs of ministry (Hiestand 2008,

355). Hillman concluded that seminaries are "failing to train leaders of the twenty-first

century" (Hillman 2008, 2-3). There is a tension between seminaries and churches. This

tension exists due to the different cultures of the seminary and the church resulting in

seminary life differing "from life in the church" (Cole 2008, vxii). Classroom

assignments, papers to write, tests to take, and professors' expectations to meet are all

part of the seminary experience. On the other hand, delivering sermons, visiting

members, leading evangelism, performing weddings, and participating in community

events mark the life of the pastor in the church. Relationships between students and

students, students and faculty, and faculty and students with administration are all a part

of the seminary experience, whereas, relationships in the church are different from

seminary relationships because they include pastor to member, member to member,

pastor and deacons, and pastor and history and culture. The tension of a perceived

disconnect has led students to lament that their seminary "studies are irrelevant to the

practical demands" of pastoral leadership (Rees 2005, 101). Scholars conclude that "the

fundamental nature of a school and the patterns of work that accrue to schools are

incongruent with the fundamental nature of the church and the practices" that are required of pastors (Aleshire 2008, 19).

There is also tension between supervised experiences in ministry and actual pastoral leadership experience. The academy or seminary setting provides limited opportunities for students to shepherd a flock. Therefore, ATS requires MDiv graduates to complete a supervised experience in ministry, ranging from a practical hands-on class to an internship that immerses the student in ministry practice with an experienced pastor.

Seminaries and churches have addressed the tensions and the perceived limits of seminary. It seems that seminaries are faced with two apparent conflicting tasks including "both practical application and the theological equipping for ministry" (Hillman 2008, 4). Seminaries, for a period of time, responded with more internship courses and churches responded with "apprenticeship-style training" (Whitman 2005, 198). Whitmer argued that field education provides seminary students the opportunity to convert knowledge from the classroom "into hands-on training so that the student will be ready to move into" pastoral leadership (Whitmer 2008, 37). Internship courses and programs provided a "link between theory and practice" (Hillman 2008, 4). The link between classroom and congregation can be completely bridged only when seminary graduates accept the call to shepherd a church.

Southern Baptists

Southern Baptists have engaged in theological education since shortly after their inception in 1845, with the founding of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1859. Today, Southern Baptists have six seminaries, and five of which are among the top ten largest seminaries based on enrollment among ATS accredited schools. These are Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

(Association of Theological Schools 2007, 5). Enrolled in these six seminaries are 5,180 MDiv students (ATS 2012). One observer reported, "One in seven U.S. seminary students attends a Southern Baptist theology school" (Witham 2005, 82).

Southern Baptist churches do not require a seminary degree for ordination in the ministry. Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson noted "in some denominations [pastors] may already be ordained to the ministry before he begins his theological study. In some he may receive a license to preach and perform certain other pastoral duties while he completes his ministerial degree. In others such as the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Reformed, graduation from seminary is usually prerequisite to preaching and parish responsibilities" (Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson 1957, 114-15). Southern Baptists do not require seminary education for licensing and ordination. Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson also recognized that a number of American Protestant denominations depend upon pastors who are working toward degrees to serve churches as pastors. These denominations include Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists, and Disciples of Christ.

Southern Baptists responded to the tensions in seminary education by following the advice of R. Albert Mohler. Mohler challenged seminaries to avoid lamenting the growth of church-based models of leadership training. Instead, seminaries "must learn again to listen to the congregations and to gain from them the knowledge necessary for seminaries to prepare ministers 'well furnished' for ministry in the local church" (Mohler 1996, 280-81). New models of seminary education have emerged to bridge the gap between the seminary and the church among Southern Baptists. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has partnered with congregations to provide seminary core curriculum courses to students while the students are immersed in church life. For example, Southern Seminary has partnered with Lakeview Baptist Church in Auburn, Alabama. In the Lakeview program, students are enrolled in courses taught on-site in Auburn by faculty from Louisville and "intern" at Lakeview in every aspect of

church life from nursery to adult ministries. In addition, Southern Seminary's Ministry Apprenticeship Program goes beyond field education classes by linking ministry experience, expert observation, and instructor interaction. Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary instituted the Great Commission Equipping Network "to provide the highest level of practical theological experience possible for future leaders" (http://sebts.edu/Equip/equip_sub/default.aspx). In addition, Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary offers leadership practicum courses as a part the MDiv curriculum that places students under a mentor pastor in a local church. The students are guided through various pastoral leadership responsibilities and are evaluated at the end of the course. Southern Baptist seminaries continue to respond to the challenge and develop new partnerships and delivery venues to provide students with a MDiv education to prepare graduates to be effective pastors.

Seminary Student Pastors

Seminary students do not begin their seminary experience as blank slates. To the contrary, students arrive at seminary with various types of life experiences "relationally, educationally, and vocationally" (McFayden 2008, 3). Seminary students also arrive at seminary "from situations in which they have already been serving as pastors for significant periods of time" (Ricciuti 2003, 146). Seminary students serving as pastors are often older students (Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire 2007, 13). Kohl concluded "training for ministry should occur in ministry, rather than before ministry. Students need the time to integrate into their lives that which they are learning" (Kohl 2001, 35). Further, Long asserted that good ministry is found "where pastors stand with one foot firmly planted in their theological education and the other foot as firmly planted in the parish" to allow the challenges to shape their pastoral practice (Long 2008, 5).

Many seminary students serve as pastors before and during their seminary experience. Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson acknowledged in their 1950s study that nearly every seminary student was engaged in some type of course or position in a church that provided an arena for sharpening their pastoral leadership skills in a church context. They recognized that many seminary students served in some capacity and that "many seminary students are pastors of rural churches during their seminary course" (Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson 1957, 110). Additionally they noted the uniqueness of pastoral on-the-job training that is not available to the professionals in law and medicine. Pastors gain on-the-job training unlike other professionals such as "law or medical" students who do not fully practice their profession before and during professional education (Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson 1957, 115). Little has changed since the 1950s because seminary students "may simultaneously be a parent, wife, and teaching assistant as well as student. Another student at the seminary may be a husband, a local pastor in a Methodist church, and work nights at a convenience store" (Lincoln 2010, 212)

Seminary students who serve churches before or during seminary are positioned to enrich their education and the churches they serve. Scholars recognize the value of contextual learning and the need to keep seminary students from being isolated from church communities (Harder 2007, 127). New delivery systems offered by seminaries provide opportunities for pastors that are serving churches to "equip themselves for ministry without suffering the financial and emotional cost of relation to a traditional seminary" (Hines et al. 2009, 33) and thereby continue to integrate their pastoral leadership with their seminary education. New seminary education delivery systems provide value to "practicing pastors" and "the church gains from this emerging pool of ministerial candidates already possessing valuable pastoral experiences" (Hines et al. 2009, 33). New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary provides distant seminary education through an extension center system. Extension centers are located in areas

48

outside of driving distance to the New Orleans campus. These extension centers "provide schedules that meet" the needs of local pastors (Dukes 1999, 117). Instruction is provided through on campus professors that travel to the centers, qualified adjunct professors from the area surrounding the center, and on campus professors through digital technology (Dukes 1999, 118). Even though New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary was the focus of an academic journal article, all six SBC seminaries deliver extension and online MDiv programs for pastors who do not or cannot relocate to a seminary. In addition, there are seminaries moving to or already providing most of the MDiv curriculum via online instruction.

Seminary Graduates

Students who attend seminary desire to graduate prepared to go directly into the ministry and lead their churches effectively. However, for too many seminary graduates report what is learned from seminary classes "remains in the cognitive realm" instead of being put into action and find they are not prepared for the demands of ministry (Selzer 2008, 25). Scholars have noted the value of pastoral leadership experience in leading to effectiveness. Success in the first years of pastoral ministry requires (before, during, or after seminary graduation) "learning the politics of ministry practice that involves knowledge that is constructed on the job" (Burns and Cervero 2002, 315). Pastors enter their first years with "eager anticipation, excited about the ministry that lies before them, and committed to serving their God, yet they are at risk" (Meek et al. 2003, 345). In addition, there is no systematic "literature about how seminary changes students" (Lincoln 2010, 208) as they become seminary graduates.

Researchers found that the disconnect between seminary and pastoral leadership effectiveness of seminary graduates is wider because practical experiences in the curriculum "are not structured or taught well enough" (Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire 2007, 24). Also, noted earlier, researchers admitted "students may not be ready to learn

49

about practice until they are actually on the job and immersed in practice" (Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire 2007, 29).

The disconnect between seminary and churches is exacerbated because seminaries and churches "become separate worlds and grow different cultures that harbor stereotypes of each other" (Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire 2007, 30). In addition, the disconnect between seminaries and churches is caused by the "polarized and unpredictable church communities that may not value theological" education (Hess 2008, 14). Seminary graduates enter churches ready to serve as pastoral leaders where "both their organizations and their parishioners have great, and sometimes divergent, expectations" (Meek et al. 2003, 344). The best skill seminaries can provide graduates is the "ability to adapt to a changing" concept of ministry (Drummond 2008, 63). Dash, Dukes, and Smith concluded, that "what emerges from this literature and from the discussions we have had is that there is no getting around the fact that theological education is at its best and pastoral formation most effective when there is an intentional partnership between the church—on both the judicatory level and as congregations—and the theological schools" (Dash, Dukes, and Smith 2005, 73). These researchers suggest that the need for partnership between churches and theological schools is necessary because the church is an entirely different setting and context than a seminary classroom. The church needs to be the focus of pastoral formation because the church is the context in which pastors lead.

The historical record informs present purposes and practices of theological education in America. ATS requires MDiv curriculum that drives seminaries to prepare pastors to serve churches with competent leadership. Some seminary students engaged in theological education pastor churches prior to and concurrent with their training. Serving a church during seminary provides "in context learning" in the local church. Southern

Baptists engage pastors and future pastors in theological education through ATS accredited seminaries which in part prepare them to lead churches.

Summary

The historical background of theological education in America is linked to the greater Protestant Reformation initiated by Martin Luther. The Reformation impacted theological education in America in the past and continues to impact theological education today. Additionally, the pious and professional periods of theological education in the United States influenced pastoral ministry and seminary education with this influence continuing to the present. Seminaries and churches adjusted to and navigated through the tensions in seminary education. Southern Baptists have engaged in seminary education and are responding to the tensions in seminary education with new models and methods. Finally, the aims and purposes of seminary education have shaped the development of the MDiv curriculum.

While pursuing the MDiv, seminary student pastors enrich their seminary education and the churches they serve. These student pastors are able to limit tensions between seminary and church. MDiv curriculum-required supervised experiences in ministry help close the disconnect between seminary classroom and congregation but do not completely close the gap; however, seminaries and churches have developed new models to help close the gap between theology and practice. The disconnect is evidenced by perceptions of seminary graduates who acknowledged their seminary education was limited in preparing them for effective pastoral leadership (Rees 2005, 101).

<div align="center">

Previous Research

</div>

Christian leadership education, seminary education in general, and ways students and graduates are affected by the seminary in particular are three areas of pastoral education in which researchers have focused attention. Foster (2010) focused

research in the area of post-baccalaureate leadership studies, both seminaries and non-seminaries. Foster reported two important points that relate to this research. First, he reported that of the programs offering post-baccalaureate leadership training, 20% are Southern Baptist (Foster 2010, 168). Second, and more important to this research, Foster reported that research skills were the number one competency and "ranked number two in course frequency." Foster concluded that in practical leadership situations, this competency could be the most important leadership competency of post-baccalaureate programs (Foster 2010, 187). Furthermore, Foster recommended that this competency be leveraged in practical leadership "situations, especially crisis situations, where such skills could prove transformative" (Foster 2010, 187). McKenna, Boyd, and Yost also studied pastoral leadership development in particular and found that pastoral leaders acquire agility through lessons learned through experiences (McKenna, Boyd, and Yost 2007, 190). Finally, Foster and McKenna, Boyd, and Yost combine to show that leadership education and development are taught in various programs and that a part of leadership development is the practice of pastoral leadership.

Master of Divinity course requirements for experiences in ministry may be inadequate. Seminary students may learn course content through these practical courses but may not "learn about practice" unless they are immersed in the practice serving as a church pastor (Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire 2007, 29). The barrier between what is learned and what is needed to practice effective pastoral leadership is often "practical and interpersonal" (Selzer 2008, 46). Practical and interpersonal barriers cannot be overcome through content taught in a practicum or supervised experience in ministry. To the contrary, learning in the role of pastor before and during seminary is needed for greater effectiveness because on the job training is essential to pastoral leadership development (McKenna, Boyd, and Yost 2007, 191).

From Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafuson in the middle of the twentieth century to Foster, Dahill, Goleman, and Tolintino early in the twenty-first century, researchers examined seminary education to determine if it adequately prepares graduates to lead churches effectively. One examination of how seminaries are doing found that more practical instruction is needed but may not be effective because "students may not be ready to learn about practice until they are actually on the job and deeply immersed in pastoral leadership (Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire 2007, 29). Studies focusing on seminary graduates from individual seminary models have been conducted including Finke and Dougherty (2002), Nelson (2005), Harder (2007), and Selzer (2008).

Recent attempts to make seminary education more practical have produced various seminary training models. Kiedis (2009) categorized and produced a taxonomy of seven seminary training models: applied, apprentice, classic, distance education, extension site, hybrid, and partnership (Kiedis 2009, 143). First, the applied model is "praxis-centered approach" and is "philosophically and programmatically integrative, intentionally combining theory and practice" (Kiedis 2009, 142). With this model the importance of the "classroom as a catalyst cannot be understated" (Kiedis 2009, 144). Mars Hills Graduate School is an example of the applied model. Second, the apprentice model "has roots in the early North American practice called *reading divinity*" and "utilizes a field based, comprehensive, full-immersion, ministry-centered pedagogy for a significant portion of the degree program" (Kiedis 2009, 174). The Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary program for missionaries is a good example of the apprentice model. Third, the classical model "places the academic and curricular focus in a teacher-centered, residential classroom, which is primarily knowledge or content-driven" (Kiedis 2009, 151). Kiedis listed Knox Theological Seminary as the exemplar of the classical model. Fourth, the distance model was a "burgeoning model provided accessible theological education" that involves "educational and instructional activity in which

students are separated from faculty and other students for a significant portion of their degree program" (Kiedis 2009, 156). Bethel Seminary is listed as an example of the distance model. Fifth, the extension site model "provides opportunities to engage in theological education without moving to the primary campus" (Kiedis 2009, 159). The extension center is a "separate until generally governed by the parent institution, but with local facilities and administration, a more contextualized faculty, and fewer curricular options" (Kiedis 2009, 159). The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary is named as an example of this model. Sixth, the hybrid model "incorporates both traditional classroom instruction, and modular or distance education modes in the degree program and coursework" (Kiedis 2009, 163). Kiedis lists Regent University School of Divinity as the exemplar hybrid model. Finally, the partnership model "provides opportunities for intentional institutional collaboration" between the seminary and other institutions such as a church or hospital (Kiedis 2009, 166). The exemplar seminaries listed for this model are Dallas Theological Seminary and George Fox Evangelical Seminary.

Kiedis found that there was no significant relationship between a graduate's seminary model and pastoral effectiveness (Kiedis 2009, 192). He also found that seminary graduates of the apprentice model (a model focused on field-based education in contrast to a classroom focused model) were least likely to be employed after five years of graduation (Kiedis 2009, 205). He speculated the inclusion of counseling program graduates in the apprentice model may explain why graduates of this model were less likely to be employed after five years.

In addition to Kiedis' research on various models, Kevin Ellington conducted research on the partnership model from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. One of the first partnership model programs began between Southern Seminary and Lakeview Baptist Church in Auburn, Alabama. Al Jackson, pastor of Lakeview Baptist Church, proposed the partnership with various seminaries to begin an "on-church-site" seminary

program awarding a MDiv upon completion. Southern Seminary approved the proposal.

The Lakeview program was organized around a cohort of MDiv students and welcomed

the first cohort in 1996 (Ellington 2004, 67). The program was established to "provide a

classical theological education" through Southern Seminary and Lakeview Baptist

Church to "educate and train men for vocational church ministry (Ellington 2004, 67-68).

A cohort of no more than twelve students begin and progress through the program. This

new "paradigm" allowed students to "experience a classical theological education while

expanding their knowledge beyond theory" (Ellington 2004, 69).

As a part of this alliance between Southern Seminary and Lakeview Baptist

Church, a team of faculty delivers classical classroom instruction. The team of

professors includes on campus faculty from Southern Seminary to teach core academic

subjects and Pastor Jackson to teach pastoral ministry courses and mentor the students.

During the three year program, Lakeview interns are mentored in the areas of

"administration and missions, student ministry, youth ministry, evangelism and prayer,

congregation care, Christian education, music, children's ministry and preschool

ministry" (Ellington 2004, 71). The value of this type of partnership between seminary

and church is in the ability to teach "within the context of actual ministry in order to

maximize learning effectiveness" (Ellington 2004, 94). Although currently there are

several seminary partnership models providing MDiv education, the Lakeview Baptist

and Southern Baptist Theological Seminary partnership has been the subject of

Ellington's research.

Bethel Seminary's In-Ministry MDiv program has also been the focus of

previous research. The purpose of Nghi Tran's research was to examine an online MDiv

pastoral leadership program to determine if transformative learning was taking place. He

used Jack Merizow's "transformative learning theory as a framework" for this qualitative

study (Tran 2011, 136). The In-Ministry program at Bethel Seminary "was designed for

non-resident students already in ministry. This program uses a mixture of distance courses, local on-site mentored leadership courses and on-campus intensives taught at the main campus" (Tran 2011, 59). The population in Tran's research included current and recent graduates who answered survey questions online and participated in interviews conducted by the researcher. In addition, as a result of the interviews, Tran chose two online courses for analysis (Tran 2011, 136). Tran's research found 80% of the students in the In-Ministry MDiv program reported having "a perspective transformation during their study" (Tran 2011, 136). Tran defined a perspective transformation, using Merizow's definition as a framework, as a "transformation in a person's habits of mind or frames of reference which make a person view his life and relationship from a new lens" (Tran 2011, 136). Tran further concluded from his research that conditions for transformative learning included the "In-Ministry and integrative learning strategy which were influenced by two other elements including physical presence and divine element" (Tran 2011, 164).

In addition to research related to seminary models, recent research has been conducted "to provide a better understanding of the leadership skills required by pastors to effectively lead the church as well as to provide an understanding of the perceived effectiveness of seminary in preparing pastors with those skills" (Christine 2010, 137). David Christine interviewed pastors that completed post-graduate seminary education, who were serving in two Texas Baptist associations: Dallas Baptist Association and Kauf-Van Baptist Association. The pastors Christine interviewed praised "their seminary in its ability to prepare them for the ministry, but they each stated that seminary did not give them the practical leadership skills that they needed to accomplish their mission" (Christine 2010, 149). Christine found pastors felt their seminary education experience was limited because the lack of interaction with practitioners who had navigated the transition from classroom to parish. The pastors interviewed stated seminaries "may

have to make a unique impact on future pastors by utilizing the alumni to assist in mentoring new ministers" during seminary or during their first pastorate (Christine 2010, 150). In addition, the pastors interviewed "expressed a desire that seminaries would give the students a more accurate expectation of the ministry" (Christine 2010, 153).

Christine concluded the pastors interviewed desired "that seminary would better prepare current and future ministers by providing practical, hands-on experience for students" (Christine 2010, 156). In addition, Christine found two areas seminaries can explore to improve the curriculum included people skills and administration skills (Christine 2010, 148). Specifically, pastors felt seminaries needed to teach skills "regarding how to deal with people, how to manage church administration, and by offering a realistic expectation regarding what the pastors will face in the pastorate" (Christine 2010, 187). Christine also concluded from his interviews "that seminary did not prepare [pastors] regarding pastoral leadership skills" but the seminary did prepare "them with the necessary foundation to obtain those leadership skills" (Christine 2010, 184).

Recent research has also focused on American Baptist pastors. Specially, Kirkpatrick Cohall and Bruce Cooper researched American Baptist pastors in relation to "their seminary and practical education, and their role as spiritual, organizational, and administrative leaders" (Cohall and Cooper 2010, 29). These researchers also desired to "add new knowledge to the body of existing literature on clergy role, their overall impact on job satisfaction, effectiveness, and vocational longevity" (Cohall and Cooper 2010, 29). The American Baptist denomination is the fourth largest Baptist denomination in the United States and is composed of 51% white and 46% black (Cohall and Cooper 2010, 30). As with other Baptist denominations, pastors are not required to earn a MDiv before serving a church as pastor. The demographics of this study showed 65% of white pastors earned a MDiv and 32% of black pastors earned a MDiv (Cohall and Cooper 2010, 38).

The findings of Cohall and Cooper's research demonstrated age of the pastor made a difference in "how pastors see job satisfaction, effectiveness, and vocational longevity" in that 26-36 year olds reported the "greatest degree of satisfaction" (Cohall and Cooper 2010, 39). The findings also showed "that Black pastors were more likely to believe that they received a quality seminary preparation than their White counterparts" (Cohall and Cooper 2010, 40). Cohall and Cooper found church size played no difference in job satisfaction, effectiveness, and longevity. But they did find that pastors with the greatest measure of effectiveness were among "pastors who served in churches with membership between 700 and 900" (Cohall and Cooper 2010, 43). Their study showed "that church involvement prior to seminary contributes significantly to pastoral preparation, which leads to an increase in job satisfaction and effectiveness" (Cohall and Cooper 2010, 44). They also reported preparation for ministry correlated strongly with "spiritual roles that a pastor plays" (Cohall and Cooper 2010, 45).

Researchers have also focused on seminary students and seminary graduates to learn more about how seminary affects them and prepares them for pastoral leadership. However, a systematic literary narrative that addresses how the seminary experience changes students does not exist (Lincoln 2010, 208), and there are few "studies of how theological education effects students" (Lincoln 2010, 218). Despite this lack of literature related to the effects of seminary study on students, it is apparent that today's seminary student "may be a husband, a local pastor" and work an additional job while attending seminary (Lincoln 2010, 212). The experience of students who are married and pastor churches while working on their degree may be substantially different from the student who is single and not engaged as a church pastor during seminary.

Hillman conducted a study of seminary students at Dallas Theological Seminary to identify "differences in leadership practices between master's level students at Dallas Theological Seminary" (Hillman 2006, 141). This study relied on student self-

assessment and used the Leadership Practices Inventory-Self inventory (Hillman 2006, 146). Hillman found that current ministry experience was a significant predictor of higher leadership scores (Hillman 2006, 153). In addition, this study demonstrated that ministry experience raised the self-perceived level of leadership of MDiv students. However, this study was limited to currently enrolled seminary students and did not address seminary graduates. This research will focus on pastors serving SBC churches that earned the MDiv from an ATS accredited seminary.

Dash, Dukes, and Smith, in their second order research relating to the first years of ministry after seminary, noted that many church traditions permit pastors to serve churches prior to and concurrent with seminary training. They suggested further research is needed because the experience of these seminary graduates would be different (Dash, Dukes, and Smith 2005, 75). They noted the culture clash between the academy and the church after graduation would be similar to all students and that seminary graduates with prior experience or concurrent experience "would be moving back and forth between the two worlds while pursuing their theological education" (Dash, Dukes, and Smith 2005, 75). They reached the following conclusions: (1) there is a gap between seminary education and the graduate's first years in ministry (p. 71); (2) there needs to be a relationship between the church and the seminary—the congregation is the primary sphere of ministry and needs to be the focus of education; (3) seminaries are no longer the place of formation they once were (p. 73); (4) and there is a group of seminary graduates that bring considerable pastoral leadership experience with them to seminary (75). Dash, Dukes, and Smith suggested that further research needs to be focused on the pastor that attends seminary with prior pastoral leadership experience or concurrent experience with seminary education (Dash, Dukes, and Smith 2005, 75).

Void in the Literature

A review of the literature on this topic demonstrates the void noted by Dash, Dukes, and Smith (2005). They recognized that much research has focused on the first years of pastoral leadership after seminary graduation. However, they also noted the need to examine the "strengths and benefits" of pastoral leadership experience before and concurrent with seminary education (Dash, Dukes, and Smith 2005, 75). There is a void in the literature relating to prior pastoral leadership experience and effective pastoral leadership of seminary graduates. Previous research examined pastoral activities and necessary competencies for effective pastoral leadership. Previous research also focused on pastoral leadership education through leadership training in general and seminary education in particular. Kiedis (2009) examined the relationship between a particular seminary model and effectiveness and Hillman (2010) explored leadership effectiveness among students of Dallas Theological Seminary. This research will explore leadership effectiveness of seminary graduates from the six Southern Baptist seminaries in relation to no prior pastoral experience, prior pastoral experience, and concurrent pastoral experience with seminary education.

Profile of Current Study

Members of Southern Baptist Convention churches expect seminary graduates immediately upon graduation to lead churches in an effective way. Immediately upon graduation when a pastor enters his first church there may be a "honeymoon" period that lasts a few weeks or months. But there remains the expectation that pastors can lead upon graduating with a MDiv degree from seminary. This expectation is based on the perception that seminaries prepare pastors for the effective pastoral leadership. Similarly, seminary students expect upon graduation they will be ready for effective pastoral leadership. The transition from seminary classroom to pastoral responsibility is challenging and cannot be completed solely in the classroom. The perception that

60

seminary graduates with prior pastoral leadership experience, either before or during seminary, are better able to navigate the challenging transition from classroom to congregation will be examined. This research addresses the void in the literature relating to the relationship between prior pastoral leadership experience and effective pastoral leadership among seminary graduates.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN

The focus of this research was the relationship between prior and concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary pastoral leadership effectiveness. In this study, pastoral leadership effectiveness of Southern Baptist pastors and seminary graduates was measured by the Lewis Pastoral Leadership Inventory (LPLI). The population consisted of seminary graduates serving as lead pastor of an SBC church for no less than one year and no more than ten years after earning the Master of Divinity (MDiv). As a part of this research, the literature review informed the development of the four research questions. This chapter presents the design overview, population, sample delimitations, limits of generalization, research instrumentation, and research procedures that were approved for completion of this study.

Purpose

The purpose of the sequential study was to examine the relationship between no experience, prior, and concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary effectiveness within the first ten years of pastoral leadership experience.

Research Question Synopsis

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What relationship, if any, exists between pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary effectiveness within the first ten years as measured by the LPLI?

2. What difference in post seminary leadership effectiveness, if any exists, among pastors with no prior, prior only, concurrent only, and pastors with both prior and concurrent experience?

3. What relationship, if any, exists between select demographics and pastoral leadership

effectiveness of seminary graduates?

Design Overview

This research is a mixed method study (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005) that examined the relationship between prior pastoral leadership experience and concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary pastoral leadership effectiveness within the first ten years of graduating from seminary a Cooperative Program supported Southern Baptist Convention seminary. The population was later expanded to include graduates serving SBC churches as pastor who graduated with a Master of Divinity from Association of Theological Schools accredited seminaries to include more SBC pastors with similar MDiv education. The pastor rating version of the LPLI (Appendix 1), a multi-source assessment instrument, was used to quantify pastoral leadership effectiveness in character, competency, and contribution through self-assessment. Follow-up interviews were conducted by the researcher to ascertain further insights and to qualify the quantitative data collected via the LPLI. The LPLI is a two-part instrument that addresses the demographic profile and the leadership inventory of pastors.

The population of this research consisted of lead pastors who graduated from seminary with no less than one year and no more than ten years post seminary pastoral leadership experience after earning the MDiv. The researcher contacted personnel from the six Southern Baptist Convention Cooperative program supported seminaries, state denominational leaders, associational missionaries, Lifeway Research, and other pastors not in the population to generate a list of pastors who meet the inclusion criteria. Members of the population who were referred to the researcher or who contacted the researcher directly were invited by email to participate in this research, provided instructions for participating, and an online link to complete the LPLI.

Upon request of the researcher, the Lewis Center for Church Leadership granted permission to use the LPLI for this study. The researcher used Survey Monkey

to host the online version of the LPLI and for data collection. The first part of the LPLI gathered demographic information on participants and their church and the second part was the leadership effectiveness inventory. The data collected from completed LPLI surveys via Survey Monkey was statistically analyzed and presented in chapter 4.

Population

The population considered in this research consisted of lead pastors who have earned the MDiv from an ATS accredited seminary within the last ten years and who currently serve in a SBC affiliated church located in the United States. Pastors in the population had no less than one year and no more than ten years pastoral leadership experience after graduation. Southern Baptist pastors are part of a unique group of pastors that are not required to graduate from seminary before serving a church as lead pastor. This group of seminary graduates is unlike pastors in other denominations that are required to complete seminary before serving a church as lead pastor. However, graduates of SBC seminaries and other closely affiliated seminaries experience similar doctrinal and practical education experience during their seminary education.

The number of pastors in the population can be identified by the number of churches and pastors. The most recent Annual Church Profile, data collected annually from SBC churches, listed 46,034 churches. The congregational study, *Southern Baptist Congregations Today*, reported 83% of SBC churches have a pastor at any given time (Jones 2001, 27). The study also reported 40% of pastors had earned the MDiv (Jones 2001, 29). Applying the 40% MDiv completion that Jones reported, there are 15,453 pastors serving SBC churches. Lifeway Christian Research of the Southern Baptist Convention reported in 2007 average age of SBC church pastors. Combining the two age groups, 30-39 and 40-49, and considering these age groups represent the largest number of MDiv graduates these age groups represent 42% of pastors. Therefore, the estimated

64

population of seminary graduates serving Southern Baptist Convention churches as pastor for this study is 6,490.

Sample and Delimitations

The purposive sample method was utilized in the study. Purposive sampling selects people to be part of the sample "for a particular *purpose*" (Leedy and Ormrod 2005, 206). Purposive sampling is appropriate for various types of research including this research because there is no list available for randomly selecting members from the population (Leedy and Ormrod 2005, 206). Whether one uses the number of graduates from SBC seminaries over a ten year period or the number of pastors serving SBC churches after earning the MDiv, the number of pastors needing to complete the LPLI for a statistically significant return required three hundred fifty to four hundred completed surveys.

The researcher contacted personnel from Southern Baptist Convention supported seminaries, state convention leaders, associational missionaries, and pastors not included in the population to identify members of the population for inclusion in the sample. The seminary personnel, denominational leaders, associational missionaries, and pastors were asked to invite pastors to participate in the study or provide contact information of pastors in the population to the researcher. The researcher emailed referred pastors on the list to introduce the research and invite them to participate in the research study. Pastors were invited to participate in the research by self-assessing his leadership effectiveness and also by inviting lay observers to assess his leadership effectiveness with the LPLI. If seminary personnel, denominational leaders, associational missionaries, and pastors were not comfortable providing contact information to the researcher, participants could invite members of the population to contact the researcher for more information or invite them to directly participate in the study by accessing LPLI on the Survey Monkey website.

The lack of positive response to the email sent to denominational and seminary leaders led the researcher to pursue additional avenues to enlist pastors in the sample for this research. The researcher telephoned key leaders at each of the six SBC seminaries. One seminary agreed to include an introduction and invitation to the researcher in their alumni email newsletter. Appeals also were made on behalf of the researcher by one state convention executive director. The director's appeal resulted in two additional state directors inviting pastors in their state conventions to participate.

Associational missionaries from across the SBC invited pastors to participate and also reported the fact they had no members of the population in their respective associations. The researcher contacted by phone two-thirds of the associational missionaries in the state of Alabama. Of these associations, less than 16% of pastors serving churches in these associations earned an MDiv regardless of the year of graduation. Associational missionaries reported they did not have any pastors in the population serving in their association. In addition, the researcher attended SBC annual meetings and state conventions to enlist pastors to participate.

The researcher planned to include lay observer ratings in this study to compare with pastor ratings. Through the efforts listed above only three lay observers rated their pastor's effectiveness by completing the LPLI. Repeated attempts were made to enlist a greater number of lay observers rating their pastor's effectiveness. Only one seminary supported by the SBC Cooperative Program agreed to participate by including an invitation in their alumni email newsletter. This SBC seminary agreed to participate with one condition. The condition limited the researcher in collecting contact information for follow up with participating seminary graduates. The SBC seminary approved emailing their graduates inviting them to participate in the study after the researcher agreed to the stipulated condition. In addition, after eighteen months and numerous attempts at enlisting pastors and lay persons, the supervising committee approved seeking and

66

collecting pastor self rating. Upon request from the researcher, the Lewis Center for Pastoral Leadership granted permission to employ only LPLI rating by pastors.

The researcher emailed participating pastors to share the online link to the LPLI and instructions for pastors on how to assess his leadership effectiveness using the LPLI. The sample was delimited to lead pastors serving SBC churches and does not include other church staff.

After receiving a total of 114 pastor completed LPLI surveys, the researcher apprised his supervising committee. The committee approved adjusting the research plan to include a qualitative element to produce further data from a mixed method study. The researcher invited, by email, pastors who had completed the LPLI and who reported an email address, to participate further in the research study by answering follow-up questions. The researcher was not able to follow up with pastors who responded to the invitation from the seminary that agreed to introduce this research to graduates through an alumni email newsletter. The questions were developed from the research findings, comments from the committee, and from consultation with pastoral leadership experts. Twenty pastors responded to the invitation, ten with prior experience and ten without prior experience pastoral leadership experience. The interviews were conducted by telephone, recorded electronically with the Dictaphone App for Apple devices, and transcribed for analysis.

Limitations of Generalization

The findings of the research may not necessarily generalize to the following: (1) non-Southern Baptist Convention lead pastors; (2) church staff members that are not lead pastors; (3) SBC pastors that did not attend or graduate from seminary; (4) seminary graduates of other non-SBC supported seminaries or divinity schools.

The findings will generalize to who participated in the research process. The findings may also be transferable to members of the population that were not included in

the sample, seminary graduates from other denominations and seminaries that permit persons to serve churches as pastor before seminary graduation, and seminary graduates with or without prior pastoral leadership experience.

Research Instrumentation

This research study assessed pastoral leadership effectiveness with the LPLI (see appendix 1). The LPLI was developed by the Lewis Center for Church Leadership, Wesley Seminary, in Washington, DC. The LPLI is a multi-source instrument that combines "self appraisal with the feedback of observers who are familiar with the pastor's work. The result is a personalized report summarizing how you see your strengths and weaknesses and how your observers see them" (Lewis Center, lpli.org). The LPLI is based on a threefold definition of ministry effectiveness. The threefold definition includes character, competence, and contribution (church leadership II.pdf). The LPLI was field tested by the Lewis Center for Church Leadership and validated through two pilot studies involving United Methodist pastors between 2006 and 2008. The field test demonstrated a coefficient alpha of .80. The initial pilot study involved over 500 Methodist pastors and the second pilot study included 621 Methodist pastors. The researcher will report the reliability for the existing population in the analysis of findings.

The LPLI is a two-part survey instrument (see appendix 2). Part one gathers demographic information on participants. The Lewis Center for Church Leadership permitted the researcher to customize the demographic questions to gain insights related to Southern Baptist Convention pastors. The demographic section ascertained data through fourteen questions: (1) last name, optional, (2) name of Baptist association where church is located, (3) age of the pastor, (4) race of the pastor, (5) years in current church, (6) full-time or part-time status, (7) seminary graduate, (8) type of seminary degree, (9) name of seminary, (10) year of graduation, (11) number of years serving as lead pastor

before attending seminary, (12) number of years serving as lead pastor during seminary, (13) number of years serving as lead pastor after seminary graduation, and (14) zip code. This demographic information characterized participating pastors in the sample.

Research Procedures

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary Research Ethics Committee granted permission to conduct the research before the researcher proceeded. The Lewis Center for Church Leadership granted permission to utilize the LPLI and to limit the responses to pastors only.

The researcher emailed Southern Baptist Convention Cooperative Program supported seminary personnel, state convention leaders, associational missionaries, and pastors to identify pastors in the population. The email of introduction asked these leaders to identify members of the population and to either forward the population member's contact information to the researcher or to invite population members to participate in the research study by accessing the LPLI on Survey Monkey. Seminary personnel, convention leaders, associational missionaries, and pastors used U. S. postal service, email, newsletters, alumni boards, websites, or other means of communication to introduce the research study and invite graduates to participate.

The researcher contacted referred population members by email to introduce them to the research, invite them to participate in the research by assessing their effectiveness, and provide the URL address to the LPLI on Survey Monkey. Personal pastoral leadership effectiveness was assessed by participating pastors. In addition, participating pastors were to ask four to eight lay observers to assess the pastor's leadership effectiveness using the LPLI. However, after several attempts by the researcher and over one calendar year, there were a total of only three lay observers responded and completed the LPLI. Participating pastors completed the LPLI

69

demographic section and assessment section via the LPLI on the Survey Monkey website.

 As pastors completed the assessments, data was gathered on the Survey Monkey website.   The researcher performed statistical analysis on the collected data, which is the subject of chapter 4. Finally, the researcher draws conclusions based upon the data and makes suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This chapter reports the analysis of data collected through completed Lewis Pastoral Leadership Inventory (LPLI) and follow-up interviews with participants. The research protocol is outlined to show steps taken to answer the research questions. The analysis addresses the research questions, qualitative findings, and concludes with an evaluation of the research design.

Compilation Protocol and Sample Data

The researcher emailed Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) seminary personnel, state denominational leaders, associational missionaries, and pastors to identify pastors in the population and to invite population members to participate in the research study. Additionally, the researcher emailed identified members of the population to introduce the research study and instructed them on the protocol. Pastors were directed to access the LPLI online in order to assess their pastoral leadership effectiveness.

As a result of low survey response rate, the researcher again emailed denominational and seminary leaders to pursue additional avenues for enlisting pastors in the sample. In addition, the researcher telephoned key leaders at each of the six SBC Cooperative Program supported seminaries (Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Sothern Baptist Theological Seminary, and Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary). One seminary agreed to include an introduction and invitation to the research in its alumni email newsletter. Also, appeals

71

were made on behalf of the researcher by one state convention executive director. The director's appeal resulted in two additional state directors emailing pastors in their respective state conventions inviting pastors to participate. The researcher contacted identified population members by email to introduce them to the research, provided the online link to the LPLI on Survey Monkey, and listed instructions for assessing their effectiveness.

A total of 128 participating pastors responded to the invitation to participate in this research by completing the online LPLI survey. Ten surveys were discarded because only one of the three leadership effectiveness sections were completed. In addition, four surveys were discarded because the participants either were not SBC pastors or did not earn the Master of Divinity (MDiv) degree. Therefore, 114 SBC pastors participated by completing the LPLI. Data collected from the 114 completed surveys was gathered through an online database and was subjected to subsequent statistical analyses.

Demographic Data

Participants in this research study provided answers to fourteen demographic questions. These demographic questions included (1) last name, optional, (2) name of Baptist association where church is located, (3) age of the pastor, (4) race of the pastor, (5) years in current church, (6) full-time or part-time status, (7) seminary graduate, (8) type of seminary degree, (9) name of seminary, (10) year of graduation, (11) number of years serving as lead pastor before attending seminary, (12) number of years serving as lead pastor during seminary, (13) number of years serving as lead pastor after seminary graduation, and (14) zip code. The following demographic information characterized participating pastors in the sample.

Personal Characteristics

Pastors in the sample reported their ages in the demographic section (Table 1). Ages of participating pastors ranged from 25 years to 74 years. The largest age group (38 pastors) was the 25-34 years of age group, representing 33.3% of the entire sample. The second largest age group (36 pastors) was the 35-44 years of age group, representing 31.6% of the entire sample.

Table 1. Age of pastors

Age of Pastor	Frequency	Percentage of Sample
18-24	0	0
25-34	38	33.3
35-44	36	31.6
45-54	20	17.5
55-64	19	16.7
64-74	1	.90
Total	114	100

Three racial groups were represented in the sample (Table 2). Caucasians were the largest represented group with 108 pastors (94.7%). African Americans were also represented with 3 pastors (2.6%) and Hispanics with 2 pastors (1.8%).

Table 2. Race of pastors

Race of Pastor	Frequency	Percentage of Sample
Caucasian	108	94.7
African American	3	2.6
Hispanic	2	1.8
Skipped question	1	.9
Total	114	100

The sample provided information on full-time or part-time service as pastors of a SBC church (Table 3). There were 100 pastors serving full-time (87.7%) and 14 pastors reported they were part-time pastors (12.3%).

Table 3. Full time or part-time pastor

Status	Frequency	Percentage of Sample
Full-Time	100	87.7
Part-Time	14	12.3
Total	114	100

Participating pastors also reported information related to the seminary they attended, year of seminary graduation, pastoral leadership experience before or during seminary, and pastoral leadership experience after graduation. The initial focus for this research was graduates from the six Cooperative Program supported seminaries. During the collection phase, the researcher and his supervising committee agreed to accept surveys from pastors serving SBC churches who graduated from seminary with a MDiv from an Association of Theological Schools (ATS) accredited seminary or a seminary closely affiliated with the SBC. The focus of the population became pastors serving SBC churches instead of graduates from SBC Cooperative Program supported seminaries. The majority of pastors in the sample reported graduating from Cooperative Program SBC seminaries (82%) and the remaining 18% from Beeson Divinity School, Liberty Seminary, and 11 from other seminaries not listed (Table 4). Graduates from New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary (NOBTS) represented the largest group with 34% of the sample and second largest from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (SBTS) with 25%. Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary (GBTS) was represented by the smallest group with 2.6%.

Table 4. Seminary from which participants graduated

Seminary	Total Pastors	Percentage of Sample
New Orleans	39	34.2
Southern	29	25.4
Southeastern	12	10.5
Other	11	9.6
Beeson Divinity	6	5.3
Southwestern	6	5.3
Liberty	4	3.5
Midwestern	4	3.5
Golden Gate	3	2.6
Total	114	100

Pastors reported a closely distributed number of years since graduation from seminary (Table 5). The largest group graduated in 2012 with 16.7% and the smallest group graduated in 2011 (5.3%).

Table 5. Seminary graduation year

Year of Seminary Graduation	Total Pastors	Percentage of Sample
2003	10	8.8
2004	14	12.3
2005	11	9.6
2006	13	11.4
2007	10	8.8
2008	12	10.5
2009	8	7.0
2010	11	9.6
2011	6	5.3
2012	19	16.7
Total	114	100

Participants reported the number of years serving as pastor before attending seminary (Table 6). The largest number of pastors in the sample reported no pastoral leadership experience before beginning seminary 86 or (75.4%). Of these with pastoral leadership experience before seminary 10.5% served 6 or more years before entering seminary and the second largest group served 2 years (6.1%).

Table 6. Number of years serving as lead
pastor before seminary graduation

Years before seminary	Total Pastors	Percentage of Sample
0	86	75.4
1	2	1.8
2	7	6.1
3	4	3.5
4	2	1.8
5	1	0.9
6 or more	12	10.5
Total	114	100

The number of pastors in the sample serving churches during seminary is closely distributed with the number not serving a church during seminary (Table 7). There were 51 pastors that did not serve a church as lead pastor during seminary (44.7%). A total of 63 pastors served a church as lead pastor during seminary (55.3%). Interestingly, of those graduates with experience serving a church as pastor during seminary, the majority served a church as lead pastor for 4 or more years during seminary. This statistic would suggest that as seminary students they served a church as pastor during their entire seminary education and that their seminary education took more than four years to complete the MDiv.

Table 7. Number of years serving as
lead pastor during seminary

Years during seminary	Total	Percentage of Sample
0	51	44.7
1	9	7.9
2	15	13.2
3	17	14.9
4 or more	22	19.3
Total	114	100

Pastors in the sample reported the number of years serving as lead pastor after seminary graduation (Table 8). The number serving five or more years after seminary (50.9%) was closely distributed with the number of pastors serving one to four years (49.1%).

Table 8. Number of years serving as
lead pastor after seminary

Years after seminary	Total Pastors	Percentage of Sample
1	16	14.0
2	17	14.9
3	9	7.9
4	14	12.3
5 or more	58	50.9
Total	114	100

Finally, the pastors in the sample reported the number of years serving their current church (Table 9). The largest group reported serving their current church as pastor for six or more years (27.2%). The second largest group was in their second year

with 22 pastors (19.3%) and the smallest group with 8 pastors was serving in their fifth year (7%).

Table 9. Number of years serving in current church

Years in current church	Total Pastors	Percentage of Sample
First	18	15.8
Second	22	19.3
Third	19	16.7
Fourth	16	14.0
Fifth	8	7.0
Six or more	31	27.2
Total	114	100

Congregational Characteristics

Pastors in the sample reported characteristics of congregations served (Table 10). The church membership with the highest frequency was 251-500 members, representing 25.4% of the sample, and church membership with the lowest frequency was 51-100 members, representing 11.4% of the sample.

Table 10. Church membership

Church Membership	Frequency	Percentage of Sample
50 or fewer	14	12.3
51-100	13	11.4
101-250	24	21.1
251-500	29	25.4
501-999	15	13.2
1,000-or more	19	16.7
Total	114	100

Participating pastors reported an average worship attendance of congregations served (Table 11). The average worship attendance group 101-250 represented 31% of reported attendance. The second largest group 51-100 worship attendees represented 25% in the sample. In addition, 50 fewer represented 14% of the sample group.

Table 11. Average worship attendance

Average Worship Attendance	Frequency	Percentage of Sample
50 or fewer	16	14.0
51-100	29	25.4
101-250	35	30.7
251-500	20	17.5
501-999	8	7.0
1,000-or more	6	5.3
Total	114	100

Findings and Displays

Data collected from the sample of participating pastors through the LPLI was analyzed to answer the research questions. The statistical analysis included t-tests, analysis of variances, and correlations. The findings were displayed based on each research question. A summary of the means, standard deviations, and Cronbach Alphas based on the entire sample are reported in Table 12. The mean, also known as average, is "the most common measure of central tendency" (Howell 2004, 61) and is calculated by adding scores or numeric responses and dividing by the total number of scores in the data set. The standard deviation is a "statistical expression of how much individual scores vary around the mean score" of a particular set of scores or numbers (Gall, Gall, and Borg 2005, 158). The standard deviation is how closely a score is clustered together when compared with other scores for a particular question or data set. The Cronbach's

79

Alpha was developed to "measure internal consistency of a test or scale" and reports a number between 0 and 1 (Tavaakol and Dennick 2011, 53). The Cronbach's Alpha score shows the internal reliability of a data set. Any Cronbach's Alpha score below .5 is considered unacceptable and therefore not internally reliable. A score above 0.6 is acceptable, a score above 0.7 is desirable, and a score about 0.9 is excellent.

Several observations can be made from Table 12. First, these pastors reported moderately positive LPLI scores across dimensions with mean responses ranging between 5.17 and 6.34 on a seven-point scale. Second, barring from a few exceptions (Integrity, Knowledge & Teaching, Proclamation & Worship, Pastoral Skills, and Professional Judgment) the Cronbach Alphas were in the desirable range ($\geq .70$). Therefore, the LPLI scores were reliable in this sample. The reliability means there is consistency in the scores provided by the persons assessing their effectiveness.

Table 12. Means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's Alphas for LPLI total scores, dimension scores, and sub-dimension scores based on the entire sample

LPLI Scores	Mean	Standard Deviation	Alphas
Character Dimension	5.92	.52	.89
Spiritual authority	6.02	.62	.79
Integrity	6.34	.45	.67
Wholeness	5.67	.76	.77
Self-awareness	5.69	.64	.71
Competency Dimension	5.88	.46	.91
Knowledge & teaching	6.04	.47	.54
Proclamation & worship	6.14	.45	.66
Pastoral skills	5.98	.56	.67
Administrative skills	5.60	.74	.78
Professional judgment	5.79	.64	.61
Strategic discernment	5.71	.66	.71
Contribution Dimension	5.50	.78	.96
Discern vision	5.75	.75	.84
Builds team	5.45	.89	.87
Reaches new people	5.58	.88	.86
Fosters faith development	5.17	.96	.82
Extends mission and service	5.53	.83	.82

Research Question 1

Research question 1 asked what relationship, if any, exists between pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary effectiveness within the ten years after graduation as measured by the Lewis Pastoral Leadership Inventory (LPLI). Specifically, whether pastors with prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience differ in their post-seminary effectiveness? Pastors completed the online version of the LPLI hosted on the Survey Monkey website. Pastors were instructed to read each of the seventy-five questions and rate their pastoral leadership effectiveness with a one to seven Rikert scale. Comparing the two data sets, the ratings of the pastors with prior experience and the ratings of the pastors without prior experience, identifies the relationship between the two comparison groups.

Table 13. Means, standard deviations, for LPLI total scores, dimension scores, and sub-dimension scores between the two comparison groups

LPLI Scores	Pastors with Prior or Concurrent Experience ($n = 64$) Mean (s.d.)	Pastors without Prior or Concurrent Experience ($n = 50$) Mean (s.d.)	t-value	P
Character	117.33 (12.51)	115.72 (13.47)	.66	.51
Spiritual authority	29.77 (3.97)	29.42 (3.67)	.48	.63
Integrity	31.55 (2.54)	30.88 (3.35)	1.21	.23
Wholeness	27.92 (4.25)	27.86 (3.94)	.08	.94
Self-awareness	28.90 (3.49)	27.57 (4.13)	.75	.46
Competency	174.63 (19.28)	168.74 (25.32)	1.41	.16
Knowledge & teaching	30.08 (3.17)	29.12 (3.47)	1.54	.13
Proclamation & worship	30.48 (3.39)	29.18 (4.44)	1.78	.08
Pastoral skills	29.52 (3.72)	28.40 (4.73)	1.43	.16
Administrative skills	27.19 (4.57)	27.56 (4.92)	-.42	.68
Professional judgment	28.97 (3.82)	27.46 (5.10)	1.81	.07
Strategic discernment	28.39 (3.93)	27.02 (4.97)	1.65	.10
Contribution	135.03 (21.92)	131.96 (26.92)	.67	.50
Discern vision	28.47 (4.51)	27.48 (5.13)	1.09	.28
Builds team	26.86 (4.99)	26.20 (5.70)	.66	.51
Reaches new people	27.52 (4.64)	26.54 (5.87)	.99	.32

Table 13—Continued

	Mean s.d.	Mean s.d	t	P
Fosters faith development	25.25 (4.99)	24.96 (6.14)	.28	.78
Extends mission & service	26.94 (4.77)	26.78 (5.59)	.16	.87

The self-appraised responses of participants relating to the three LPLI major dimension scores and the 15 sub-dimension scores are displayed in Table 13. A series of t-tests indicated that the two comparison groups showed no statistically significant difference in the three LPLI major dimension scores and in the 15 sub-dimension scores. The t-test is a statistical measure "used to determine whether an observed difference between the mean scores of two groups on a measure is likely to have occurred by chance or whether it reflects a true difference in the mean scores of the population represented by the two groups" (Gall, Gall, and Borg 2005, 166). The t-test shows if there is a true difference in the average scores of the two groups. The n in Table 13 reports the total number of responses from the two test groups.

The group differences on two of the sub-dimension scores were marginally significant. Specifically, pastors with prior or concurrent leadership experience tended to have higher scores than pastors without such experience on three sub-dimensions of Competency: proclamation and worship (30.48 versus 29.18, $t = 1.78$, $p < .10$), professional judgment (28.97 versus 27.46, $t = 1.81$, $p < .10$), and strategic discernment (28.39 versus 27.02, $t = 1.65$, $p < .10$). The t-value in Table 13 reports the results of the t-test (Gall, Gall, and Borg 2005, 166). In addition, the P-value represents the "probability that a particular result would occur by chance" (Howell 2004, 285). Nevertheless, taken together, pastors with prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience and pastors without such experience did not differ on post-seminary leadership effectiveness as measured by the LPLI.

Research Question 2

Research question 2 explored the pastoral leadership effectiveness of participating pastors among four groups: (a) participating pastors with no prior pastoral leadership experience, (b) participating pastors with prior leadership experience before the seminary only, (c) participating pastors with concurrent leadership experience during the seminary only, and (d) participating pastors with prior leadership experience both before and during the seminary. Table 14 presents the sample size of each above four groups of participating pastors. Group (b) had only one pastor and will be excluded from subsequent analysis.

Table 14. Sample sizes for the four groups of pastors

Groups of Pastors	Frequency	Percentage of Sample
A: With no prior, nor concurrent leadership experience	50	43.9
B: With prior leadership experience only	1	0.9
C: With concurrent leadership experience only	36	31.6
D: With both prior and concurrent leadership experience	27	23.7
Total	114	100

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is used to examine research question 2, focusing on the three LPLI major dimension scores and the 15 sub-dimension scores. Table 15 presents means and standard deviations of LPLI scores for the three comparison groups. The data reports that Group (c) (participating pastors with concurrent leadership experience only) and Group (d) (participating pastors with both prior and concurrent leadership experience) tend to have slightly higher LPLI scores than Group (a) (participating pastors with no prior and concurrent leadership experience). Whether these

differences are statistically significant is examined using ANOVA. The *n* in Table 15 represents the groups the number of participating pastors in each group, the mean is the average, and the s.d. is the standard deviation for each dimension and sub dimension.

Table 15. Means and standard deviations for the three groups of pastors

LPLI Scores	Group (a) (*n* = 50) Mean (s.d.)	Group (c) (*n* = 37) Mean (s.d.)	Group (d) (*n* = 27) Mean (s.d.)
Character	115.72 (13.47)	117.47 (9.80)	116.74 (15.66)
Spiritual authority	29.42 (3.67)	29.47 (2.86)	29.96 (5.09)
Integrity	30.88 (3.35)	31.44 (2.17)	31.56 (2.97)
Wholeness	27.86 (3.94)	27.92 (4.35)	27.85 (4.29)
Self-awareness	27.56 (4.13)	28.58 (2.66)	27.37 (4.36)
Competency	168.74 (25.32)	172.58 (16.47)	176.78 (22.70)
Knowledge & teaching	29.12 (3.46)	30.19 (2.81)	29.81 (3.66)
Proclamation & worship	29.18 (4.44)	30.31 (2.98)	30.59 (3.91)
Pastoral skills	28.40 (4.73)	29.22 (3.31)	29.78 (4.04)
Administrative skills	27.56 (4.92)	26.58 (4.38)	27.93 (4.85)
Professional judgment	27.46 (5.10)	28.36 (3.74)	29.74 (3.92)
Strategic discernment	27.02 (4.97)	27.92 (3.35)	28.93 (4.62)
Contribution	131.96 (26.92)	134.81 (18.52)	134.96 (26.44)
Discern vision	27.48 (5.13)	28.47 (3.54)	28.37 (5.67)
Builds team	26.20 (5.70)	26.75 (4.88)	26.93 (5.31)
Reaches new people	26.54 (5.87)	27.67 (4.05)	27.22 (5.45)
Fosters faith development	24.96 (6.14)	24.72 (4.31)	25.93 (5.87)
Extends mission & service	26.78 (5.59)	27.19 (4.29)	26.52 (5.48)

The groups were compared using ANOVA statistical analysis (Table 16). ANOVA is "A statistical technique for testing for differences in means of several groups" (Howell 2004, 356). The *df* represents the degrees of freedom and "the more the degrees of freedom, the easier in general it is to determine whether an observed difference between groups is statistically significant" (Gall Gall, and Borg 2006, 279). None of the ANOVA results were significant, meaning that these three comparison groups did not differ on post-seminary effectiveness as measured by the three Lewis Pastoral Leadership Inventory primary dimensions and the 15 sub-dimensions.

Table 16. LPLI total, dimension, and sub-dimension
scores between the comparison groups

	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Character				
Between Groups	2	32.98	.20	.82
Within Groups	110	169.35		
Character – spiritual authority				
Between Groups	2	2.82	.19	.83
Within Groups	110	14.73		
Character – integrity				
Between Groups	2	5.32	.62	.54
Within Groups	110	8.59		
Character – wholeness				
Between Groups	2	.16	.01	.99
Within Groups	110	17.28		
Character – self-awareness				
Between Groups	2	14.88	1.04	.36
Within Groups	110	14.32		
Competency				
Between Groups	2	579.23	1.17	.31
Within Groups	110	493.79		
Competency – knowledge & teaching				
Between Groups	2	12.70	1.15	.32
Within Groups	110	11.01		
Competency – pastoral skills				
Between Groups	2	18.05	1.04	.36
Within Groups	110	17.34		
Competency – administrative skills				
Between Groups	2	16.15	.72	.49
Within Groups	110	22.48		
Competency – professional judgment				
Between Groups	2	45.73	2.33	.10
Within Groups	110	19.65		
Competency – strategic discernment				
Between Groups	2	32.48	1.66	.20
Within Groups	110	19.63		
Contribution				
Between Groups	2	118.47	.198	.82
Within Groups	110	597.15		
Contribution – builds teams				
Between Groups	2	5.69	.20	.82
Within Groups	110	28.72		
Contribution – reaches new people				
Between Groups	2	13.74	.50	.61
Within Groups	110	27.61		

Table 16—Continued

	df	Mean Square	F	p-value

Contribution – extends mission & service
    Between Groups
    Within Groups
	2
	110
		3.74
		26.88
			.14	.87

Research Question 3

Research question 3 explored whether several select demographics are related to post-seminary pastoral leadership effectiveness. The select demographics include age, years post-seminary, sizes of church membership, and seminary affiliation (New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary versus Southern Baptist Theological Seminary). For the first three demographics, correlation coefficients were calculated, whereas for the last demographics, t-tests were used. The correlation coefficient deals with the "relationship between two variables" and measures the degree or strength of the relationship (Howell 2004, 164). The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient technique was used in calculating the correlation coefficient. The Pearson product correlation coefficient technique "is the most common correlation coefficient" (Howell 2004, 164). Table 17 below provides information regarding the general interpretation of correlation coefficients (Salkind 2011, 88).

Table 17. Correlation Coefficient relationship

Size of the Correlation	Coefficient General Interpretation
.8 to 1.0	Very Strong
.6 to .8	Strong
.4 to .6	Moderate Relationship
.2 to .4	Weak Relationship
.0 to .2	Weak or no relationship

Table 18 reports correlation coefficients between three demographics (years post-seminary, age, and sizes of the church membership) and LPLI scores (Table 18). The data analysis of these select demographics shows none of the correlation coefficients were significant ($p < .05$). However, sizes of church membership had marginally significant correlation coefficients with four LPLI sub-dimension scores: wholeness under the character dimension, $r = .18$, $p = .06$; strategic discernment under the Competency dimension, $r = .16$, $p = .10$; discern vision under the contribution dimension, $r = .17$, $p = .07$; and builds teams under the contribution dimension, $r = .18$, $p = .06$. These results indicate pastors working with a larger size church membership tended to be somewhat more effective in the above four areas.

Table 18. Correlations between three demographics and LPLI scores

Dimensions and Sub-dimensions	Years post-seminary		Age		Sizes of Membership	
	r	p	r	p	R	p
Character	.12	.19	.01	.89	.13	.17
Spiritual authority	.07	.45	.00	.99	.12	.20
Integrity	.09	.34	.04	.66	.13	.18
Wholeness	.12	.22	.02	.86	.18	.06
Self-awareness	.15	.11	-.01	.93	.04	.71
Competency	.05	.60	.09	.36	.12	.22
Knowledge & teaching	.10	.28	.01	.94	.06	.52
Proclamation & worship	.10	.29	.06	.56	.07	.44
Pastoral skills	-.01	.94	.06	.50	.02	.83
Administrative skills	.01	.89	.08	.41	.14	.13
Professional judgment	-.01	.93	.13	.16	.14	.14
Strategic discernment	.09	.37	.10	.30	.16	.10
Contribution	.02	.87	.02	.87	.14	.14
Discern vision	.06	.55	.01	.91	.17	.07
Builds team	-.01	.96	.03	.76	.18	.06
Reaches new people	-.03	.78	-.02	.81	.08	.42
Fosters faith development	.03	.76	.08	.42	.14	.15
Extends mission and service	.02	.82	-.02	.82	.09	.32

The two seminaries with the highest frequency were compared to identify any correlations. The means and standard deviations of LPLI scores for the two comparison groups, including New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary (NOBTS and Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (SBTS) are displayed in table 19. As indicated, these two groups did not differ on any of the LPLI scores (three primary dimensions and fifteen sub-dimensions).

Table 19. Means and standard deviations for the two comparison groups

Dependent variables	NOBTS (n = 42)	SBTS (n = 29)	t-value	p
Character	117.41 (14.44)	117.17 (11.29)	.07	.94
Spiritual authority	29.69 (4.37)	29.66 (3.25)	.04	.97
Integrity	31.26 (2.75)	31.62 (2.97)	-.52	.60
Wholeness	28.64 (4.13)	28.14 (3.62)	.52	.60
Self-awareness	27.82 (4.35)	27.76 (3.60)	.06	.95
Competency	171.38 (23.75)	174.28 (19.72)	-.53	.60
Knowledge & teaching	29.23 (3.84)	30.07 (3.20)	-.96	.34
Proclamation & worship	29.82 (4.17)	29.72 (3.36)	.10	.92
Pastoral skills	28.56 (4.49)	29.69 (3.23)	-1.15	.26
Administrative skills	27.49 (4.80)	27.83 (3.90)	-.32	.76
Professional judgment	28.41 (4.64)	29.00 (4.17)	-.54	.59
Strategic discernment	27.87 (4.46)	27.97 (4.08)	-.09	.93
Contribution	135.64 (27.30)	133.86 (18.50)	.30	.76
Discern vision	28.15 (5.41)	28.17 (3.87)	-.02	.99
Builds team	27.41 (5.65)	26.66 (4.29)	.60	.55
Reaches new people	27.33 (5.74)	27.00 (4.24)	.26	.79
Fosters faith development	25.72 (5.96)	24.59 (3.91)	.89	.78
Extends mission and service	27.02 (5.92)	27.44 (4.34)	-.33	.75

Qualitative Findings

The data analysis above shows no statistical difference between the two pastor groups, those with and without prior pastoral leadership experience. According to these findings there was no advantage to having pastoral experience before graduating from seminary. The researcher consulted the supervising committee and proceeded to develop

an interview protocol (Appendix 7) in order to gain more insight. The interviewer contacted participating pastors who completed the LPLI and invited them to participate further by answering follow-up questions. The questions were developed with and reviewed by the dissertation supervisor and an expert panel.

The researcher contacted the pastors who provided email addresses (60 total with email address, 44 were from the seminary that forbade further contact, and 10 did not provide an email address). Twenty pastors (10 with prior pastoral experience and 10 without prior pastoral experience before or concurrent with seminary) responded to the email invitation and provided a telephone number and arranged an interview time. The researcher followed the interview protocol questionnaire, recorded the conversations with the Dictaphone application for Apple devices, took notes of the conversations, and transcribed the recordings with the Transcription application for Apple devices. In order to present comments of the interviewed pastors, each pastor interviewed was numbered 1 through 20 in the order they were interviewed by the researcher. The number system was used to protect the pastors' identity as they were assured their identity would not be disclosed.

Pastors with prior experience. Of the ten pastors with prior experience, only one pastor had pastoral leadership experience before attending seminary and nine pastors had only pastoral leadership experience during seminary. This group of pastors with prior and concurrent experience will in general be referred to as pastors with prior experience and concurrent experience and will only be used in specific needed reference. The pastors with prior experience during seminary reported the experience was positive and helpful (7) or informing to their seminary classroom experience and three pastors reported their concurrent pastoral experience was disconnected from the classroom and not helpful (Table 20).

Positive reflections were provided by pastors with prior seminary experience during seminary. Pastor 6 stated he was an online MDiv student and his seminary education experience lead him to "dig deeper into God's Word, become a better communicator, and helped his church grow." Pastor 13 shared that his seminary education and concurrent pastoral leadership experience was beneficial because he was applying areas of study into church ministry and was with other student pastors experiencing the similar joys and challenges. He stated the benefit of serving and attending seminary concurrently was valuable because as iron sharpens iron, fellow students "sharpen each other, you are around others in the pastorate and working together on seminary classroom" assignments. Finally, pastor 20 added that seminary education with concurrent pastoral leadership experience "undergirded his work as a pastor" during seminary and greatly added to his effectiveness after graduation.

Pastors with prior pastoral leadership experience during seminary also shared less than positive comments relating to their seminary education. Pastor 8 commented that his seminary education experience was "lacking" and there were "gaps between seminary education and the person in the pew" which created some conflict while "serving a church during seminary." He was thankful the concurrent experience provided a place to fail and serving the church during seminary provided a safety net before serving a church as full-time pastor after seminary graduation. Pastor 11 stated "seminary is academic oriented" and is thereby limited to academic pursuits. He found little room for teaching practical application in the MDiv curriculum. He further stated some areas that need more focus in the MDiv curriculum included "time management" and specifically strategies to manage the "demands on your time as a pastor." Something he thought was not sufficiently taught in seminary.

Table 20. Interview responses of pastors with prior
pastoral leadership experience

Questions	Responses	Frequency
How did pastoral leadership experience inform your seminary classroom experience?	Helpful Disconnected	7 3
How did the seminary classroom add to your experience as a pastor during seminary?	Helped Enhanced Relationships	5 5 1
How did prior or concurrent experience impact your effectiveness as a pastor after seminary?	Beneficial Enriched Information/not how to	4 1 1
What part of the MDiv curriculum impacted your effectiveness as a pastor after seminary graduation?	Bible Related Theology Counseling Exposition Apologetics Lack of leadership courses	5 3 2 2 1 1
What are your thoughts on the findings of the research?	Surprised Agreed Not surprised Shocked	4 2 2 1
Do you think it is important for a person training for pastoral ministry to gain experience prior to or concurrent with seminary?	Important	10

Further pressing for a connection between MDiv curriculum and effectiveness after seminary graduation, pastors with prior experience were asked to list courses or course work that contributed to effectiveness after graduation. Biblical and theological courses garnered the most responses (5) followed closely with pastoral (3). Pastor 13 shared that he found biblical and theological classes contributed most to his effectiveness because it "taught me how to interpret the Bible" which aided in sermon preparation and biblical application. Pastor 11 found the pastoral ministry courses to be very practical and helpful and that they enriched his pastoral ministry experience during seminary. He stated that taking the courses and being in a position to apply them immediately added to his post seminary effectiveness.

Individual pastors shared more than one response to this question as reflected by the thirteen responses to this question. Pastors commented several times to various questions about the impact and helpfulness of counseling courses taken during seminary. Pastor 1 said he learned "a great deal" about counseling persons from a biblical and pastoral perspective and it helped prepare him "to work with people." Pastors commenting on counseling courses repeatedly placed great value on and application from these courses.

The interview protocol (Appendix 7) included three questions asking pastors with prior experience to place a value (1-7) on the impact of seminary education on the forming of the three LPLI dimensions: character, contribution, and competency (Table 21). Overall, the pastors with concurrent pastoral leadership experience during seminary rated the formative value in the 5.40 to 6.00 range for each of the three dimensions. The contribution dimension recorded the lowest mean score (5.40) and character was rated the highest (6.00).

Table 21. Responses of pastors with prior pastoral
Leadership experience

How much value would you place on your seminary experience as being formative in terms of your:	Responses	Means (s.d.)
Character	7, 6, 6, 6, 4, 6, 6, 7, 5, 7	6.00 (.94)
Contribution	5, 6, 4, 7, 4, 5, 5, 5, 6, 7	5.40 (1.08)
Competency	7, 6, 2, 7, 4, 3, 7, 7, 5, 7	5.50 (1.52)

The pastors with prior pastoral leadership experience rated their seminary education highly impactful on their character. Pastor 2 stated the professor's relating of personal stories and experience in his spiritual formations class proved to be valuable in further forming his character. Pastor 18 added to the numeric rating by saying character formation through the MDiv curriculum helped him better relate to people and thereby "build relationships." Pastor 1 offered that his seminary education helped "flesh out sins" which were a part of his life before beginning seminary. He rated seminary education's impact at a 7 in the dimension of character.

In addition, pastors also commented on the seminary curriculum's impact on their competency. Pastor 2 shared both positive and negative thoughts on the seminary's curriculum on his effectiveness in the area of competency. On the positive side he expressed pastoral leadership, preaching, and management classes were very helpful. However, he did not feel that any class added to his competency in the area of leadership. Even in the one "leadership" class, as he called it, was not beneficial because the content did not relate to his role as a pastor leader.

Even though the contribution dimension was rated the lowest among the three LPLI dimensions, pastors shared helpful insights beyond the numeric ratings. Pastor 1 shared that the impact of seminary education was significant in the area of contribution. He listed three specific areas seminary education contributed to his effectiveness through contribution: teaching, counseling, and organization. The teaching aspect led him to "significant" study and preparation to preach and teach a particular subject or book. He said he knew nothing about counseling when he entered seminary and the curriculum counseling class was "very helpful" in preparing him to meet counseling needs of a pastor.

In addition, pastors with prior experience were asked about their opinions on the findings of this research and the importance of seminarians serving as pastor

concurrent with seminary (Table 22). Four pastors were surprised there was no

difference in perceived effectiveness between pastors with prior experience and pastors

without prior experience. Two agreed with the findings, two were not surprised, and one

respondent was shocked. The majority of the pastors with prior pastoral leadership

experience were surprised at the findings because they thought the more experience one

had the greater the effectiveness after seminary. They were surprised to learn seminary

education provided a leveling effect for the pastors without prior or concurrent

experience.

Pastor 11 thought pastoral leadership experience during seminary would close

the disconnect between the seminary classroom and the pastorate because experience

allows one to become familiar with "the dynamics of being a pastor" that cannot be

gained in the classroom. Pastor 20 felt pastoral leadership experience would lead to

greater effectiveness because, for him, serving as a pastor during seminary allowed

everything from his education "to come together and his class work became much more

focused" because he was depended on to lead and serve a church.

Table 22. Final two interview questions for
pastors with prior experience

Questions	Responses	Frequency
What are your thoughts on the findings of the research?	Surprised Agreed Not surprised Shocked	4 2 2 1
Do you think it is important for a person training for pastoral ministry to gain experience prior to or concurrent with seminary?	Important	10

94

Finally, the last interview protocol question asked pastors with prior experience if it was important for seminarians to serve churches as pastor during seminary education. All ten pastors responded with a yes (Table 22). Pastor 2 reported the first church he served as pastor after seminary graduation expected him to know how to be a pastor and how to lead. He said "the church expected him to lead" and his pastoral leadership experience during his seminary education prepared him to lead on day one. He expressed a high value on learning to work with people while serving as a pastor during his seminary education; something he said he did not believe he would have learned in the seminary classroom. Pastor 19 focused on the need for seminary students to be "preaching as regularly as possible to cultivate the gift given by the Holy Spirit and being informed through seminary" coursework. He said serving as a pastor during seminary provides the regular opportunities to preach.

Pastor 6 agreed that pastors should serve a church as pastor during seminary even though there are "seminary churches" that can be very challenging for seminary students to serve. He said pastors should serve if the opportunity presents itself to serve a church that will build up the seminarian during his school years and not bring harm. Pastor 8 agreed seminary students needed to serve a church as pastor during seminary but desired more seminary or denominational involvement in selecting churches to be involved in calling pastors in order to help screen out difficult churches. Pastor 13 agreed seminary students should serve a church as pastor only "if he was called" by the Lord to serve the church. Finally, pastor 20 felt so strongly that seminarians should serve a church as pastor during seminary that he felt seminaries should be "rebuked for not forcing it more." He felt the seminaries could be a stronger influence on seminary students to serve a church as pastor and thereby begin the process of applying what is taught in the classroom.

Pastors with prior pastoral experience added to the findings of this research by sharing thoughts on pastoral leadership experience and seminary education. The overall impressions of serving and studying concurrently were positive and contributed to pastoral leadership effectiveness after graduation. In addition, the gap between seminary and practice was narrowed through their engagement in pastoral leadership during seminary education. The pastors with prior experience had mixed feelings about the findings of this research. However, this group was in agreement on the need for seminary students to serve churches as pastor-leaders during seminary. The pastors without prior experience were also asked a series of questions to discover further findings related to the relationship between pastoral leadership experience and after graduation leadership effectiveness.

Pastors without experience. Pastors with prior experience provided important insights on the relationship between pastor experience and seminary education and post-graduation effectiveness. However, this group only provided half the picture because there is also the group of seminary graduates without prior pastoral leadership experience. The focus of questioning for pastors without prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience was appropriate to their seminary education and therefore the questions were different for the group without prior pastoral leadership experience.

Pastors without prior pastoral leadership were asked to identify the part of the MDiv curriculum that had the greatest impact on pastoral leadership effectiveness after seminary graduation (Table 23). Six pastors stated that the practicum semester had the greatest impact on post-graduation effectiveness. Interestingly, from the same groups, three pastors reported curriculum experiences in ministry (required by Association of Theological Schools for MDiv programs) were not helpful.

The majority of pastors (5) shared that biblical and theological courses contributed to their post-seminary effectiveness. The remainder of the pastors listed

pastoral (3), no class, family ministry, evangelism, counseling, and ethics class, each had one response, contributed to post-seminary effectiveness. Pastor 3 stated that biblical and theological classes "increased his view of God and His sovereignty" and thereby contributed to his desire to be an effective pastor. Pastor 4 also commented that biblical classes led to better "understanding of the Bible and to teach/preach the Bible." In addition, he found one particular counseling course to be very helpful in his being effective after graduation, a very similar response from pastors with prior pastoral leadership experience. Pastor 15 felt learning biblical genres, Hebrew, and Greek led to his great effectiveness because these courses aided in preparing sermons and "leading from the pulpit." Pastor 9 reported there were no courses in his seminary education that contributed to his post-graduation experience. He reported "leadership courses were useless because they did not relate to pastoral leadership, my preaching class was awful, and the work of the pastor classes were useless." Pastor 9 was the only pastor reporting negative feelings about seminary course work.

Table 23. Responses of pastors without prior pastoral leadership experience

Questions	Responses	Frequency
What part of the MDiv curriculum impacted your effectiveness as a pastor after seminary graduation?	Practicum Pastoral Practical	6 2 1
How did the curriculum experiences in ministry (internship, applied ministry semester, classes providing experiences in ministry in the MDiv program) affect your effectiveness as a pastor after seminary graduation?	Helpful Not helpful No class Counseling Staff experience	3 3 1 1 1
What course or course work contributed to your effectiveness as a pastor after seminary graduation?	Biblical/Theological Pastoral None Family ministry Evangelism Counseling Ethics	5 3 1 1 1 1 1

As noted in the previous section, the interview protocol included three questions requesting graduate's to place a numeric value (1-7) on the impact of seminary education on forming the three LPLI dimensions: character (who they are), contribution (what they accomplish), and competency (what they do). Pastors without prior experience rated the value of seminary in forming their contribution the highest (5.40), and character and competency (5.10) equal as the lowest rating (Table 24). Pastor 4 stated seminary "affirmed" character traits he had learned growing up at home and at church. Pastor 12 shared that seminary education formed his contribution through two different types of courses: preaching and evangelism. He stated preaching classes prepared him to study and prepare to preach week after week and thereby to lead the church he served after seminary. He also found that evangelism classes aided his contribution because he learned to teach others to share personal testimony of salvation in Jesus. In addition, he learned about "concentric circles" in evangelism class which proved to be helpful in more than just evangelism. He felt these two concepts alone were a great way he contributed to the Kingdom of God through his pastoral leadership effectiveness after graduation from seminary.

Pastors shared thoughts on how seminary education helped form effectiveness in the areas of character and competency. Pastor 3 reported, in the area of competency, seminary education greatly informed him on what to do as a pastor. He stated he "would not trade his seminary experience for anything." Pastor 4 said his internship was helpful in developing competency after graduation. Pastor 4 stated that seminary "affirmed" character traits he had learned growing up at home and at church. Pastor 5 stated that seminary helped him to grow in character through the course work and through interaction with professors and fellow students. Pastor 6 also found that seminary "helped a lot" in forming his character.

Table 24. Responses of pastors with prior
pastoral leadership experience

How much value would you place on your seminary experience as being formative in terms of your:	Responses	Means (s.d.)
Character	6, 4, 5, 3, 5, 6, 6, 5, 5, 6	5.10 (.99)
Contribution	6, 6, 6, 3, 3, 7, 6, 6, 5, 6	5.40 (1.35)
Competency	7, 7, 4, 3, 3, 6, 6, 4, 5, 6,	5.10 (1.52)

The valued responses between the pastors with prior pastoral experience and

pastors without prior experience were statistically analyzed to identify any similarities or

differences. The *t*-test was utilized and the results are displayed in Table 25. The two

groups gave identical responses to the value of seminary in forming their competency

with a slight difference in the standard deviation. The two groups did not have any

statistically significant difference in their responses which furthers the quantitative

findings of this research.

Table 25. Comparison of responses between pastors with
and without prior experience

Interview Questions	Pastors with Experience (*n* = 10)	Pastors without Experience (*n* = 10)	*t*-value	*p*
Character	6.00 (.94)	5.10 (.99)	2.08	.05
Competency	5.40 (1.08)	5.40 (1.35)	0.00	1.00
Contribution	5.50 (1.90)	5.10 (1.52)	.52	.61

In addition, pastors without prior pastoral leadership experience were asked about their opinions on the findings of this research and the importance of seminary students serving a church as pastor prior to or concurrent with seminary (Table 26). Three pastors were not surprised by the findings, two were surprised, two found the findings interesting, one did not know about the findings, and one reported it was hard to say anything about the findings. One pastor did not wish to record an answer to this question. Pastor 3 was surprised the group with prior pastoral leadership experience and the group without prior pastoral leadership experience showed no statistical difference between the two. He thought the group with prior pastoral leadership experience would report higher pastoral leadership effectiveness ratings. Pastor 4 stated he did not know what to think about the findings because "he could not put his arms around" the idea that pastors with experience did not have greater pastoral leadership effectiveness. Pastor 5 was not surprised because he felt the MDiv curriculum prepared seminary graduates to "answer their calling to pastor and do the work as God's" shepherd of the local church. Pastor 9 thought the findings were interesting and affirmed his thoughts that seminary had "been like a technical college preparing his skills" to be an effective local church pastor. Finally, pastor 15 was not surprised with the findings, but expressed a helpful insight related to the findings. He considered seminary education to be foundational because he thought "application after graduation; education then application" was the best method for preparing seminary graduates without prior experience for effective pastoral ministry after graduation.

Table 26. Final two interview questions for
pastors with prior experience

Questions	Responses	Frequency
What are your thoughts on the findings of this research?	Not surprising Surprising Interesting Do not know Hard to say	3 2 2 1 1
Do you think it is important for a person training for pastoral ministry to gain experience prior to or concurrent with seminary?	No Yes Depends on person	7 2 1

Finally, pastors without prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience were asked if other seminarians should serve a church as pastor during seminary. Seven pastors did not think it was important to serve as a pastor during seminary, two said it was important to serve, and one said it depended on the person and their calling from the Lord. Of the 7 pastors that said no, most shared reasons for their answer. Pastor 7 stated seminarians should not serve a church as pastor during seminary because education was too important and students did not need divided loyalties during seminary. Pastor 12 and pastor 16 thought it best for seminarians to focus on their academic responsibilities. Pastor 9 did not think seminarians should not serve as pastor during seminary because "the breadth" between the classroom and the pastorate was too great to navigate during seminary education. Finally, pastor 14 shared it was not important to serve during seminary. However, he did think seminarians should serve a church in some capacity during seminary, but not as pastor. He felt too many seminary students "refused to serve" in any capacity during seminary.

The pastors that said yes or depends on the person whether they should serve a church as pastor during seminary also shared reasons for their answers. Pastor 4 not only stated yes but, said "absolutely" yes because the seminary student "needs an outlet to take from the classroom into real life." Pastor 5 said yes with the qualification that

seminarians did not need to serve a church as pastor before seminary, but it was "important to be a pastor" during seminary.

With only a few exceptions in sub-dimensions, the two groups pastors with prior experience and those without prior pastoral leadership experience before seminary graduation, responses were not statistically significant. The follow up interview protocol did not show any significant differences between the two groups. The implications of these findings will be presented in chapter 5. Evaluation of the research design follows in the next section.

Evaluation of Research Design

The present research design was satisfactory. The plan to enlist pastors and lay observers to assess leadership effectiveness of seminary MDiv graduates was a valid plan for gaining a 360° perspective. Studying the relationship between seminary education and graduate pastoral leadership effectiveness would contribute to the literature of seminary education and pastoral leadership effectiveness. The quantitative nature of this research design would enable the researcher to obtain empirical data to address the research questions. The research design was adjusted to enlist as many SBC pastors in the sample as possible in order to answer the research questions, and to identify any relationship between prior pastoral leadership experience and post seminary leadership effectiveness. The proposed study was a quantitative only study and limited to LPLI scores. The completed study is a sequential, mixed method study incorporating quantitative and qualitative elements. There are strengths and weaknesses to this research that need recognition.

Strengths of the Research Design

The sample was enlisted even though no public list of pastors serving Southern Baptist Convention churches with seminary degrees was available for the researcher.

The plan to contact associational directors of mission, state convention leaders, seminary personnel, and other pastors not in the population provided a valid attempt to include SBC pastors of the population in the research sample. One seminary and three state convention executive directors proved invaluable in sharing the present research with their constituents as well as inviting graduates and pastors to participate.

Though the original plan to include lay observers' rating of their pastor's leadership effectiveness was not successful, added strength was gained in the current study through the adjusted mixed method design. The qualitative findings provided deeper insights from seminary graduates regarding the relationship between seminary education and pastoral leadership effectiveness.

The Lewis Pastoral Leadership Inventory (LPLI) provided a valid instrument for measuring the pastoral leadership of Master of Divinity seminary graduates. The LPLI measured pastoral leadership effectiveness through three dimensions: character, contribution, and competency. The LPLI was developed and deemed reliable and valid by the Lewis Center for Church Leadership. The instrument has been widely used among United Methodist pastors in conferences throughout United States. The LPLI scores provided empirical quantitative findings related to pastoral leadership effectiveness of MDiv seminary graduates.

Weaknesses of the Research Design

The participation rate proved to be a weakness because there was no list available of pastors serving SBC churches and seminary graduates and once pastors were contacted they were reluctant to submit to ratings by lay observers. One can obtain a list of churches, possibly even a list of SBC pastors, but no organization compiles a list or current statistical data regarding how many SBC pastors are MDiv seminary graduates. Improved SBC pastor participation may be accomplished through Lifeway Research providing contact information for enlisting pastors. In addition, seminaries could prove

more helpful through a greater willingness to contact their graduates and to invite them to participate.

This present research relied on pastors to assess their pastoral leadership effectiveness. Additional assessments by lay observers may have provided a more complete measurement of pastoral leadership effectiveness. However, prior use of the LPLI by the Lewis Center for Church Leadership among Methodist pastoral leaders reported higher average ratings by lay observers. Overall scores and dimension scores by lay observers were higher than pastor ratings. Overall average scores by lay observers were 6.16 compared to 5.80 overall scores of pastor perspectives. The dimension scores rating effectiveness of pastors and lay observers were also higher among lay observers than pastor's perceptions. The character dimension average score had the greatest gap between pastors and lay observers (character by pastors 5.93 and lay observers 6.28). The contribution dimension returned the smallest gap between pastors and lay observers (pastors 5.53 and lay observers 5.97). This present study may not have any different results or implications with additional lay observer ratings based on the pilot study among Methodist pastors.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between prior and concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary effectiveness within the first years of pastoral leadership experience. This chapter restates the research purpose and research questions. In addition, this chapter presents implications of the research, research applications, research limitations, and ideas for further research.

Research Purpose

The purpose of the sequential, mixed method study was to examine the relationship between no experience, prior, and concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary effectiveness within the first ten years of pastoral leadership experience.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study of the relationship between prior experience and post-seminary pastoral leadership effectiveness:

1. What relationship, if any, exists between pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary effectiveness within the first ten years as measured by the LPLI?

2. What difference in post seminary leadership effectiveness, if any, exists among pastors with no prior, prior only, concurrent only, and pastors with both prior and concurrent experience?

3. What relationship, if any, exists between select demographics and pastoral leadership effectiveness of seminary graduates?

Research Implications

The implications of the present research focusing on the relationship between prior experience and post-seminary education pastoral leadership effectiveness are listed below. The researcher provides insights into seminary training practices for pastoral leadership effectiveness.

1. There is no significant statistical relationship between prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post seminary leadership effectiveness.

2. Master of Divinity seminary graduates benefit from the leveling gained through the MDiv curriculum and this leveling translates into pastoral leadership effectiveness after seminary.

3. There is value in completing the curriculum requirements of the MDiv degree and graduating from seminary.

4. There is no relationship between curriculum required experience in ministry and greater pastoral leadership effectiveness.

5. There is an expressed need for seminarians to gain pastoral leadership experience before or during seminary.

6. There is no system in place to track Southern Baptist Convention pastors' educational level or to track all Southern Baptist Convention Cooperative Program supported seminary graduates in Southern Baptist Convention churches after graduation.

Experience and Effectiveness

Implication 1: There is no significant statistical relationship between prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post seminary leadership effectiveness. The data collected for this research showed no significant statistical relationship between prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post seminary leadership effectiveness. Even though stakeholders in seminary education and its preparation for pastoral leadership anecdotally imply that prior or concurrent experience leads to greater effectiveness, the findings of this research suggest prior or concurrent experience does not lead to any greater level of self-perceived pastoral leadership effectiveness.

While overall there was no statistical relationship between pastors with prior experience and pastors without prior experience, there were differences on three of the

sub-dimension scores. Differences in these two groups were marginally significant.

Pastors with prior or concurrent leadership experience tended to have higher scores than

pastors without such experience on three sub-dimensions of competency. Specifically,

pastors with prior or concurrent leadership scored higher in proclamation and worship

(30.48 versus 29.18, $t = 1.78$, $p < .10$), professional judgment (28.97 versus 27.46, $t =$

1.81, $p < .10$), and strategic discernment (28.39 versus 27.02, $t = 1.65$, $p < .10$). With

these exceptions, overall pastors with prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience

and pastors without such experience did not differ on post-seminary leadership

effectiveness as measured by the LPLI.

Curriculum and Effectiveness

Implication 2: Master of Divinity seminary graduates benefit from the leveling

gained through the MDiv curriculum and this leveling translates into pastoral leadership

effectiveness after seminary. According to the quantitative findings of this research,

students without prior pastoral leadership effectiveness rated their effectiveness

statistically as high as the seminary graduates with prior pastoral leadership experience.

Rather than experience, it appears that the leveling gained during seminary education

through the curriculum translates into pastoral leadership effectiveness after seminary.

The measure of success of seminary MDiv education is the effectiveness of graduates in

pastoral leadership (Wheeler, Miller, Aleshire 2007, 41). The MDiv curriculum provides

courses or coursework that aids seminary students in their preparation for effective post

graduation pastoral leadership.

This research focused on the relationship between prior experience and post-

graduate leadership effectiveness. No relationship was found between prior experience

and post-graduate effectiveness. As a result, one may infer from the findings that the

MDiv curriculum is formatted in a manner leading to graduate effectiveness even without

prior pastoral leadership experience. These findings are contrary to findings of Christine,

who concluded "that seminary would better prepare current and future ministers by providing practical, hands-on experience for students" (Christine 2010, 156). Kiedis' research had similar findings to the current research. He found that there was no significant relationship between a graduate's seminary model and pastoral effectiveness (Kiedis 2009, 192). That is, the amount of apprenticeship or hands-on training in the curriculum in various models showed no greater effectiveness than minimum required MDiv experiences in ministry. The present study found the more academic courses in the MDiv curriculum contributed to the effectiveness of graduates serving as pastoral leaders. This present research finds the MDiv curriculum prepares graduates to face the first years after seminary. The MDiv curriculum offers sufficient required experiences in ministry and academic courses to prepare one for effective pastoral leadership experience after graduation.

Value in Seminary Education

Implication 3: There is value in completing the curriculum requirements of the MDiv degree and graduating from seminary. The findings of this research show there is value in completing the curriculum requirements for the MDiv degree and graduating from seminary. The seminary graduates in this research sample rated their pastoral leadership effective using the LPLI. The pastors without prior pastoral leadership effectiveness rated their effectiveness on level with the seminary graduates with prior experience. Even though scholars lament the disconnect between 'academic' scholarship and theological needs of ministry (Hiestand 2008, 355), the disconnect is not ascertainable in the findings of this research. Only one of the pastors interviewed for the qualitative portion of this research found that seminary was not very valuable. The other nineteen pastors interviewed stated their seminary education was valuable.

During the follow-up interviews, pastors also expressed that their seminary experience was positive and helpful in preparing for post-seminary pastoral leadership

effectiveness. Both biblical and theological and practical courses proved helpful in leading graduates to pastoral leadership effectiveness. One pastor, pastor 3, (pastors were numbered 1 to 20 by chronological order of the interview and are labeled by this number) stated that biblical and theological required classes in the MDiv curriculum aided him in acquiring a greater view of God that "increased his view of God and His sovereignty" and thereby contributed to his desire to be an effective pastor. That is, required biblical and theological courses led to greater effectiveness as a pastor after graduation. In addition, pastor 11, a pastor with prior pastoral leadership stated that pastoral ministry courses in the curriculum were very helpful and these courses enriched his pastoral leadership experience during seminary. There is a sense from this limited sample that pastors are meeting the seminary's expectations for their graduates to reach a level of readiness for pastoral leadership effectiveness after graduation. Accordingly, there remains value in completing the curriculum requirements for the MDiv degree and graduating from seminary.

Curriculum Experiences in Ministry

> *Implication 4: There is no relationship between curriculum required experiences in ministry and greater pastoral leadership effectiveness*. The findings of this research show no relationship between curriculum required experience in ministry and a greater level of pastoral leadership effectiveness among seminary graduates. The follow-up interviews revealed the curriculum mandated experiences in ministry were not helpful compared to the biblical and theological courses in preparing seminary graduates for pastoral leadership. Five of the interviewed pastors without prior pastoral leadership experience reported that biblical and theological courses contributed to their post seminary pastoral leadership effectiveness. In contrast, none of the group of graduates reported curriculum experience in ministry contributed to their post seminary effectiveness. The accrediting agency, Association of Theological Schools (ATS),

requires minimum standards for the MDiv curriculum including curriculum experiences in ministry.

According to the pastors interviewed for this research, many of the experiences in ministry courses provided some practical setting for pastors to follow a senior pastor or engage in practical application in a controlled environment. Pastor 3 reported his seminary education informed him on the role of a pastor. He stated that he "would not trade his seminary experience for anything." Also, pastor 4 reported that his internship helped him to develop competency for pastoral leadership effectiveness after graduation. However, some of the coursework did not provide meaningful experiences in ministry. In addition, seminary graduates reported the most helpful and practical MDiv courses were focused on counseling.

Need For Experience

Implication 5: There is an expressed need for seminarians to gain pastoral leadership experience before or during seminary. The qualitative interview protocol asked pastors, who rated their pastoral leadership effectiveness, a series of follow up questions to gain further insights into the research findings. As a part of the interview protocol, pastors with prior pastoral experience and pastors without prior experience were asked, "Do you think it is important for a person training for pastoral ministry to gain experience prior to or concurrent with seminary?" Even though the findings of this research show there was no statistical relationship between experience and effectiveness, all of these pastors stated it was best to have pastoral leadership before seminary graduation. Only two of the ten pastors without prior experience stated it was important for prior experience. In addition, seven pastors without prior pastoral leadership said it was not important to gain pastoral leadership experience before graduating from seminary. One pastor without pastoral leadership experience reported the need for prior experience before seminary depended on the person.

110

A majority of pastors interviewed for the qualitative portion of this research, twelve of the twenty interviewed, affirmed the need for seminary students to serve churches during seminary education. Comments from two pastors with prior pastoral leadership experience characterize the sentiments of this group of pastors. Pastor 2 commented that his first church after graduation expected him to be an effective leader and that his pastoral leadership experience during seminary helped prepare him for effective pastoral leadership after graduation. Pastor 20 went so far to say, seminaries should be "rebuked" for not "forcing" more students to engage in pastoral leadership in a local church during their seminary education.

In addition, the following comments from pastors without prior pastoral leadership experience epitomize the thoughts shared by pastors without prior experience. Pastors 12 and 16 indicated it was best if seminarians focused on academic responsibilities during seminary. Pastor 9 said the "the breadth" between the classroom and the pastorate was too great to navigate during seminary education and therefore did not think it was important for seminary students to serve churches as pastor during seminary.

Tracking Graduates

Implication 6: There is no system in place to track Southern Baptist Church pastor's educational level or to track all Southern Baptist Convention Cooperative Program supported seminary graduates in SBC churches after graduation. Seminaries may track graduates through volunteer reporting through alumni relation offices but beyond this mechanism there is no systematic program to track educational attainment of SBC pastors. Lifeway Research collects Annual Church Profile (ACP) reports submitted by churches annually through area associations and state convention; however, the ACP does not include data related to education of SBC pastors. Lifeway Research conducts research for the SBC in various areas but they do not have a systematic data-gathering

program for SBC pastors. Ascertaining the number of pastors serving SBC churches with a MDiv or other seminary degree is challenging at best.

Additionally, there is no uniform system of identifying seminary graduates serving Southern Baptist Convention churches as pastor on the local associational level. This researcher contacted by email all state executive directors across the SBC to identify pastors to include in this research. In addition, this researcher contacted directors of mission by telephone to identify seminary graduates serving churches in their associations as pastor. There were associations without a single seminary graduate serving a church as pastor and some with only one church with a seminary graduate. Because of the lack of tracking seminary graduates, identifying members of the population was challenging.

Beyond the interests of this research and future researchers, stakeholders would benefit from tracking the placement of MDiv graduates. Seminaries tracking graduates would provide a realistic picture of areas where and how many graduates are serving churches as lead pastors. The findings may not be encouraging if there are small numbers of graduates leading churches, but, this information will provide a realistic picture of placement of their graduates. Conventions, similar to the Southern Baptist Convention, which support seminary education, would also benefit from tracking graduates in their churches to determine if there is a positive return on their investment in future pastoral leaders.

Additionally, seminaries and stakeholders should want to track MDiv graduate placement and effectiveness for the purposes of funding decisions, curriculum decisions, and institutional effectiveness. Seminaries and denominational bodies make funding decisions based on enrollment. Information on placement and graduate effectiveness could provide a new paradigm for denominational funding decisions for seminary education. Currently, surveying seminary professors and seminary presidents inform

112

curriculum and curriculum revisions. Limiting surveys only on professors and presidents limits decision making to one aspect of seminary education. Again, a paradigm shift would occur if graduate placement and effectiveness data were availed in the decisions on revising and implementing curriculum. Finally, what measures inform a seminaries institutional effectiveness? Measuring placement and effectiveness of MDiv graduates would provide a more accurate picture of an institution's effectiveness in preparing graduates for effective pastoral leadership.

Implications Conclusion

These six implications from the present research represent three key areas of seminary education, pastoral leadership experience, and tracking seminary graduates. The anecdotal suggestion that greater effectiveness comes through experience is not supported by the findings of this research. Of the twenty pastors interviewed, twelve indicated prior experience before or during seminary was important (12 of 20). The lack of a Southern Baptist Convention wide tracking system limits researchers attempting to ascertain the number of SBC churches being served by a seminary graduate. Research applications are addressed in the next section.

<div align="center">

Research Applications

</div>

This present research suggests there is value in seminary education. Seminary graduates without prior pastoral leadership experience rated their post seminary pastoral leadership on the same level as seminary graduates with prior pastoral leadership experience. However, while the MDiv curriculum provides courses that lay a solid foundation for pastoral leadership effectiveness, there is also a perceived need for seminary students to gain pastoral leadership experience before graduation. This section addresses applications of this present research in the three areas of seminary education, churches, and in both seminary and church.

Application for Seminaries

The purpose of the present research was to examine the relationship between prior, or lack of prior pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary leadership effectiveness. Within this purpose, there are two areas of application, the seminary and the church. Within the area of seminary education, this section will address the value of seminary education through the MDiv curriculum, a proposal for improved practical experiences in ministry during seminary, mentorships, innovation, and in listening to the local church.

The present research shows that seminary students learn pastoral leadership through the MDiv seminary curriculum and achieve an equal level of perceived pastoral leadership effectiveness as pastors without prior pastoral leadership experience. There is value in the classroom and academic work required of seminary students earning the MDiv. Regarding pastoral leadership effectiveness, Southern Baptist churches have encouraged and certainly will continue to encourage future pastors to attend seminary. In addition, Southern Baptist churches that are searching for a pastor can be confident when considering and extending a call to a seminary graduate that the knowledge and skills learned in the classroom lead to pastoral leadership effectiveness.

Southern Baptist pastors in this study stressed that the biblical and theological courses proved to be more helpful than the practical course required by the MDiv curriculum. It should be noted, given the demographic characteristics of those involved in the research, these pastors received their theological education when campus-based opportunities were the only option. Recently the Association of Theological Schools fully accredited online MDiv programs. As a result of ATS accreditation of the entire online MDiv program, it should be expected that more pastors concurrently serving churches will be enrolling and earning the MDiv off campus and in various locations beyond the six seminary campuses. Such a trend may produce a need for curriculum that requires different experiences in ministry for on-campus students who are not

114

concurrently serving a church as pastor than for pastors concurrently serving a church and earning the MDiv through online or extension programs.

The findings of the present research neither support the need for additional practical education nor indicate a disconnect between the classroom and the practice of pastoral leadership. However, there are strong advocates that stress the need for more practical application during seminary at the expense of core academic curriculum. Most of these advocates press for more field education classes because these classes provide seminary students the opportunity to convert knowledge from the classroom "into hands-on training so that the student will be ready to move into" pastoral leadership (Whitmer 2008, 37). The idea being the more one practices a skill or group of skills the greater the effectiveness. Most advocates want practical training and lament a perceived disconnect between 'academic' scholarship and the theological needs of ministry (Hiestand 2008, 355).

Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire found that the disconnect between seminary and pastoral leadership effectiveness of seminary graduates is wider because practical experiences in the curriculum "are not structured or taught well enough" (Wheeler, Miller, and Aleshire 2007, 24). One solution to address this concern regarding structure and delivery of practical education through the MDiv curriculum would be to offer two-tiered pastoral and practical experiences in ministry courses. In the same way that prior knowledge of biblical language is used to place students in an appropriate course level, students without pastoral leadership experience would be placed in more intensive pastoral leadership courses and very practical experiences in ministry that are required in the MDiv curriculum. Students without pastoral leadership experiences would be taught rudimentary pastoral leadership practices such as how to make pastoral visits in the home and hospital, how to conduct a funeral, how to serve the Lord's Supper, and how to conduct a baptism service. These practical skills are essential for seminary graduates to

115

perform in order to lead effectively after graduation and for serving in their first church. Such a two-tiered curriculum would prepare these students to accomplish these tasks. In a similar fashion, students with prior pastoral leadership experience would be placed in a more advanced pastoral leadership course and given a different type of curriculum required experience in ministry class.

Seminary students with prior pastoral leadership experience and currently serving a church as pastor would be placed in courses that build upon their experience and less time on the rudimentary elements of pastoral leadership. These courses can focus instruction to enhance pastoral leadership skills already used by the pastor and expand to include legacy pastoral leadership skills. Legacy pastoral leadership skills include mentoring new believers, younger pastors, denominational service, and developing more advance administration skills. These students can also be assigned to the same pastoral classes as students without prior pastoral leadership experience where professors have freedom to make assignment adjustments for experienced pastors through assignments in the syllabus. This would provide more advanced instruction for pastors during their seminary education.

In addition to the two-tier pastoral leadership courses, seminaries can develop new or expand existing mentorship program for future pastors. All six of the Cooperative Program Southern Baptist Convention seminaries have some type of mentoring program that connect future graduates, planning to serve churches as pastor, with experienced lead pastors. These programs range from voluntary to mandatory and include various levels of commitments for meetings and involvement over the semester. Mentorships provide opportunities for more experienced pastors to guide and prepare less experienced pastors for pitfalls that seminary graduates often face after graduation and bridge the gap between theoretical and practical application in the pastorate. Mentorships also provide encouragement on the pathway from classroom to the first church after graduation.

These mentorships can continue and grow after graduation and lay the foundation for the less experienced pastor to become a mentor to others in the future.

Southern Baptist Cooperative Program supported seminaries have been on the forefront of innovative ways to offer and deliver seminary education. These innovative ways to deliver seminary education include extension center based distance education and evening and weekend classes. Southern Baptist seminaries have a long and distinguished history of enhancing their students' educational experience through local church internship programs. Seminaries may also explore ways to place students in smaller SBC churches through internships that span their time attending seminary and earning the MDiv. Seminary education through internships should not be limited to larger church settings because the majority of seminary graduates will never pastor a mega-church where many seminary internship programs are located. Mohler was correct to assert that seminaries should not lament the growth of church-based internship models of leadership training but must instead "learn again to listen to the congregations and to gain from them the knowledge necessary for seminaries to prepare ministers 'well furnished' for ministry in the local church" (Mohler 1996, 280-81). With most of the church based MDiv internship programs hosted by larger churches, seminaries would do well to listen to the smaller churches and not over emphasize pastoral leadership for the mega-church.

There are advantages to accredited online learning. Education is not limited to one location. Seminaries are able to deliver instruction to any location where students are able to access the class through an internet connection. As a result, pastors can participate in lectures and complete course assignments given by the best seminary professors. This will allow pastors to remain in the church field where they serve and complete seminary MDiv curriculum. While online education does provide new

challenges and adaptations in both teaching and learning, these advantages outweigh the disadvantages online learning students may experience.

Through online learning, a new student population may be enrolled in seminary education. Already mentioned are the pastors who remain in the church field they serve. This church field may be rural, suburban, or urban. Second, online seminary education also has the potential of reaching lay leaders employed in other careers. Finally, seminary education for lay leaders will lead to a better understanding of the pastor's education, preparation, and an expanded criterion for evaluating pastoral leadership effectiveness.

In addition, online seminary education has the potential to strengthen the relationship between seminaries and churches. Pastors serving churches while pursuing the MDiv online can be guided by a mature local pastor through a mentorship relationship. This mentorship relationship and the pastor's work in the church field can be a part of curriculum required experiences in ministry and part of his pastoral leadership class work. Connecting the seminary student pastor's online MDiv course work and work on the church field can bridge the gap between the classroom and pastoral leadership. Church members can also come alongside pastors earning the MDiv online and observe the impact the MDiv curriculum has on the pastor's growth and effectiveness.

Applications for Churches

Churches expect seminary graduates to be prepared to lead with effectiveness after MDiv graduation. At the same time, perceptions persist that seminaries do not prepare seminary graduates to lead effectively. The present research findings demonstrate seminary graduates with or without prior pastoral leadership experience were effective pastoral leaders after graduation. Churches need to recognize that seminary graduates are generally prepared to lead churches effectively after seminary

118

graduation. The negative perception that seminary graduates are not prepared can be reduced if churches begin recognizing the effectiveness of MDiv graduates and giving them time to demonstrate effectiveness. In some ways, the first church a seminary graduate serves after graduation may prove more important in developing an effective pastoral leader than the church served by a seminary student.

Churches can also contribute to the future effectiveness of pastoral leadership by encouraging advanced theological education. Churches need to encourage seminary education and graduation because the present research findings show that seminary graduates are effective pastoral leaders. Churches sending future pastors to seminary also need to remain in contact with future pastors while they attend seminary. Churches can remain in contact with seminarians by encouraging them with opportunities to fill their pulpits, providing financial assistance, and committing to pray for them while they attend seminary.

Even though this present research does not necessarily support the need for more practical experience before or during seminary to be effective as a pastoral leaders after seminary, churches can still provide students a place to apply the biblical and theological principles learned in seminary in a practical setting while attending seminary by calling and welcoming pastors who are attending seminary. Churches willing to call a seminary student to serve as pastor no longer have to be located geographically close to a seminary because of the multiple seminary delivery systems employed in delivery theological education including ATS accredited online seminary degree programs.

Churches can also provide mentors to come along side seminary students. These mentors may be pastors, other ministers, or mature church members. These mentors can provide spiritual guidance and encouragement to seminary students while they pursue the MDiv. These mentors can provide instructions on practical application of biblical truths learned in class. In addition, these mentors can guide seminary students to

focus on their relationship with God in Christ to keep them grounded as they navigate seminary education and the transition to their first church they serve as pastor.

Common Applications

In addition to applications unique to seminaries and churches, there are research applications common for both seminaries and churches. There is a need for greater cooperation between Southern Baptist churches and Cooperative Program supported seminaries. The Cooperative Program is an excellent funding program for persons in the local church to give to missions through one fund to support missionaries, convention activities, and seminary education. However, this funding mechanism limits the relationship and creates distance between SBC churches and SBC supported seminaries. While there have been attempts in recent years to close the distance between seminaries and churches through the development of internship and seminary training programs based in local churches, there remains a disconnect.

Both seminaries and churches can work to grow the relationship between the two by establishing more internship programs and pulpit supply opportunities for seminary students. Many state conventions continue to maintain an education commission or committee. Even without such a structure, state conventions can promote "Baptist college/university and seminary day" where the focus is on promoting the educational services provided by Baptist institutions of higher education. These emphasis days can provide an opportunity for students to participate in worship leadership, giving the church an opportunity to invest in future ministers and giving the student the opportunity for a hands-on learning experience. The more seminaries and churches work together to grow together in a closer relationship the greater the opportunities for churches and seminaries to be creative in establishing avenues of practical learning for seminary students.

A closer relationship between seminaries and churches can lead to creative funding avenues beyond the Cooperative Program. New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary benefited from a donation to fund student tuition explicitly for seminary students serving in small Louisiana Baptist affiliated churches. These and other new relationship building opportunities benefit seminaries, small local churches, and seminary students. The closer the relationship between seminaries and churches the greater the chance of churches and seminary graduates seeing greater pastoral leadership effectiveness. In addition, the greater the relationship between seminaries and churches the greater the understanding church members have of seminary education and seminary graduates thereby preparing churches for calling a recent seminary graduate as pastor.

In addition, seminaries should consider designing and implementing Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) prepared for churches calling a seminary graduate into his first pastorate after seminary graduation. Such an effort would seize upon the extraordinary talent present in the faculties of all six of the SBC seminaries. Lectures from distinguished faculty could be video-captured from within the MDiv curriculum and pastoral leadership philosophy taught by the seminary faculty. These lectures could be enhanced by specific learning outcomes and assigned readings. In addition to the seminary faculty, noted Baptist leaders could be included in the preparation of the video curriculum. These lectures can shine light on various aspects of the best practices of pastoral leadership for both the church and the graduate.

Once developed, MOOC would be made available to all Baptist churches or especially churches calling a recent seminary graduate for use with their laity. The typical, established MOOC structure could be used free of charge by these individuals who are interested in advancing their knowledge and preparing for newly called pastor. This application will present the "Open" access for which the MOOCs have gained recognition. Laity will have the advantage of being introduced to the same type of

theological education that their pastors receive and thereby gain a greater appreciation for the work required of an educated pastoral leader.

Applications Conclusion

This present research suggests there is value in seminary education and the MDiv curriculum provides sufficient courses to prepare effective pastoral leadership. Applications of the research findings cover the areas of seminaries, churches, and in both seminaries and churches. These research applications can strengthen the already strong relationship between seminary education and pastoral leadership effectiveness.

Research Limitations

The present research limitations included access to the research population, necessity to expand range of years from seminary graduation from five to ten years, and perceptions of graduates. The researcher was able to access seminary graduates serving Southern Baptist churches as pastor even though there is no available public list of pastors serving Southern Baptist Convention churches who are also seminary graduates. While seminaries attempt to track Master of Divinity graduates through alumni associations, these programs are voluntary and depend on graduates keeping seminaries informed. Lifeway Christian Resources of the Southern Baptist Convention collects statistical data through the Annual Church Profile of Southern Baptist Convention but the Annual Church Profile does not collect information about seminary attendance and graduation of church pastors. Lifeway Research conducts various research studies relating to pastoral leadership, but again they do not collect and track seminary graduate placement in pastoral leadership.

This present research also was limited by the need to expand the population to include recent seminary graduates beyond the first five years after graduation to include graduates up to ten years after graduation. After the initial low return rate of recent

seminary graduates within the first five years, the population was expanded to include graduates serving as pastors up to ten years after graduation. Expanding the years of experience after graduation provided more years of experience and allowed more graduates to be included in the sample. Data analysis showed no relationship between the number of years of experience and effectiveness. There was neither an increase nor a decrease in effectiveness over the number of years of experience.

This study was limited to perceptions of pastoral leadership effectiveness. During the early stages of this research, the researcher encouraged pastors to rate their pastoral leadership effectiveness and to enlist lay observers to also rate their effectiveness. The pastors were seemingly reluctant to enlist lay observers. The reluctance could be traced to a lack of desire to be vulnerable to review in spite of the fact the lay observers ratings were to be confidential and not shared with the pastor.

Further Research

The findings of this research suggest that further research is needed in three key areas. First, there needs to be a study conducted to explore the placement of Master of Divinity seminary graduates to identify how many are serving churches as a pastor. Further research on the placement of MDiv graduates would provide valuable data for seminaries, churches, future pastors, and funding programs. Seminaries and funding program (Cooperative Program of the Southern Baptist Convention) administrators would gain insight into how they are doing in preparing, placing, and long term effectiveness of graduates in remaining in pastoral leadership positions. Further research would fill the void in data related to seminary graduation and pastoral leadership placement and service.

Second, there needs to be a multi-source 360° degree study conducted among seminary graduates serving Southern Baptist Convention churches as pastors. Even though the LPLI studies among Methodist lay observers rated pastoral leadership

effectiveness higher than pastor's self perception, a multi-source 360° study of MDiv graduates would provide additional perceptions of pastoral leadership beyond self-perceptions of pastors by including perceptions of key leaders or lay members. These 360° studies may require relaxing statistical requirements for the number of members to participate in a sample and may have to be limited to a geographical region in order to provide a sufficient sample with lay observer ratings to gain new insights into pastoral leadership effectiveness. Multi-source 360° studies give an additional perspective global picture of perceptions and provide a more complete picture of the topic studied.

Third, further research needs to be conducted to examine the relationship between prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience during MDiv seminary education and pastoral leadership effectiveness. Even though pastoral leadership in general has garnered attention through social science research, there are limited research studies examining the impact of seminary education on graduates and their pastoral leadership effectiveness after seminary. Further research among MDiv graduates with and without prior pastoral leadership will return greater insights into the value of experience during seminary.

APPENDIX 1

LEWIS PASTORAL LEADERSHIP INVENTORY

CHARACTER: WHO A LEADER IS

Spiritual Authenticity

1. Demonstrates a personal experience of God
2. Demonstrates personal faith in Jesus Christ
3. Lives in such a manner that the love of God is incarnate in their daily activities
4. Conveys passion for their ministry as a divine opportunity and responsibility
5. Continues to grow in spiritual maturity

Integrity

6. Maintains the highest ethical ideals of Christian life in professional and personal behavior
7. Is honest
8. Models what is asked of the congregation's members
9. Maintains appropriate boundaries so sexual misconduct or harassment are never issues
10. Follows through on promises and commitments

Wholeness

11. Is self-motivated and driven by a clear sense of purpose
12. Leads a physically healthy lifestyle
13. Balances the demands of self, ministry, and family
14. Is sustained by a support system of colleagues, friends, and family
15. Faithfully practices spiritual disciplines

Self Awareness

16. Learns from mistakes and failures
17. Seeks and receives feedback to improve
18. Responds appropriately to criticism
19. Seeks opinions that represents differing points of view
20. Listens carefully to others in all situations

COMPETENCE: WHAT A LEADER DOES

Knowledge and Teaching

21. Has intellectual grounding needed for ministry
22. Demonstrates solid biblical and theological knowledge

23. Understands and shares the denominational heritage with the congregation
24. Shows evidence of ongoing study, reading, and curiosity
25. Relates knowledge to the congregation in effective ways

Proclamation and Worship

26. Preaches the Word accurately and passionately
27. Teaches the Word and faith with skill and conviction
28. Leads worship and administers the sacraments in ways that feed the congregation spiritually
29. Communicates effectively when speaking and writing
30. Plans and prepares for worship

Pastoral Skills

31. Ensures that congregational members receive sensitive pastoral care in times of illness, crisis, or death
32. Treats others with dignity and respect
33. Deals constructively with conflict
34. Encourages diversity and inclusiveness
35. Genuinely cares about me

Administrative Skills

36. Handles administrative matters competently
37. Develops specific goals and plans to implement the congregation's vision
38. Is prudent in attending financial matters
39. Is effective supervising others
40. Manages time wisely

Professional Judgment

41. Judgment is sound and mature
42. Speaks positively about the denomination and encourages support
43. Encourages dialogue about changes that could improve the denomination
44. Uses humor appropriately
45. Maintains appropriate personal appearance and presence

Strategic Discernment

46. Understands the context in which they serve
47. Exercises leadership appropriate to the situation
48. Experiments and takes strategic risks
49. Is flexible
50. Demonstrates courage

CONTRIBUTION: WHAT A LEADER ACCOMPLISHES

Discerns a Vision

51. Helps the congregation discern God's vision
52. Describes a compelling image of what the congregation can accomplish
53. Presents new and creative possibilities

54. Inspires confidence and passion about the divine meaning of the church's mission
55. Cultivates a shared vision of what God's next step is for the congregation

Builds Teams

56. Builds teams to accomplish the congregation's vision
57. Recruits and develops new leaders
58. Shows appreciation and celebrates the accomplishments of the congregation
59. Ensures that members know what is expected of them and holds them accountable around the congregation's mission, values, and goals
60. Equips others to accomplish ministry goals

Reaches New People

61. Shares the Gospel witness passionately
62. Helps others to see God's presence in their lives in new ways
63. Develops plans to reach new disciples
64. Helps people begin their discipleship journey
65. Makes inviting newcomers a priority

Fosters Faith Development

66. Forms new groups for study, prayer, and spiritual growth
67. Helps members discover and develop their gifts for ministry
68. Increases members' participation in new and existing ministries
69. Increases worship attendance
70. Increases giving by emphasizing stewardship

Expands Missions and Service

71. Calls the congregation to a mission beyond the walls
72. Conveys a concern for social justice
73. Increases awareness about world and community concerns
74. Encourages acts of love, service, and justice in the community
75. Increases members' service to others beyond the congregation

APPENDIX 2

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Agreement to Participate

The research in which you are about to participate is designed to examine the relationship between prior pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary effectiveness within the first 10 years after graduation. This research is being conducted by William Cannon II for purposes of dissertation research. In this research, you will self-assess your pastoral leadership effectiveness and ask lay observers to assess your pastoral leadership effectiveness. Any information you provide will be held strictly confidential, and at no time will your name be reported, or your name identified with your responses in my dissertation writing. Participation in this study is totally voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time.

By your completion of the Lewis Pastoral Leadership Instrument, and checking the appropriate box below, you are giving informed consent for the use of your responses in this research.

2. What is your name? (optional)

3. Name of association?

4. What is your age?

        A. 18 to 24
        B. 25 to 34
        C. 35 to 44
        D. 45 to 54
        E.   55 to 64
        F.   65 to 74
        G. 75 or older

5. What is your race?

        A. Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native
        B. Asian or Pacific Islander
        C. African American/Black
        D. Caucasian/White
        E. Hispanic/Latino/Latina

F. Multi-Racial
G. Other

6. Year in current church

    A. First year
    B. Second year
    C. Third year
    D. Fourth year
    E. Fifth year
    F. Six or more year

7. Clergy Status

    A. Full-Time Local Pastor
    B. Part-Time Local Pastor

8. Seminary Graduate (Master of Divinity)?

    A. Yes
    B. No

9. Additional Seminary Degree(s) Earned

    A. Doctor
    B. Master of Arts
    C. Other
    D. None

10. Which seminary did you graduate?

    A. Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary
    B. Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
    C. New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary
    D. Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
    E. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
    F. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
    G. Other Seminary/Divinity School

11. What year did you graduate from seminary?

    A. 2012
    B. 2011
    C. 2010
    D. 2009
    E. 2008
    F. 2007

G. 2006
H. 2005
I. 2004
J. 2003

12. Number of years serving as lead pastor before attending seminary?

A. Zero
B. One
C. Two
D. Three
E. Four
F. Five
G. Six or more

13. Number of serving as lead pastor during seminary?

A. Zero
B. One
C. Two
D. Three
E. Four or more

14. Number of years serving as lead pastor after seminary?

A. 1
B. 2
C. 3
D. or more

15. Zip code of the congregation

16. How long has this congregation been worshiping at its current location?

A. Ten years or less
B. 10 – 25 years
C. 26 – 50 years
D. 51 – 75 years
E. More than seventy-five years

17. What is the current membership of this congregation?

A. 50 or fewer
B. 51 – 100
C. 101 – 250
D. 251 – 500
E. 501 – 999

F. 1,000 or more members

18. What is the average worship attendance of this congregation?

    A. 50 or fewer
    B. 51 – 100
    C. 101 – 250
    D. 251 – 500
    E. 501 – 999
    F. 1,000 or more members

19. Within the last two years, has your congregation experienced a conflict that led some people to leave the congregation?

    A. Yes
    B. No

20. Please provide your email address for follow up (optional)

APPENDIX 3

EMAIL TO BAPTIST LEADERS

The researcher emailed pastors, directors of mission, state convention leaders, and Southern Baptist seminaries enlisting their help in gathering contact information of pastors in the population. The contact information was utilized in contacting pastors to invite them to participate in the research.

Subject Line: Pastoral Leadership Effectiveness Research

Greetings,

My name is Bill Cannon, pastor and Ph.D. student (dissertation phase) at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. I am researching pastoral leadership effectiveness of pastors in the first years after graduating from seminary. The purpose of my research is to study the relationship between pastoral leadership experience before seminary graduation with pastoral leadership effectiveness in the first years after graduating with the Master of Divinity.

You can help by inviting pastors who have earned the Master of Divinity and have experience in senior pastor ministry to participate by completing the online Lewis Pastor Leadership Inventory at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/9XD7WPV In addition, you can participate by forwarding contact information for pastors in your association to me for invitation. Individual responses of pastors will be kept private and will only be analyzed and reported in an aggregate form.

Identifying and reaching this group of seminary graduates and pastors is difficult and your participation will prove vital to the success of this research.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you for participating in this important research relating to pastoral leadership effectiveness.

Link to Survey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/9XD7WPV

Bill Cannon

Pastor, FBC Union Springs, AL
MDiv, New Orleans Seminary
PhD. Candidate, Southern Seminary

132

sbc360@gmail.com
334-502-3459

APPENDIX 4

EMAIL INVITATION FOR PASTORS

The researcher sent this email to individual pastors inviting them to participate in the study.

Subject Line: Pastoral Leadership Effectiveness Research

Greetings,

My name is Bill Cannon, pastor and Ph.D. student (dissertation phase) at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. I am researching pastoral leadership effectiveness of seminary graduates in their first years after graduation. The purpose of my research is to study the relationship between pastoral leadership experience before seminary graduation with pastoral leadership effectiveness in the first years after graduating with the Master of Divinity.

You can participate by completing the Lewis Pastoral Leadership Inventory online at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/9XD7WPV The inventory rates pastoral leadership effectiveness in the areas of character, competency, and contribution. The survey takes less than fifteen minutes to complete. Your personal information and individual responses will remain private, confidential, and will not be reported. Your responses will be compiled in an aggregate form for analysis and reporting.

Thank you for participating and contributing to this important research relating to pastoral leadership effectiveness. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Link to the survey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/9XD7WPV

Bill Cannon

Pastor, FBC Union Springs, AL
MDiv, New Orleans Seminary
PhD. Candidate, Southern Seminary
sbc360@gmail.com
334-502-3459

APPENDIX 5

DIRECTOR'S EMAIL

The following email was forwarded to pastors in a state convention by the executive director or the state convention.

Subject Line: Request

Dear Fellow Laborer,

I hope this contact finds you doing well during these busy days of ministry. In communication with some of you recently, I am convinced that the pace of ministry continues to accelerate. I pray for you regularly as you deal with all kinds of challenges these days.

The purpose for my contact with you is to inform you of a study being conducted by an Alabama Baptist pastor, Bill Cannon, of the First Baptist Church of Union Springs. As a major component of his Ph.D. work at SBTS, he is seeking the input of participants who can provide perspective in a study of the relationship between the pastoral leadership experience prior to or during seminary training and post seminary effectiveness within the first ten years after graduation.

The assessment is a brief online format which is found at sbc360@gmail.com. The research is, of course, managed by Bill Cannon. He will be a good steward of the information in terms of privacy and usage.

I believe this research has potential to help in evaluating the critical situation related to pastoral leadership in our churches. Would you consider communicating this opportunity to your pastors in some fashion? Rarely, if ever, have I sought much input from you, my colleagues. However, I am a believer in this research and I think it is a worthwhile investment of your time. Thanks for your consideration.

Blessings,

Director
Isaiah 41:10

APPENDIX 6

FOLLOW UP INTERVIEW EMAIL

This email invited participating pastors to participate further by answering interview questions to gain additional insights.

Subject Line: SBC Research

Greetings,

I am writing to invite you to continue your participation in my research study and to receive $50 cash or Amazon Card. You recently completed the LPLI as a part of my Ph.D. research. The purpose of my research is to ascertain the relationship between prior experience and pastoral leadership effectiveness after seminary graduation.

The analysis of the data collected for the LPLI showed no significant relationship between prior pastoral leadership experience and greater effectiveness after seminary. I need to further explore pastoral leadership experience and seminary education by asking you a few questions.

The interview should take between 15 and 30 minutes. As I mentioned, you will receive $50 cash or Amazon Card for your time and participation.

Call me directly at 334-733-5034 to arrange a day and time to talk or reply to this email to provide a phone number for me call you to arrange an appointment.

I look forward to your participation and to talking with you.

Bill Cannon
334-524-3459

APPENDIX 7

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Randomly select twenty pastors to contact for follow-up interview. Among them, ten with prior or concurrent pastoral experience, and ten without experience.

2. This researcher will contact the randomly selected pastors to introduce them to the research, remind them of completing LPLI, and ask them to further participate by answering follow up questions.

3. This researcher will ask open-ended questions derived from the data analysis. The researcher will record the answers by electronic device.

 Questions for pastors with prior or concurrent experience

1. What was your prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience? What exactly did you do? Was that a positive or negative experience?

2. How did this experience inform your seminary classroom experience?

3. How did the seminary classroom add to your experience as a pastor during seminary?

4. How much value would you place on your seminary experience as being formative in terms of your character, contribution, and competency?

5. How did the prior or concurrent experience affect your effectiveness as a pastor after seminary graduation?

   a. In terms of your character (an LPLI domain) Who you are
   b. In terms of your contribution (an LPLI domain) What you accomplish
   c. In terms of your competency (an LPLI domain) What you do

6. What part of the Master of Divinity curriculum affected your effectiveness as a pastor after seminary graduation?

   a. In terms of your character (an LPLI domain)
   b. In terms of your contribution (an LPLI domain)
   c. In terms of your competency (an LPLI domain)

7. What are your thoughts on the findings of my survey? Any suggestions why there was no relationship between prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary pastoral effectiveness?

8. Do you think it is important for a person training for pastoral ministry to gain experience prior to or concurrent with seminary? If so, why? If not, why not?

Questions for pastors with prior or concurrent experience

1. What part of the Master of Divinity curriculum affected your effectiveness as a pastor after seminary graduation?

    a. In terms of your character (an LPLI domain)
    b. In terms of your contribution (an LPLI domain)
    c. In terms of your competency (an LPLI domain)

2. How did the curriculum experiences in ministry affect your effectiveness as a pastor after seminary graduation?

    a. In terms of your character (an LPLI domain)
    b. In terms of your contribution (an LPLI domain)
    c. In terms of your competency (an LPLI domain)

3. How did the seminary classroom add to your experience as a pastor after seminary graduation?

4. How much value would you place on your seminary experience as being formative in terms of your character, contribution, and competency?

5. What are your thoughts on the findings of my survey? Any suggestions why there was no relationship between prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience and post-seminary pastoral effectiveness?

6. Do you think it is important for a person training for pastoral ministry to gain experience prior to or concurrent with seminary? If so, why? If not, why not?

REFERENCE LIST

Aleshire, Daniel. 2003. "The Character and Assessment of Learning for Religious Vocation: MDiv Education and Numbering the Levites." *Theological Education* 39, no. 1: 1-15.

_____. 2008. *Earthen Vessels: Hopeful Reflections on the Work and Future of Theological Schools*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Allison, Gregg. 2011. *Historical Theology: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Anderson, Robert. 1991. *Circles of Influence: Expanding Your Leadership Capabilities in the Church*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.

Andrews, Roy. 2005. "The Pastorate as a Metaphor for the Seminary President: A Focus Study." *Theological Education*. 40, supp.: 115-27.

Anthony, Michael, and Mick Boersma. 2007. *Moving on Moving Forward: A Guide for Pastors in Transition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Ascough, Richard. 2002. "Chaos Theory and Paul's Organizational Leadership Style." *Journal of Religious Leadership* 1, no. 2: 21-43.

Association of Theological Schools. 2003. *Fact Book on Theological Education: 2002-2003*. Pittsburgh, PA: Association of Theological Schools.

_____. 2006. *Master of Divinity Curriculum Revision*. Pittsburgh, PA: Association of Theological Schools.

_____. 2007. *Fact Book on Theological Education 2006-2007*. Pittsburgh, PA: Association of Theological Schools.

_____. 2012. *Bulletin* 50, part 1. Pittsburgh, PA: Association of Theological Schools.

Augsberger, David. 2009. "Evaluating Servanthood: From Servant Leadership to Leading as Serving." In *The Three Tasks of Leadership: Worldly Wisdom for Pastoral Leaders*, edited by Eric Jacobsen, 99-101. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing.

Banks, Robert, and Bernice Ledbetter. 2004. *Reviewing Leadership: A Christian Evaluation of Current Approaches*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Barfoot, D. Scott, Bruce Winston, and Charles Wickman. 2011. "Forced Pastoral Exits: An Exploratory Study. School of Leadership Studies, Regent University." Accessed April 8, 2011. http.www.regent.edu.

Barker, Lance, and B. Edmond Martin, eds. 2004. *Multiple Paths to Ministry: New Models for Theological Education*. Cleveland, OH: The Pilgrim Press.

Barna, George. 1993. *Today's Pastors: A Revealing Look at What Pastors are Saying about Themselves, Their Peers, and the Pressures They Face*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books.

Barnett, David. 2003. "A Comparative Analysis of Critical Competencies of the Assessment of Ministry Effectiveness." Ed.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Baron, David, and Lynette Padwa. 1999. *Moses on Management: 50 Leadership Lessons from the Greatest Manager of All Times*. New York, NY: Pocket Books.

Bass, Dorothy, and Craig Dykstra. 2008. *For Life Abundant: Practical Theology, Theological Education, and Christian Ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Battle, John. 2005. "Pastoral Imperatives: Paul's Use of the Imperative Mood in His Letters to Timothy and Titus." *Western Reformed Seminary Journal* 12, no. 2: 12 19.

Baxter, Richard. 1982. *The Reformed Pastor: A Pattern for Personal Growth and Ministry*. Portland, OR: Multnomah Press.

Black, Thomas. 1999. *Doing Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences: An Integrated Approach to Research Resign, Measurement, and Statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bell, Skip, and Roger Dudley. 2002. "Leadership Formation in Ministerial Education-Part 1: An Assessment and Analysis of Leadership Traits in Seventh-Day Adventist Pastors in North America." *Andrews University Studies* 40, no. 2: 277-99.

_____. 2004. "Leadership Formation in Ministerial Education-Part 2: The Impact of Graduate Theological Education on Leadership Development in the Local Pastorate." A*ndrews University Studies* 42, no. 1: 203-16.

Bell, Skip, Roger Dudley, and Douglas Tilstra. 2005. "Leadership Formation in Ministerial Education-Part 3: A Comparison of Transformational Effect in Three Selected Programs." *Andrews University Studies* 43, no. 1: 59-76.

Bennis, Warren. 1989. *On Becoming a Leader*. Reading, MA: Perseus Books.

Black, Thomas. 1999. *Doing Quantitative Research in Social Sciences: An Integrated Approach to Research, Design, and Statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Blanchard, Ken. 2007. *The Heart of a Leader: Insights on the Art of Influence*. Colorado Springs, CO: David C. Cook.

Blizzard, Samuel. 1985. *The Protestant Parish Minister: A Behavioral Science Interpretation*. Storrs, CT: Society for the Scientific Study of Religion.

Bredfeldt, Gary. 2006. *Great Leader Great Teacher: Recovering the Biblical Vision for*

Leadership. Chicago, IL: Moody Publishers.

Breen, Gerald-Mark. 2007. "Interpersonal, Intragroup Conflict between Southern Baptist Pastors: A Qualitative Inquiry Examining Contributing Factors." *Pastoral Psychology* 56, no. 3: 249-68.

Brothers, Wilburn. 2010. "A Cross-Cultural Study of Factors Motivating Church of Christ Ministry Students to Enter Ministry." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Bruce, Alexander. 1889. *The Training of the Twelve.* 4th ed. New York, NY: Armstrong and Son.

Burns, Robert, and Ronald Cervero. 2002. "How Pastors Learn the Politics of Ministry Practice." *Religious Education* 97, no. 4: 304-21.

Carpenter, Scotty. 2006. "An Analysis of the Relationship Between Leadership Characteristics of SBC Pastors and Transformational Leadership." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Carroll, Jackson. 2006. *God's Potters: Pastoral Leadership and the Shaping of Congregations.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Carroll, Jackson, Barbara Wheeler, Daniel Alshire, and Penny Long Marler. 1997. *Being There: Culture and Formation in Two Theological Schools.* New York, NY Oxford.

Carson, D. A. 2004. *The Cross and Christian Ministry: Leadership Lessons from 1 Corinthians.* 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

Carter, Judith. 2009. "Transformational Leadership and Pastoral Leadership Effectiveness." *Pastoral Psychology* 58, no. 3: 261-71.

Cahalan, Kathleen. 2008. "Introducing Ministry and Fostering Integration: Teaching the Bookends of the Masters of Divinity Program." *Teaching Theology and Religion* 11, no. 2: 65-74.

Chang, Patricia. 2005. *Factors Shaping Clergy Careers: A Wakeup Call for Protestant Denominations and Pastors.* Durham, NC: Pulpit and Pew Research on Pastoral Leadership.

Christine, David. 2010. "Baptist Pastoral Leadership: An Analysis for Curriculum Development." Ph.D. Diss., University of North Texas.

Chu, Raymond. 2011. "Conflict Management Styles of Pastors and Organizational Servant Leadership: A Descriptive Study." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Clarke, Andrew. 2008. *A Pauline Theology of Church Leadership.* New York, NY: T&T Clark.

Clinton, J. Robert. 1988. *The Making of Leader: Recognizing the Lessons and Stages of Leadership Development.* Colorado Springs, CO: Navpress.

Coggin, James. 2004. "A Comparative Analysis of Leadership Competencies and Characteristics for Vocational Ministry Leaders as Identified by Ministry Professionals." Ed.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Cohall, Kirkpatrick, and Bruce Cooper. 2010. "Educating American Baptist Pastors: A National Survey of Church Leaders." *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 19, no. 1: 27-55.

Cole, Allan Hugh, ed. 2008. *From Midterms to Ministry: Practical Theologians on Pastoral Beginnings*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Coleman, Robert. 1993. *The Master Plan of Evangelism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Fleming Revell.

Collins, Jim. 2001. *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap and Others Don't*. New York, NY: Harper.

Cordoza, Frederick. 2005. "Perceptions of Ministerial Effectiveness by Leaders of Urban Churches in the Southern Baptist Convention." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Cormode, Scott. 2009. "Multi-Layered Leadership: The Christian Leader as Builder, Shepherd, and Gardener." Accesswed January 15, 2009. http://christianleadership.org.

Creswell, John. 2003. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dale, Robert. 1981. *To Dream Again: How to Help Your Church Come Alive*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.

_____. 1984. *Ministers as Leaders*. Nashville, TN: Broadman.

_____. 1998. *Leadership for a Changing Church: Charting the Shape of the River*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

_____. 2005. *Seeds for the Future: Growing Organic Leaders for Living Churches*. Atlanta, GA: Chalice Press.

Dash, Michael, Jimmy Dukes, and Gordon Smith. 2005. "Learning from the First Years: Noteworthy Conclusions from the Parish Experience of Recent Graduates of ATS Schools." *Theological Education* 40, no. 2: 65-77.

Davids, Peter. 1990. *The First Epistle of Peter*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

De Pree, Max. 1989. *Leadership is an Art*. New York, NY: Dell.

Dever, Mark. 2005. *Nine Marks of a Healthy Church*. 4th ed. Washington, DC: Nine Marks.

_____. 2007. "The Doctrine of the Church." In *A Theology for the Church*, edited by Daniel Akin, 927-43. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic.

142

Dietterich, Inagrace. 2005. "Discerning and Participating in God's Mission: The Relationship Between Seminaries and Congregations." *Theological Education* 40, supp.: 93-99.

Dougherty, Kevin. 2004. "Institutional Influence on Growth in Southern Baptist Congregations." *Review of Religious Research* 46, no. 2: 117-31.

Dreibelbis, John, and David Gortner. 2005. "Beyond Wish Lists for Pastoral Leadership: Assessing Clergy Behavior, and Congregational Outcomes to Guide Seminary Curriculum." *Theological Education* 40, supp.: 25-49.

Dreyer, Elizabeth. 1996. "Excellence in the Professions: What Theological Schools Can Learn from Law, Business, and Medical Schools." *Theological Education* 33, no. 1: 1-12.

Drummond, Sarah Birmingham 2008. *"*Theoretical Perspectives on Integrative Learning." *Theological Education* 43, no. 2: 55-66.

Estep, James, Jr., Michael Anthony, and Gregg Allison. 2008. *A Theology for Christian Education.* Nashville, TN: B&H Academic.

Farley, Edward. 1983. *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education.* Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

Fitzgerald, Catherine, and Linda Kirby. 1997. *Developing Leaders: Research and Application in Psychological Type and Leadership Development.* Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.

Flahardy, Brian. 2007. "Essential Leadership Competencies of Professional Ministerial Staff as Identified by Senior Pastors, Staff Members, and Church Lay Leaders." Ed.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Finke, Roger, and Kevin Dougherty. 2002. "The Effects of Professional Training: The Social and Religious Capital Acquired in Seminaries." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41, no. 1: 103-20.

Foster, Anthony. 2010. "A Study of Post-Baccalaureate Leadership Curricula at Select Christian Institutions of Higher Education." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Foster, Charles. 2005. "Hearing the Congregation's Voice in Theological Education: A Response to the Consultation Conversation." *Theological Education* 40, supp.: 87-91.

Foster, Charles, Lisa Dahill, Lawrence Golemon, and Barbara Tolentino. 2006. *Educating Clergy: Teaching Practices and Pastoral Imagination.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fowler, James. 1985. "Practical Theology and Theological Education: Some Models and Questions." *Theology Today* 42, no. 1: 43-58.

Fox, Donald. 2005." An Analysis of Bible College Training in Relationship to Ministry Satisfaction and Persistence in Christian Service." Ed.D. diss., The Southern Baptist

Theological Seminary.

Gall, Joyce, M. D. Gall, and Walter Borg. 2005. *Applying Educational Research: A Practical Guide.* 5th ed. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Gan, Jonathan. 2007. *The Metaphor of Shepherd in the Hebrew Bible: A Historical-Literary Reading.* New York, NY: University Press of America.

Gangel, Kenneth. 1989. *Feeding and Leading: A Practical Handbook on Administration in Churches and Christian Organizations.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

_____. 1997a. "Delivering Theological Education that Works." *Theological Education* 34, no. 1: 1-9.

_____. 1997b. *Team Leadership in Christian Ministry: Using Multiple Gifts to Build a Unified Vision.* Chicago, IL: Moody Press.

_____. 2001. "Marks of a Healthy Church." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 158, October-December: 467-77.

George, Timothy. 1996. "The Baptist Tradition." In *Theological Education in the Evangelical Tradition*, edited by R. Albert Mohler and Gary Hart, 27-44. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

Gohall, Kirkpatrick, and Bruce Cooper. 2010. "Educating American Baptist Pastors: A National Survey of Church Leaders." *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 19, no. 1: 27-55.

Grieb, A. Katherine. 2005. "'The One Who Called You…': Vocation and Leadership in the Pauline Literature." *Interpretation* 59, no. 2: 154-75.

Harder, Cameron. 2007. "Using Participatory Action Research in Seminary Internships," in *The Practicum in Professional Education*, edited by Keith Douglas Walker, Edwin George Ralph, and Randolph Wimmer, Calgary, AB: Detselig, 2010: 123-38.

Hart, D. G. and R. Albert Mohler, eds. 1996. *Theological Education in the Evangelical Tradition.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Harvard Business School. 1998. *Harvard Business Review on Leadership.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Hemrick, Eugene, and Dean Hoge. 1991. "A Survey of Priests Ordained Five to Nine Years." Washington, DC: National Catholic Education Association.

Herbert, Terry. 2010. "Assessing Readiness for Ministry of Graduating Students at Dallas Theological Seminary" from Selected Profiles of Ministry Personal Characteristics Criteria. D.Min. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary.

Herrington, Jim, Mike Bonem, and James Furr. 2000. *Leading Congregational Change: A Practical Guide for the Transformational Journey.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Herrington, Jim, R. Robert Creech, and Trisha Taylor. 2003. *The Leaders Journey: Accepting the Call to Personal and Congregational Transformation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hess, Lisa. 2008. "Formation in the Worlds of Theological Education: Moving from 'What' to 'How'" *Teaching Theology and Religion* 11, no. 1: 14-23.

Hiestand, Gerald. 2008. "Pastor-Scholar to Professor-Scholar: Exploring the Theological Disconnect Between the Academy and the Local Church." *Westminister Theological Journal* 70, no. 2: 355-69.

Hillman, George, Jr. 2006a. "Internships and Competency Sharpening." Dallas Theological Seminary. Accessed July 21, 2008. http.//dts.edu.

_____. 2006b. "Leadership Practices and Current Ministry Experiences of Master-Level Seminary Students." *Christian Higher Education* 5, no. 2: 141-59.

_____. 2008a. *Ministry Greenhouse: Cultivating Environments for Practical Learning*. Herndon, VA: Alban Institute.

_____.2008b. *Preparing for Ministry: A Practical Guide to Theological Field Education.* Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel.

Hines, Travis, Thomas McGee, Lee Waller and Sharon Waller. 2009. "Online Theological Education: A Case Study of Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry." *Christian Higher Education* 8, no. 1: 32-41.

Hoge, Dean, and Jacqueline Wenger. 2005. *Pastors in Transition: Why Clergy Leave Local Church Ministry.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Holifield, E. Brooks. 2007. *God's Ambassadors: A History of the Christian Clergy in America*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing.

Hough, Joseph, Jr., Richard Mouw, and Robert Franklin. 2001. "Issues and Challenges in Theological Education: Three Reflections." *Theological Education* 37, no. 2: 101 16.

Howell, David. 2004. *Fundamental Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole—Thompson Learning.

Howell, Don. 2003. *Servants of the Servant: A Biblical Theology of Leadership*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.

Huizing, Russell. 2011. "Leaders from Disciples: The Church's Contribution to Leadership Development." *Evangelical Review of Theology* 35, no. 4: 333-44.

Jones, L. Gregory, and Kevin Armstrong. 2006. *Resurrecting Excellence: Shaping faithful Christian Ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing.

Jeynes, William. 2012. "The Need for Changes in the Nature of Christian Seminary Education." *Christian Higher Education*. 11, no. 2: 69-80.

Jurkowitz, Carolyn. 2003." What is the Literature Saying about Learning and

Assessment" in Higher Education. *Theological Education* 39, no. I: 53-92.

Kelsey, David. 1993. *Between Athens and Berlin: A Theological Education Debate*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing.

Kemery, Edward. 2006. "Clergy Role Stress and Satisfaction: Role Ambiguity Isn't Always Bad." *Pastoral Psychology* 54, no. 6: 561-70.

Kiedis, Thomas. 2009. "A Comparative Analysis of Leadership Development Models in Post-Baccalaureate Theological Education." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Klimoski, Victor. 2003. "Getting to the Questions: Assessment and the Professional Character of Ministry." *Theological Education* 39, no. 1: 35-71.

Kling, David. 1996. "New Divinity Schools of the Prophets." In *Theological Education in the Evangelical Tradition*, edited by R. Albert Mohler and Gary Hart, 129-47. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

Kotter, John. 1990. *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

_____. 1996. *Leading Change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kohl, Manfred. 2001." Current Trends in Theological Education." *International Congregational Journal* 1, no. 1: 26-40.

Kouzes, James, and Barry Posner. 2002. *The Leadership Challenge*. 3rd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

_____, eds. 2004. *Reflections on the Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Kraut, Allen, ed. *Organizational Surveys: Tools for Assessment and Change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kuhne, Gary, and Joe Donaldson. 1995. "Balancing Ministry and Management: An Exploratory Study of Pastoral Work Activities." *Review of Religious Research* 37, 2: 147-63.

Langdon, Danny, Kathleen Whiteside, and Monica McKenna, eds. *Intervention Resource Guide: 50 Performance Improvement Tools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Laniak, Timothy. 2006. *Shepherds After My Own Heart: Pastoral Traditions and Leadership in the Bible*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.

Lea, Thomas, and Hayne Griffin, Jr. 1992. *The New American Commentary: 1,2 Timothy and Titus*. Nashville, TN: Broadman.

Leddy, Paul, and Jeanne Ormrod. 2005. *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. 8th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Lepsinger, Richard, and Antoinette Lucia. 2009. *The Art and Science of 360° Feedback*.

2nd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lewis Center for Church Leadership. 2008. Accessed November 10, 2008. http://lpli.org.

Lewis, G. Douglass, ed. 2006. *A Handbook for Seminary Presidents*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing.

Lifeway. 2007. Southern Baptist Convention Statistical Summary. Accessed November 11, 2010. http://www.lifeway.com.

Lincoln, Timothy. 1998. "Mobile Sheep and Stable Shepherds: The Ecumenical Challenge of Porous North American Denominational Boundaries." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 35, no. 3/4: 425-36.

_____. 2010. "How Master of Divinity Education Changes Students: A Research-Based Model." *Teaching Theology and Religion* 13, no. 3: 208-22.

Lischer, Richard. 2005. "The Called Life: An Essay on the Pastoral Vocation." *Interpretation* 59, no. 2: 166-75.

London, Manuel. 1995. *Self and Interpersonal Insight: How People Gain Understanding Of Themselves and Others in Organization*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

_____. 2002. *Leadership Development: Paths to Self-Taught and Professional Growth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Lummis, Adair. 2003. *What Do Lay People Want in Pastors: Answers from Lay Search Committee Chairs and Regional Judicatory Leaders*. Duke, NC: Duke Divinity School.

Luther, Martin. 1967. *Selected Writings of Martin Luther*. Theodore Tappert, Ed. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress.

Long, Thomas. 2008. "The Essential Untidiness of Ministry." In *From Midterms to Ministry: Practical Theologians on Pastoral Beginnings*, ed. Allan Cole, 1-12. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

MacArthur, John, Jr. 1995. *Rediscovering Pastoral Ministry: Shaping Contemporary Ministry with Biblical Mandates*. Dallas, TX: Word Publishing.

_____. 2010. *Called to Lead: 26 Leadership Lessons from the Life of the Apostle Paul* Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson

Maciariello, Joseph. 2003. "Lessons in Leadership and Management from Nehemiah." *Theology Today* 60, no. 3: 397-07.

Malphurs, Aubrey. 2003. *Being Leaders: The Nature of Authentic Christian Leadership*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Mayhue, Richard, and Robert Thomas, eds. 2002. *The Master's Perspective on Pastoral Ministry*. The Masters Master's Perspective Series, vol. 3. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregal.

McFayden, Kenneth. 2008. "Threats to Formation of Pastoral Leaders in Theological Education: Insights from the Tavistock Model of Group Relations." *Journal of Religious Leadership* 7, no. 1: 1-34

McKibbens, Thomas, Jr. 1986. *The Forgotten Heritage: A Linage of Great Baptist Preaching.* Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

McKenna, Robert, Tanya Boyd, and Paul Yost. 2007. "Learning Agility in Clergy: Understanding the Personal Strategies and Situational Factors that Enable Pastors to Learn from Experience." *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 35, no. 3: 190-01.

McKenna, Robert, and Katrina Eckard. 2009. "Evaluating Pastoral Effectiveness: To Measure or Not to Measure." *Pastoral Psychology* 58, no. 3: 303-13.

McMillan, Becky. 2002. "What Do Clergy Do All Week." *Pulpit and Pew*. Accessed July 8, 2008. http://pulpitandpew.duke.edu.

_____. 2003. *The View from Pulpit & Pew: Provocative Findings on Pastoral Leadership in the 21st Century*. Pulpit and Pew.

McQuilkin, Robertson. 2007. *The Five Smooth Stones: Essential Principles for Biblical Ministry.* Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing.

Meek, Katheryn, Mark McMinn, Craig Brower, Todd Burnett, Barrett McRay, Michael Ramey, David Swanson, and Dennise Villa. 2003. "Maintaining Personal Resiliency: Lessons Learned from Evangelical Protestant Clergy." *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 31, no. 4: 339-47.

Mercer, Joyce. 2005. "Teaching the Bible in Congregations: A Congregational Studies Pedagogy for Contextual Education." *Religious Education* 100, no. 3: 280-95.

Meltzoff, Julian. 1998. *Critical Thinking About Research: Psychology and Related Fields*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Miller, Glenn. 1990. *Piety and Intellect*: *The Aims and Purposes of Ante-Bellum Theological Education*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

_____. 2007. *Piety and Profession: American Protestant Theological Education, 1870-1970.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Mohler, R. Albert. 2007. "The Pastor as Theologian." In *A Theology for the Church*, edited by Daniel Akin, 927-43. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic.

Muller, Richard. 1996. "The Era of Protestant Orthodoxy." In *Theological Education in the Evangelical Tradition*, edited by R. Albert Mohler and Gary Hart, 103-28. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

Naman, Trudy, and Chester McCall. 1999. *Pastoring the Church Into the Twenty-First Century.* Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Ontario, Canada, 19-23 April. ERIC, ED 430 482.

Nelson, Randy. 2005. "Learning Congregational Leadership in Context: A Case Study in

Contextual Theological Education." *Theological Education* 40, supp.: 75-86.

Niebuhr, H. Richard, and Daniel Williams. 1956. *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives*. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.

Niebuhr, H. Richard, Daniel Williams, and James Gustafson. 1957. *The Advancement of Theological Education*. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.

Norman, R. Stanton. 2001. *More Than Just a Name: Preserving Our Baptist Identity*. Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman.

Osmer, Richard. 2008. *Practical Theology: An Introduction.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Parks, David. 2004. "A 360-Degree Analysis of the Leadership Styles of Southern Baptist Ministers of Youth." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Paulus, Michael, Jr. 2011. "Archibald Alexander and the Use of Books: Theological Education and Print Culture in the Early Republic." *Journal of the Early Republic* 31, no. 4: 639-69.

Paver, John. 2006. *Theological Reflection and Education for Ministry: Explorations in Practical, Pastoral, and Empirical Theology*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate.

Peace, Richard. 2009. "Spiritual Formation as Service: The Essential Foundation for Leadership." In *The Three Tasks of Leadership: Worldly Wisdom for Pastoral Leaders,* edited by Eric Jacobsen, 110-22. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing.

Peluso-Verdend, Gary. 2005. "Hearing the Congregation's Voice in Evaluating/Revising The MDiv Curriculum: The Church Relations Council." *Theological Education* 40, supp.: 51-62.

Poe, Harry. 1996. "The Revolution in Ministry Training." *Theological Education* 33, no. 1: 23-30.

Polhill, John. 1992. *Acts. The New American Commentary*, vol. 26. Nashville: Broadman.

Powell, Doug. 2008. "The Relationship Between Administrative and Managerial Competencies and Ministry Satisfaction of Executive Pastors in Southern Baptist Churches." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Price, Matthew. 2002. "After the Revolution: A Review of Mainline Protestant Clergy Leadership Since the 1960s." *Theology Today* 59, no. 3: 428-50.

Purcell, Larry. 2001. "A Comparative Analysis of a Congregation's Perception and a Pastor's Perception of Ministerial Leadership." Ed.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Purves, Andrew. 2004. *Reconstructing Pastoral Theology: A Christological Foundation.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Rees, Frank. 2005. "Teaching Theology with Due Regard to Experience and Context."

Theological Education 40, supp.: 101-113.

Reid, Daniel, Robert Linder, Bruce Shelley, and Harry Stout, eds. 1990. *Dictionary of Christianity in America: A Comprehensive Resource on the Religious Impulse that Shaped a Continent*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.

Ricciuti, Gail. 2003. "The Tensile Core: Theological Pedagogy in a New Context." *Teaching Theology and Religion* 6, no. 3:146–50.

Roozen, David. 2009. *American Congregations 2008*. Hartford, CT: Hartford Institute for Religion Research.

Rost, Joseph. 1993. *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Salkind, Neil. 2011. *Statistics for People Who Think They Hate Statistics*. 4th ed. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Sanders, J. Oswald. 1994. *Spiritual Leadership: Principles of Excellence for Every Believer*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.

Sargeant, Joan, Karen Man, Cees Van Der Vleuton, and Job Metsemakers. 2008. "'Directed' Self-Assessment: Practice and Feedback Within a Social Context." *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions* 28, no. 1: 47-54.

Scalise, Charles. 2009. "Defining the Reality of Your Role: Historical Contexts and Theological Models of Christian Education." In *The Three Tasks of Leadership: Worldly Wisdom for Pastoral Leaders*, edited by Eric Jacobsen, 77-90. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing.

Schaller, Lyle. 1989. *Reflections of a Contrarian: Second Thoughts on the Parish Ministry*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Schaper, Donna. 2002. "360 Degree Assessments: Performance Evaluation from Every Angle." *Congregations* 28, no. 2: 12-13. 28.

Scott, Donald. 1978. *From Office to Profession: The New England Ministry from 1750-1850*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Scuderi, Noelle. 2010. "Servant Leadership and Transformational Leadership in Church Organizations." Ph.D. diss., Columbian College of Arts and Sciences of the George Washington University.

Seamands, Stephen. 2005. *Ministry in the Image of God: The Trinitarian Shape of Christian Service*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books.

Selzer, Elisabeth. 2008. "Effectiveness of a Seminary's Training and Mentoring Program and Subsequent Job Satisfaction of its Graduates." *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 17, no. 1: 25-53.

Shaw, Perry. 2006. "Vulnerable Authority: A Theological Approach to Leadership and Teamwork." *Christian Education Journal* Series 3, 3, no. 1: 119-33.

Southern Baptist Convention. 2000. *The Baptist Faith and Message.* Nashville, TN:

Lifeway.

Stein, Robert. 1992. *Luke. The New American Commentary, vol. 24*. Nashville, TN: B&H Group.

Ste-Marie, Lorraine. 2008. "Immunity to Change Language Technology: An Educational Tool for Pastoral Leadership Education." *Teaching Theology and Religion* 11, no. 2: 92-102.

Stewart, Kristin. 2009. "Keeping Your Pastor: An Emerging Challenge." *Journal for the Liberal Arts and Science* 13, no. 3: 112-27.

Stott, John. 2002. *Basic Christian Leadership: Biblical Models of Church, Gospel, and Ministry.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Tan, Siang-Yang. 2009. "The Primacy of Servanthood." In *The Three Tasks of Leadership: Worldly Wisdom for Pastoral Leaders*, edited by Eric Jacobsen, 77-90. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing.

Thangaraj, M. Thomas. 1992. "Theological Education in the United States; A View from the Periphery." *Theological Education* XXIX, no. 2: 8-20.

Tavakol, Moshen and Reg Dennick. 2011. "Making Sense of Cronbach's Alpha." *Internal Journal of Medical Education*, no. 2: 53-55

Thompson, James. 2006. *Pastoral Ministry According to Paul: A Biblical Vision*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Thorndike, Robert, George Cunningham, Robert Thorndike, and Elizabeth Hagen. 1991. *Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education.* 5th ed. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Thrall, Bill, Bruce McNicol, and Ken McElrath. 1999. *The Ascent of a Leader: How Ordinary Relationships Develop Extraordinary Character and Influence.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Tornow, Walter, Manuel London, and CCL Associates. 1998. *Maximizing the Value of 360-Degree Feedback: A Process for Successful Individual and Organizational Development.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Toulouse, Mark. 2005. "Crafting Research that Will Contribute to Theological Education." *Theological Education* 40, no. 2: 115-34.

Towner, Philip. 2006. *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Tran, Nghi. 2011. "Transformative Learning in Online Theological Education: A Case Study of an Online Program at a Theological Seminary." Ph.D., diss., University of North Texas.

Tunnicliff, Thomas. 2005. "The Early Leadership Development Experiences of Highly Effective Senior Pastors." Ed.D. diss., University of Southern California.

Waldman, David, and Leanne Atwater. 1998. *The Power of 360° Feedback.* Houston,

TX: Gulf Publishing.

Wallace, Byron. 2005. "A Comparative Analysis of Senior Pastor Perceptions and Practices of Servant Leadership." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Weaver, Andrew, Kevin Flannelly, David Larson, and Carolyn Stapleton. 2002. "Mental Health Issues Among Clergy and Other Religious Professionals: A Review of Research." *The Journal of Pastoral Care and Counseling* 56, no. 4: 393-03.

Weber, Timothy. 2008. "The Seminaries and the Churches: Looking for New Relationships." *Theological Education* 44, no. 1: 65–91.

Weems, Lovett. 1993. *Church Leadership: Vision, Team, Culture, and Integrity.* Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Welch, James. 2003. "An Analysis of Perceptions of the Role and Effectiveness of Southern Baptist Seminaries in Preparing Students for Administrative Tasks." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Wheeler, Barbara, Sharon Miller, and Daniel Aleshire. 2007. *How Are We Doing? The Effectiveness of Theological Schools as Measured by the Vocations and Views of Graduates.* New York, NY: Auburn Theological Seminary.

Wilkes, Paul. 1990. "The Hands that Would Shape Our Souls." *The Atlantic Monthly.* Accessed July 15, 2008. http://theatlantic.com.

Williamson, Ian, and Steven Sandage. 2009. "Longitudinal Analyses of Religious and Spiritual Development Among Seminary Students." *Mental Health, Religion and Culture* 12, no. 8: 787-01.

Willimon, William. 2000. *Calling & Character: Virtues of the Ordained Life.* Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Witham, Larry. 2005. *Who Shall Lead Them?: The Future of Ministry in America.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Witmer, Timothy. 2007. "Seminary: A Place to Prepare Pastors?." *Westminster Theological Journal* 69, no. 2: 229-46.

Wood, Charles. 1994. *An Invitation to Theological Study.* Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.

Works, Charles. 2008. "An Analysis of the Relationship Between the Conflict Management Styles of Terminated Pastors and Selected Contextual Factors." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Wright, Walt. 2009. "Introduction: Mentor to Mentor." In *The Three Tasks of Leadership: Worldly Wisdom for Pastoral Leaders*, edited by Eric Jacobsen, 1-16. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing.

Yount, William. 1996. *Created to Learn: A Christian Teacher's Introduction to Educational Psychology.* Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman.

Yperen, Jim. 2002. *Making Peace: A Guide to Overcoming Church Conflict.* Chicago, IL: Moody.

ABSTRACT

PRIOR PASTORAL LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE
AND POST-SEMINARY EFFECTIVENESS:
A MIXED METHOD STUDY

William R. Cannon II, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2015
Chair: Dr. Michael S. Wilder

This research was a descriptive mixed method study of pastoral leadership effectiveness of Southern Baptist pastors in the first ten years after graduating with the Master of Divinity degree from accredited seminaries. The research was limited to lead pastors of Southern Baptist churches and sought to identify any relationship in pastoral leadership effectiveness during the first ten years after seminary training between pastors with pastoral experience prior to or concurrent with seminary training and pastors with no prior or concurrent pastoral leadership experience during seminary training. Only Southern Baptist pastors graduating with a Master of Divinity from Association of Theological Schools accrediting seminaries with less than ten years post graduation pastoral experience were included in the sample population. The Lewis Pastoral Leadership Instrument assessment was utilized to ascertain pastoral leadership effectiveness. The inventory evaluated a pastor's leadership effectiveness in three key areas: character, competency, and contribution. The inventory was developed by the Lewis Center for Church Leadership at Wesley Seminary, Washington, DC.

VITA

William Ralph Cannon II

EDUCATIONAL
 Diploma, Carroll High School, Ozark, Alabama, 1988
 B.A., Auburn University, 1998
 M.Div., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004

MINISTERIAL
 Pastor, First Baptist Church, Salem, Alabama, 1995-1998
 Pastor, First Baptist Church, Notasulga, Alabama, 1998-1999
 Pastor, Pleasant Grove Baptist Church, Hodgenville, Kentucky, 1999-2000
 Pastor, Pleasant Hill Baptist Church, Gordon, Alabama, 2000-2005
 Pastor, Siloam Baptist Church, Marion, Alabama, 2005-2006
 Pastor, Farmville Baptist Church, Auburn, Alabama, 2006-2009
 Pastor, First Baptist Church, Union Springs, Alabama, 2012-